THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher — J. E. DOWD, General Manager — WILLIAM M. REDDIG, Editor

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1947

Secret Of Soviet 'Atom Bomb'

THE big Red scare goes on. By way of Prague and Paris, we are advised that Russia is making atom bombs and already has set one off in a test in Siberia. This is inside stuff, "information transmitted from Moscow" to "confidential sources," according to the Paris dispatch. It is the follow-up of V. Y. Molotov's assertion last week that the "secret of the atom bomb no longer exists." There will be more "confidential" details later from those secretive Russians.

This marks an interesting turn in Russia's war of nerves against us, which started with Andrei Vishinsky's assault on our "warmongers," and which apparently has a threefold purpose. These aims, which have become clearer as the campaign has progressed, are: (1) to anger and alarm us to the point where we will think it useless to go on with our efforts to contain Communist expansion through the United Nations and the Marshall Plan; (2) to frighten off other countries from collaboration with the United States; ((3) to convince the people in Russia that the Stalin regime has scored an epochal victory over its capitalistic enemies. In other words, it is a program admirably suited to the purposes of a country that doesn't have the atom bomb or any immediate prospects of making one and knows it must prepare the home folks for a defeat.

Operation No. 1 must be about completed. The Soviet bluster, slander and obstructionism have not succeeded in provoking us into wrecking UN in a moment of rage and frustration over the Russian veto, and have not made us lose heart in the Marshall Plan undertaking.

Operation No. 2 apparently enters a more intensive phase with the Russian atom bomb report, which is accompanied by rumors of Soviet military movements in the satellite countries. However, these moves seem designed more to intimidate Russia's allies than to impress the European countries that are going along with the Marshall Plan.

That brings us to Operation No. 3, which is the only one that has been a notable success. It reached a high point in the recent celebration of the 30th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, when the Red orators proclaimed the defeat of the capitalist countries and roared defiance at the American imperialists.

This Soviet rejoicing over "victory" is significant in relation to the Communist decline now under way in Western Europe and the digging in that is in progress in Eastern Europe. It becomes even more interesting in view of the fact that the Red propaganda offensive has been accompanied by a rising undertone of reasonableness in the Kremlin.

Stalin himself sounded that note several months ago when he reversed himself to declare that capitalist and communist systems could exist side by side. It was repeated by Molotov last week at the same time he was giving us the old strong-arm treatment. We may expect more of the same along with more rumors of atom bombs and other scares. Both are signs that we are near the eve of great events.

Marshall's Trumps On Germany

SECRETARY MARSHALL apparently is trying for a grand slam in the game on Germany. His strategy at the coming Conference of Foreign Ministers in London was indicated when he appeared yesterday before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee to discuss the European recovery program and called for restoration of the German economy. In projecting the German treaty issue to the forefront of the Marshall Plan discussion he seems to be attempting a double squeeze to get a settlement that will end the partition of Germany.

In thus relating German restoration to the whole recovery program, Mr. Marshall serves notice on both Russia and France that the United States holds the trumps in this game and they should concede the tricks. For France it is notice that continued obstruction of German economic revival by the French will jeopardize the entire recovery program which the United States is sponsoring and upon which the French are depending so heavily.

For Russia it is both a warning and an invitation—a warning that she has nothing to gain in a deadlock over Germany, a reminder that the Soviet has been checkmated at every point and the contest for Western Europe has been decided in favor of the democratic or capitalist world with the institution of the Marshall Plan; an invitation to reach an agreement on Germany which will open the way to a general settlement. It was a hint rather than an open bid, but the point was unmistakable when the Secretary spoke of the fears of some people in Europe that a restored Germany "will again be involved in the destruction of European civilization," and declared they would be dispelled when it becomes apparent that the United States is attempting only to get Europe on its feet. Those words may be construed as reassurance to both France and Russia.

In view of the tension between Russia and this country, and the political situation here, the Secretary could not have made a more pointed gesture toward the Soviet. He was surrounded by Republicans who have been talking loudly for a separate German treaty and no more truck with the Russians.

Mr. Marshall already has drawn some criticism on the score that he does not give enough interviews and doesn't take the Republicans into his confidence. Some of this unfriendly comment comes from twerps who can't appreciate the magnitude of the task on which the Secretary is concentrating, but mostly it comes from GOP critics that want to close the door to a settlement with Russia even before Mr. Marshall goes to the conference on Germany.

Perhaps it is too much to hope that there is a chance for peace in Germany, but if there is we have George C. Marshall to thank for it. Meanwhile, we give thanks for our good fortune in having a Secretary who is short on words but long on deeds.

Hope For W. Trade Underpass

THERE is real hope that Charlotte at last will be able to eliminate the Southern Railway crossing on West Trade St. which creates a major traffic bottleneck, endangers the lives of our citizens, slows down the community's progress, stamps the city as a hick town in the eyes of countless travelers, creates an unlovely aspect all around and gives everyone a pain in the neck.

Mayor Herbert H. Baxter and the City Planning Board have given this project priority and the movement gets off to a promising start with a recommendation for a survey, which is contained in a letter from Chairman Frank Thies of the Planning Board to Mayor Baxter and City Councilmen.

"We consider this one of the most urgent needs in our endeavor to cope with existing traffic conditions," Mr. Thies writes in support of the Board's suggestion that a competent railroad engineer be employed by the City to advise the Board and Council on the feasibility of underpassing the crossing.

This is the practical and economical way to proceed. Construction of an underpass admittedly will be a complicated operation and there are many questions to be answered before a program for this long-needed improvement can be presented to the public for final discussion and approval. Costs of a survey will be nominal, a very small item compared to the benefits to be derived from formulating a plan that will actually solve the problem. This study will give us the information we must have to obtain a dependable estimate of the costs involved. It will be cheap insurance against a costly mistake. It offers the only means by which we may intelligently answer the question whether a satisfactory solution is possible and is within our means at this time. It will provide the only sound basis for a building program now or later.

Finally, this is a step which the Southern itself should welcome. It is inconceivable that anyone or any interest should obstruct the movement at this stage. If he does, let him or it be sentenced to spend a day trying to cross the tracks on West Trade where the cars, the busses and the pedestrians stand in miserable confusion while the trains go by.

From The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Incentives To Produce

GENERAL ELECTRIC is ending profit-sharing with rank-and-file workers because, says the company, it no longer acts as an incentive to produce. The abandonment supports an argument made last year by the New York Herald Tribune: The incentive works best when the employees must make a visible contribution to the business in return, when it is based essentially on volume of production rather than on volume of profits.

G. E. drops out but others remain. Sears Roebuck has operated a plan since 1916 in which the company contributes a fraction of its net earnings to a pension fund, giving employees a lifelong interest in the company's success. Endicott-Johnson's plan started in 1919, based on average earnings and length of service. Eastman Kodak pays employees a dividend whenever common stock dividends exceed a stated rate.

The mortality in incentive plans is high, but so is the birth rate. That is natural, because only experimental solutions are possible, and they must be worked out company by company. Such a spirit of experiment is certainly wholesome because as Senator Vandenberg told the Senate on submitting a 1939 report:

> The committee finds that profit-sharing, in one form or another, has been and can be eminently successful, when properly established, in creating employer-employee relations that make for peace, security, efficiency and contentment. We believe it to be essential to the ultimate maintenance of the capitalistic system. We have found veritable islands of peace, equity, efficiency and contentment, and like wise prosperity, dotting an otherwise relatively turbulent industrial map, all the way across the continent. This fact is too significant . . . to be ignored or depreciated in our national quest for greater stability and greater democracy in industry.

Experience with incentives is mixed, but evidences of success already mount high enough to suggest that the "right" structure in enough industries could be a golden key to industrial peace and unparalleled production.

Stopgap Program

Marquis Childs

Mounting Inflation

WASHINGTON

THE TRAVELER returning from Europe feels the moment he steps on shore the clash and clang and roar of America's vitality. It assails him like a wave, and the contrast with Europe is overpowering.

In Europe you have the feeling of a society that is fraying out at the ends. Here you know that we are still winding up to a greater and greater effort.

The 60,000,000 jobs that once seemed to us a distant dream are now taken for granted. Production levels are up to heights never dreamed of in peacetime.

But so are prices. And that is the catch. During my three months' absence, the price spiral has soared dizzily upward.

You notice the changes immediately. I gave a washroom attendant a dime as a tip. He looked at it mournfully as though it were a worthless relic of a recently vanished civilization. Without a word he dropped it into a saucer in which there were quarters and half dollars. The dime, I was clearly given to understand, had passed out of circulation.

INFLATION'S TERRORS

Anyone who travels in Europe however briefly, must catch some idea of the terrors of inflation. The kind of inflation spreading in Italy and France undermines all values—economic, social and moral. It is like a creeping plague that sans the life-blood of a nation.

We do not have that kind of inflation in America today. But skilled observers, and among them the President's Council of Economic Advisers, feel that we are certainly not immune from it.

In fact, some of the beginning symptoms are already apparent. We cannot afford to be smug about Europe's black markets when our own markets in some commodities are in a gray or a blackish zone. A cartoon in the current New Yorker shows a used-car lot with shiny new cars in the "used" section and next door a department for "used cars" containing jalopies and older models.

Paying a hotel bill in New York, you get a jolt. You are reminded of the European hotel bills that are added up in hundreds of thousands of francs, marks or lira or francs. It hasn't come to that yet. But the threat is there, lurking just behind the cash register.

At this point, it seems to me, we come up against the real problem on aid to Europe. The area of agreement on the need for relief and reconstruction is remarkable. A year ago even the most optimistic prophet would not have ventured to predict general agreement ranging from right-wing Republicans to convinced internationalists. We have an enormous assist, of course, from Molotov, Vishinsky & Co. Without their ranting and raving we should be much more divided than we are.

CONGRESS DIVIDED

Congress in the coming special session will differ, and sharply, over the aid program both in its emergency and its long-range phases. Disagreement will come on the questions of where, how much, what and when. In the end, non-partisan support seems certain to underwrite both a short-term and a long-term program.

When it comes to the steps that may be necessary to curb our own inflation, under the burden of further aid, it is hard to find any agreement. That is where partisan politics comes in.

A depression in America following on the present boom is the cornerstone of Soviet policy. They are counting on it just as a mariner counts on the tides. A diplomatic source I believe to be reliable quoted Stalin as having said recently:

"Six months after the onset of the American depression, there will be much widespread unemployment and the threat of social upheaval that we will be able to deal on our own terms with American business. We shall buy the machines we need at a fraction of what they now cost."

To give the masters of the Kremlin the depression they are counting on would be unequaled folly. It would be equivalent to handing them the world with a nice red ribbon around it. That is why somehow an area of agreement must be found on the domestic as well as the foreign phase of the relief program.

Lobbies In Session

Line-Up On The Marshall Plan

CONGRESSMEN coming back to Washington to wrestle with the problems of foreign aid will find several bags full of literature from national pressure groups urging them this way or that, but their desks are almost bare of mail from constituents on the subject.

With a few important exceptions, the preponderance of lobby sentiment favors additional aid to Europe. So, from all indications, does the preponderance of Congressional sentiment.

CAN RECONTROL BE AVOIDED?

The extremes of the basic dilemma confronting congressmen are whether to allow Western Europe to go Communist on the one hand, or whether to reimpose elaborate controls on America's domestic economy.

The crux of the matter is not so much the effect of aid to Europe (that is, exports) on the American economy, though this is important, as it is the effect of the American price level on aid to Europe. Europe's needs are measured in terms of tons of coal and steel and bushels of wheat. The prices of these things in the United States determines the cost of aid to Europe. If American prices rise as much in the next four years as they have in the last four years, the cost of the Marshall Plan would be nearer $25 billion than the $16 billion now estimated.

WHERE LOBBIES STAND

Congressional Quarterly has checked the pressure group mail of several congressmen. It finds that most of the national organizations which have taken positions on aid to Europe and which will supply most of the non-Government witnesses at forthcoming committee hearings are concerned as much with the implications of aid to Europe as they are with the problem of aid itself.

Organized labor generally favors the Marshall Plan, but there have been complaints from unions like the United Electrical Workers (CIO) and the National Maritime Union (CIO) that the plan is based too much on the requirements of big business.

Big business itself, though it generally supports foreign aid, shows considerably less enthusiasm than other pressure groups. Several trade associations, like the National Retail Lumber Dealers, oppose increases in exports of their particular goods; and others, like the American Bankers Association, favor tying political strings to foreign aid.

Citizens and church organizations give foreign aid its most vocal support. Among those who want to go all out are the League of Women Voters, Americans for Democratic Action, the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace, and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

Few pressure groups lobby against the Marshall Plan. Some of them are the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, the Progressive Citizens of America, and the General Welfare Federation of America.

Flat endorsements of aid to Europe have come from such organizations as the American Veterans Committee, the American Bar Association, the Association of National Advertisers, the American Unitarian Association, the Catholic Association for International Peace, the National Women's Trade Union League of America, the Friends Committee on International Legislation, the Young Women's Christian Association, the National Council of Jewish Women, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Planning Association, the American Association of University Women, the American Federation of Labor, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Amvets, American Friends of Slovak Freedom, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Co-operatives, and the People's Lobby.

FARMERS UNION PLAN

Joining the other major farm organizations in supporting aid to Europe, the Farmers Union has come out with a seven-point program for handling the air, including a return to rationing and price control in the United States.

Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish groups are supporting the Marshall Plan. The National Council of Catholic Charities urges "aid for starving Europe," and the National Catholic Welfare Conference on Thanksgiving will begin collection of food for Europe. Dr. C. Oscar Johnson, president of the Baptist World Alliance, has pledged the support of American Baptists for aid to Europe. The Board of Temperance of the Methodist Church favors "intelligent and generous use of food products to aid Europe," and calls for halting manufacture of alcoholic beverages. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America describes the "continuing desperate need for relief overseas" as being "of far longer duration and more appalling magnitude than we had anticipated," and urges acceptance by the public of responsibility for meeting this emergency "even at the cost of a reduction in the general standard of living." The Council urges "the Church people of the United States" to communicate to members of Congress and Government officials their convictions "regarding our obligations to share our food, fuel and clothing with people in tragic suffering."

Organizations concerned primarily with foreign policy generally support aid to Europe. Federal Union, Inc., says the Marshall Plan will fit into a Federal Union of Europe, and the Foreign Policy Association says it will strengthen the United Nations. The American Association for the United Nations predicts that failure to implement the Marshall Plan "could well bring Western Europe to economic and social chaos."

THE CRITICAL SIDE

Other comments: Norman Thomas, chairman of the National Action Committee of the Socialist Party: The Marshall Plan is worthy of support but requires changes eliminating divisive nationalism.

National Economic Council: It is a very important thing for the United States to help save Europe. But it is more important to save herself. If America does not persuade Britain to abandon Socialism, America will miss the greatest single opportunity she will have to help in the rescue of Europe."

America's Future, Inc.: U. S. should tell England, "For God's sake, stop calling me Papa; I'm only your Uncle Sam."

General Welfare Federation of America: U. S. should take care of its own people, especially the aged, first.—**Congressional Quarterly.**

Samuel Grafton

Saving The Peace

A FAINT, almost invisible line separates the period in which we still expect peace from the period in which we begin to expect war. The danger is that we can cross that line without knowing it. The task of men of good will is to dress that line up in neon lights, and with markers and warnings, so that we shall know it is there. It is a pity to stumble finally across the Rubicon in the belief it is only a crack in the sidewalk.

In the coming debate on the Marshall Plan, we must be careful to consider it as a plan to preserve the peace, not as a plan to give us a somewhat better setup for a coming war. Mr. Marshall hit exactly the right note last June when he invited all the nations of Europe, including Russia, to share in the plan. Russia suffered diplomatic damage when she declined, and induced Poland and Czechoslovakia. But it was not because Mr. Marshall was clever that he dealt this stroke; it was because he was honest, and had shaped his suggestion within the perspective of peace.

To keep that perspective, to refuse to cross the line, to preserve the moral atmosphere of the expectation of peace, may be hard, but it is necessary. If we want peace, we must conduct ourselves as if we expected peace.

The great danger in the coming debate will arise not from enemies of the Marshall Plan, but from hotheaded friends, who may sputter, through the foam on their lips, that the Marshall Plan will furnish us with something like bases on the Continent from which to fight. Such marplots should be given some cookies and sent off to bed.

As a military measure the Marshall Plan is probably valueless; its only possible value is as a plan for creating enough stability in Western Europe on which to construct a peace. We must know what we want the Marshall Plan for, for in the end our fingers will shape it according to what is in our hearts, try to guide them as we may.

* * *

In the same way, if we make a big tantara at the coming council of Foreign Ministers, and come out of it with a clean break with Russia, and a separate peace with Western Germany, we may find that we have crossed the line. For Rubicon is everywhere these days; it lies in coils about our feet. The point is not to cross it inadvertently, or because a foot slips.

It is for us to make our dwelling this side of the line that separates the expectation of peace from the expectation of war, to lock it out, patiently and stubbornly, to accept no provocations and to give none, and to let spectacular breaks, if they must be, come from the other side.

For if we but once cross the line, a subtle change will take place in our national character and in our national work. A diplomat who expects peace has a task quite different from that of a diplomat who expects war. The first must work patiently, evenly, building, giving and taking. The second has a much lower and easier job; he can yield no point, for to yield becomes something like treason, and he accepts any offered compromise with the spirit of one who has found a soft spot. The first one must create; the second need not.

A change from one way of work to the other must affect our conceptions of industry, trade, our internal life; it cannot stop short of working an eerie transformation in things we do, and in the end it will guide us. We have not yet crossed the line, and we need not, but we must know that it exists and that it can be crossed inadvertently.

War is not made by a declaration of hostilities but in the hidden moment, perhaps years back, when someone, almost unconsciously, stopped hoping for peace.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Mayors Organize To Study Government

ABOARD THE FRIENDSHIP TRAIN—Some interesting people are aboard the Friendship Train and one of them is Mayor George Welsh of Grand Rapids, Mich., chairman of the Conference of Mayors. Most people don't realize it, but the mayors of the United States have their own "union," and George Welsh is the head of it.

This union has quite a gilt-edged membership list, including Mayors William O'Dwyer of New York, Martin Kennelly of Chicago, Joseph Smith of Oklahoma and all the others. I have been kidding Mayor Welsh that his organization is really for the purpose of getting higher wages and preventing the electorate from kicking mayors out of office, but he claims it's merely to discuss the perennial headaches of city problems and see if something can't be done about them.

Mayor Welsh is the only member of the five original founders of this "union" still endorsed by his electorate and able to do business at the same old stand.

The mayors' "union" was founded during the depression when most cities of the USA found themselves with breadlines, empty treasuries, and desperation down almost every street.

At that time, Mayor Welsh, a Republican, teamed up with several Democratic mayors and went to Washington to get help from President Herbert Hoover. They explained the plight of American cities, warned that rioting and bloodshed might be around the corner and asked for Federal credit to help them finance the emergency.

Hoover listened carefully, then replied: "I am sorry, gentlemen, but the problem of relief in local municipalities is a problem for those municipalities."

Mayor Welsh, a Republican, then went back to Michigan and voted for Franklin Roosevelt.

Riding On The Friendship Train

MAYOR WELSH was discussing the problem of municipal government with Mayor J. E. Fritz of Merced, Calif., and City Manager Walter Hogan of Stockton. They seemed to agree that the old, old problem of city versus agricultural countryside is just as hot and difficult as ever.

The cities of the United States pay the largest proportion of State taxes, according to Mayor Welsh, but they pay it into State coffers; then the State refuses to give a proper proportion back to them. That's why cities are always poverty stricken, while governors can boast of surpluses in the State treasuries.

"We talk about democracy," says Mayor Welsh of Grand Rapids, "but when some small town in Connecticut, with 520 in its population, has the same vote in the Connecticut Legislature as Hartford, we're a long way from democracy. When Los Angeles County with 4,000,000 people has the same vote as a couple of little counties in northern California with only 1,000 people, then something's wrong."

Last Summer Mayor Welsh led a group of other American mayors on a visit to Europe. Before leaving, he asked the Book Cadillac Hotel in Detroit, the Vanderbilt Hotel in New York and several others to give him 1,000 small cakes of hotel soap, and those small cakes of soap, given to the mayors of European cities, were more welcome than gold.

Mayor Welsh came back with a grim picture of conditions in Europe, and is now riding on the Friendship Train in order to help do his part to collect food for those people.

City Manager's Problem

WALTER HOGAN, another part-way passenger on the Friendship Train, has been city manager of Stockton, Calif., for nineteen years—longer than any other city manager in the country except C. W. Eichelberger of Dayton, Ohio, who has been in office for 25 years. John Ames of Ames, Iowa, also has a long record of successful city management.

The mortality among city managers, however, can be pretty high. Long Beach, Calif., for instance, has kicked out about six managers in one year.

The chief trouble with city managers, according to mayors who have visited with us on the Friendship Train, is that having one discourages alertness on the part of the City Council and the electorate. People take the attitude "let the city manager do it," instead of doing it themselves.

Mr. Hogan, city manager of Stockton, didn't quite agree with this, and judging by the co-operation they gave the Friendship Train, there was no "let George do it" attitude on the part of the people of Stockton.

Hushing Up China

BY WASHINGTON PIPELINE: The State Department's refusal to show Republican Senator George Wilson of Iowa the top-secret report on China by Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer will touch off some hot debate on the Senate floor when Congress is reconvened Nov. 17.

Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are prepared to demand that they be permitted to see the secret document. So far it has been shown only to President Truman, Secretary of State Marshall and a few other top-notchers. One reason for suppressing the report may be the fact that General Wedemeyer, who made a tour of China for the President, sharply denounces bottlenecks in U. S. aid to China—bottlenecks which Wedemeyer insists could have been avoided.

The U.S.A. has supplied Chiang-Kai-shek with planes and heavy weapons with rifles and other arms to protect themselves against communist aggressors But, Wedemeyer states in his highly secret report, we have failed to provide ammunition for the weapons. Therefore, the weapons are virtually useless since Chiang inherited American ammunition, which the Chinese have been unable to get.

Wedemeyer also states that General MacArthur has plenty of ammunition that he is preparing to turn over to China, if he is ordered by Washington. So far however, no such order has been forthcoming.

Wedemeyer indirectly blames the State Department for failure to use MacArthur's ammunition to help China. It might take as long as six months for Chiang Kai-shek to get the ammunition he needs in the U. S. and get it to China. By then, according to Wedemeyer, it might be too late to be of any effective help in resisting the Communists.

Wedemeyer secretly praises Chiang Kai-shek as an honest, trustworthy leader with whom we can continue to do business, but denounces a number of Chiang's top aides as grafters and pro-communists.

Wedemeyer recommends a sweeping shakeup of Chiang's staff to get rid of these undesirables. Note that State Department officials say privately that Wedemeyer made only a brief tour of China and saw only what Chang Kai-shek wanted him to see. General Marshall, on the other hand, remained in China one year before making his highly critical report on the Chiang regime. The Marshall and Wedemeyer reports are in direct conflict, another reason why Wedemeyer's report isn't being published.