THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

60th Anniversary Year

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

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1948

Mr. Vishinsky's Hollow Words

ANDREI VISHINSKY again demonstrated last week Russia's determination to make continuing use of the United Nations General Assembly as a sounding board for vitriolic Communist propaganda. His 1948 castigation of the West fell on the ears of many of the same delegates who heard him with amazement during the 1947 Assembly session in New York; but neither the delegates in attendance at the Paris meeting nor the world-wide audience which read and heard about his words felt anything like the same measure of surprise.

"Old stuff," said United States Delegate Warren R. Austin. And much of the world (especially citizens of the United States reading Sunday press reports alongside the Saturday football scores) would surely echo that sentiment.

Still, the East-West impasse had reached a stage so serious that it seemed profitable to examine Mr. Vishinsky's latest tirade with exceeding care. Was there any seed of harmony there? Did he propose anything that had about it the sweet sound of reason?

Excepting his caustic blasts at "Western imperialists," the Soviet delegate's entire exposition centered around proposals that the five great powers scrap one-third of their land, sea and air forces and that the UN ban "aggressive" use of the atomic bomb.

Both these proposals fall in the sphere of "disarmament" which has been one of the focal points of United Nations activity since it was organized. But past experience has consistently shown that Russia's real interest in the matter—atomic energy, et al.—goes no further than the effective "disarmament' of the West while she herself remains well armed. This is to say that the Soviet Union has continuously defeated any proposals that would make her own economy subject to the same "control" she advises for others.

Exhibit Number One is the report of the UN Atomic Energy Commission which proposed that something approaching an efficient and thorough inspection system be established for all world powers before the United States should begin to limit her manufacture of atomic weapons. Although the West generally approved this principle, Russia backed down immediately when it became apparent her internal affairs would be subject to outside inspection.

This, somehow, strikes at the very heart of the East-West controversy. The United States has repeatedly shown a willingness to co-operate in a "control" system. Russia has not and she has thereby displayed to the world her true motivations in all the post-war maneuverings.

But there is little need to rely on supposition and speculation about these motivations and plans. Soviet leaders have reiterated them over and over again since the time of Lenin.

Only last week Soviet Deputy Premier Nikolai A. Voznesensky emphatically predicted another world war, basing his opinion on the belief that capitalistic countries and the Soviet Union cannot exist side by side. He made this prediction in a book just published in the United States which also included a paragraph pertinent to the Vishinsky speech.

"The Soviet state," Mr. Voznesensky wrote, "does not rule out participation in various international organizations insofar as they do not claim to interfere in the internal conditions of the USSR and do not affect the economic systems of the USSR."

There it is in black and white. Russia will not abide international control of anything inside her borders.

But she will continue, as Mr. Vishinsky reveals, to push forward tempting propagandic propositions which, through the use of the specific items (one-third reduction, for instance), seem to harbor new attitudes of co-operation.

Unless there have been some very decided changes inside the Soviet hierarchy (which seem improbable) Andrei Vishinsky's latest proposals are as meaningless as those he made last year.

The United States and the West will do well to continue their current policy of weighing with great care each proposition made by Russia and maintaining the patient firmness Secretary Marshall mentioned in his opening speech in Paris last week.

The Wrong Approach

ONE OF the very real dangers facing the United States in an era of bristling guns and even more bristling ideologies is the prospect of having to fight a war with depleted petroleum reserves. Opinions from industry and Government vary considerably, but all experts seem to be generally agreed that the U. S. has something less than a super-abundance of petroleum, and that something ought to be done about it.

Newest proposal for stretching out the thin reserves is now before the National Security Resources Board. Under the plan the states would require that oil companies cut their production to save petroleum. They would be permitted to raise prices by joint action as compensation for lost production, and would receive immunity from prosecution under the anti-trust laws.

It is still merely a proposal, and supposedly a confidential one, and no action has yet been taken on it. But it's a patently ridiculous solution, since it would insure the very thing it seeks to avoid. When you cut down oil production and artificially raise oil prices, you limit the industry's capacity to produce and lessen the demand which inspires it to produce. Furthermore, you set up another monopoly.

You don't have to be an oil expert to see that it would be far better to: (1) encourage the discovery and development of new world oil resources; (2) spend some more money on research designed to develop synthetics and substitutes; (3) concentrate on design and technique in an effort to improve the efficiency of the modern combustible engine.

The Government is always deploring high prices and monopoly. The present proposal would bring about both.

'Our Bob' In Franco Land

ROBERT RICE REYNOLDS, former Tar Heel Senator and perhaps North Carolina's only indulgence in political sideshow entertainers familiar to the Deep South, has departed for Madrid accompanied by his young daughter. This travel note reaches North Carolina via the New York gossip column of Leonard Lyons who also passes on the interesting tid-bit that "Our Bob" still has his eye on the Senatorial seat he relinquished in 1944 to Clyde Roark Hoey.

Lyons, who is not known to be an astute political observer, says Reynolds will definitely be a candidate for the U. S. Senate when he returns from Spain next year. (Mr. Hoey's term expires in December, 1949).

There would naturally be speculation throughout North Carolina as to the intention of "Our Bob" if not because he poses a threat to the established political regime, then certainly because Bob Reynolds is a colorful, unpredictable man.

In departing for Spain, the man from Buncombe announced that he and his daughter would be abroad at least one year, but there was little indication how "Our Bob" expects to further his Senatorial candidacy from the confines of Dictator Franco's long-conquered province.

Some North Carolinians might recall that Bob Reynolds took a similar trip in 1930— just prior to his successful slam-bang campaign against Cam Morrison. On that trip he mailed back to North Carolina dozens of picture post cards to his voting constituents. In those days cards postmarked from places like New Delhi, Suez and Singapore meant a good deal more than they do to the been-everywhere war generations of today. "Our Bob" may have something like that in mind, but possibly his only interest is to examine the governmental system of one of the world's flourishing dictatorships. Besides kissing Jean Harlow on the Capitol steps, Bob also took a trip to Germany in the late thirties and came back, some people said, bubbling praise for National Socialism.

Perhaps such speculation wanders in the real of fancy. Bob and his rich little daughter (scion of the late Evelyn Walsh McLean) may just be seeking the momentary diversions of travel. They have wealth now, even of the same amount and texture as that "Our Bob" vilified when he was campaigning against Cameron Morrison. Let "Our Bob" and little Miss Reynolds depart for Madrid in peace.

* * *

"What is Hitler doing? He is looking after the people of Germany . . . What ought Uncle Sam to do? God Bless Uncle Sam. I love him and you love him, Senators. But I want him to come home. He has been wandering over the face of the earth, trying to police the earth. I want him to get back here and take care of his twelve million nieces and nephews who are out of work! . . . Mussolini is not sticking his nose in the business of other countries of the world. Mussolini is thinking about the Italians; and the dictators are doing what is best for their people. I say it is high time we find out how they are doing it, and why they are progressing so rapidly."

—Senator Reynolds in The Congressional Record.

A Purdue professor recommends using garbage to fertilize woodlands, and what a pity that flooded rivers won't flow upstream to where the woods are. — *Louisville (Ky.) Times.*

Few of those who insist the farmer is getting rich are taking the road back to the farm. — *New Orleans (La.) States.*

Even the best of women are pretty bossy. And the most reasonable and likeable men are frequently grouchy. — *Lamar (Mo.) Democrat.*

News Of The World

Unwise And Dangerous

A Military Foreign Policy

By SUMNER WELLES
Former Undersecretary of State

WASHINGTON

THE Alsop brothers did a useful job in one of their recent columns by calling attention to the fact that the National Security Council has taken over the control of American foreign policy.

The council is composed of the Secretaries of State, Defense, Army, Navy and Air and the chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Generals Wedemeyer and Norstad, Admiral Struble, and George Kennan of the State Department are chiefly responsible for the plans which it considers.

The council passes on all important questions in this country's international relations and decides the policy to be adopted. It has now been given authority by the President to determine our political objectives in every part of the world.

The explanation is offered that since the President is the final arbiter, and the council's members are civilian heads of executive departments, the civil viewpoint is not subordinated to that of the armed services.

That explanation will not bear analysis.

FAITH IN BRASS

No President since General Grant has had such childlike faith in the omniscience of the high brass as the present occupant of the White House. It is no surprise to learn that President Truman invariably approves every decision of the council.

Of his 45 years of outstanding service Secretary Marshall has spent all but the last three as a professional soldier. At the age of 68 he cannot lose the military impress of a lifetime. During this generation our country has had no abler nor more devoted public servant than James Forrestal. Yet, as Secretary of Defense, it is his obligation to place military considerations first, and these considerations must equally prevail with the heads of the three service departments who sit with him on the council.

Those who have served in our Government in a national emergency recognize the need for a council composed of the top officials responsible for foreign policy and national defense. By making possible their close collaboration, and the co-ordination of their activities, such an agency as the National Security Council can insure the efficient implementation of defense policy and prevent the repetition of such an unnecessary disaster as Pearl Harbor.

But no emergency can justify the control of this country's foreign policy by a council which reaches its decisions from a military standpoint.

The military concept of foreign policy is necessarily based upon the use of force. It attributes little value to such other important factors as the influence of ideas and of emotion, of the interplay of economic relations. It would not apprehend the ultimate advantage often to be gained from negotiations in which neither side can claim a total victory.

FURTHER DAMAGE

Should the military concept continue to govern American foreign policy we will face a further danger. The old isolationism has at last learned that we cannot withdraw from the world. The new isolationism holds that international co-operation is a fantasy and that the United States must run the world singlehanded. No stauncher advocates of that doctrine will be found than in the armed services.

In the world of today our foreign policy cannot succeed unless it is backed by power. But neither will our foreign policy succeed if it envisages the use of force as its sole means of implementation.

In 1941 the United States needed to secure air bases and port facilities in a great South American republic for its projected invasion of North Africa. The republic's chief authorities assured us that if they had time to prepare public opinion and to prevent internal dissension, arrangements would be made. A satisfactory solution was already in sight when I received, while acting Secretary of State, an urgent call from the Secretary of War to say that he and the Chief of Staff insisted that the United States should immediately occupy the desired areas by force. The military objective was so compelling that they had lost sight of other values. Had they possessed the power to decide policy we would have lost the support of one of our most loyal allies, and the resentment of our other Latin-American neighbors would have been so violent that we would no longer have had the invaluable safeguard of a united and friendly hemisphere.

A fatal mistake was avoided because President Roosevelt consistently refused to permit those charged with the military prosecution of the war to decide questions of foreign policy.

Should such a question come before the National Security Council can it be doubted that the demands of the military would prevail?

We have mounting evidence of the harm done by the predominance of the military viewpoint in our foreign policies in such cases as Palestine, Panama, the Pacific trusteeships, the Italian colonies, Germany and reparations.

The shadow of totalitarianism now darkens the world. There can be no liberalism in any national policy which is determined by the military. And if liberalism vanishes from the national policy of the United States, the battle for Western civilization will be lost.

The Alsop brothers express the belief that if Governor Dewey becomes President he will "make maximum use" of the National Security Council as "an extraordinarily effective instrument of Government."

I think most Americans will hope on the contrary that, should Governor Dewey be elected, he will restore the control of foreign policy to the civil authorities designated by the Constitution, and limit the National Security Council to the co-ordinating functions for which alone it is qualified.

Quote, Unquote

The way to make the motor in a power lawnmower behave, somebody writes in to say, is to hide behind a tree and throw rocks at it. We here and now serve notice on our own not so illustrious contribution that we intend to follow this advice to the letter unless it stops acting up. —Roanoke (Va.) Times.

A lot of smart folks lie around town most of the year and make enough picking cotton in the Fall to get by the rest of the year. They skip the plowing, hoeing and planting. —Grenada County (Miss.) Weekly.

Merry-Go-Round

President Seeks New Job For Leahy

WASHINGTON

PRESIDENT TRUMAN has been privately turning on the heat to ease out his chief of staff, 73-year-old Elder Statesman Adm. William D. Leahy.

Mr. Truman, who hates to fire anyone himself, recently called in Leahy's close friend, Adm. Louis Denfield, chief of naval operations and the man who really runs the Navy. Addressing Denfield as "Lou," though he usually calls him "Admiral," Truman said:

"Lou, I want you to do something for me. I want you to ask Leahy to retire.

"I like the old man," the President continued, "but he's ourgrown his usefulness. I just hate to do this, but you can find a way of suggesting it to him. When I first came here, he offered to resign and I said no. Then last Spring he offered to resign again, and I asked him to stay. So it's very embarrassing to me and I can't very well ask him myself."

Admiral Denfield, who has known Leahy all his life, demurred.

"I suppose Secretary Forrestal has been telling you that I have two votes in the joint chiefs of staff—mine and Leahy's," he said. "But just look at the record. You'll find Leahy voted against me most of the time."

"He's gotten too reactionary," countered the President. "He and George Marshall are hard to speaking terms. Everything Marshall proposes, Leahy tears to pieces. Clark Clifford tells me the public reaction to him is bad."

Denfield replied that he didn't see how he could possibly ask Admiral Leahy to retire.

"He's my superior," he said, "and I can't go to him with a proposal like that."

Leahy, Ambassador To Spain?

"WELL, figure out some big job we can give him," countered the President "I want him to retire in a blaze of glory. After his career he deserves it. Think up some important mission we can send him on—something really important."

Admiral Denfield promised to look into the matter, came back a few days later with the idea that Admiral Leahy be appointed U. S. Ambassador to Spain. Leahy had already served as Ambassador to France and Governor of Puerto Rico, has something of a diplomatic background and Truman was delighted with the idea. However, he overlooked the fact that we have no diplomatic relations with Spain, and have agreed not to appoint an ambassador until the Franco Government is recognized by the United Nations.

This fact was promptly brought to Mr. Truman's attention when he suggested that Leahy become Ambassador to Spain. The State Department was emphatic and adamant. No ambassador, it said—not even Admiral Leahy—would be sent to Madrid.

Mr. Truman is still looking for a job for Admiral Leahy.

Gouzenko Shuns Congress

FOR weeks the House Un-American Activities Committee has been trying to make contact with Igor Gouzenko, the Soviet code clerk who jarred the world with his sensational revelations on Russia's atomic spy ring in Canada.

Gouzenko, however, is living under another name on a Canadian farm closely guarded by the Canadian Government which doesn't trust headline-hunting American Congressmen to keep his identity secret.

Once the committee almost got to Gouzenko, but upset its own applecart. Arrangements had been made with Prime Minister Mackenzie King who agreed to meet committee members secretly in Ottawa for further discussions.

Congressmen John McDowell of Pennsylvania, Richard Nixon of California and Ed Hebert of Louisiana set out in strictest secrecy. They even left separately and took different routes to the railroad station to throw off suspicion.

But when the three Congressmen reached New York they were greeted with glaring headlines revealing their plans. A member of the committee had leaked the whole story to the press.

Since then the committee has got the royal brush-off from the Canadian Government.

NOTE—What the committee wants to question Gouzenko about is Soviet spies in the United States. It has a tip that Gouzenko knows about two key spies in America who were not mentioned in the Canadian Royal Commission's report.

Marquis Childs

Partner In Peril

WASHINGTON

A VISITOR is in Washington who comes from a people under siege. Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancellor of the Exchequer in Britain's Labor Government, lean, austere, self-disciplined, is a symbol of the struggle going forward in England.

That the siege is against the forces of economic catastrophe makes it no less rigorous. The end of the shooting war three years ago brought very few differences to the beleaguered population of the tight little island.

Speaking not long ago in Parliament, Cripps reported definite and substantial gains against the threatening enemy. His report of progress got very little attention in the news here. It seemed almost as though the siege of Britain had already been discounted as lost.

What Cripps said in his report was that Britain's annual trade deficit with the rest of the world had been reduced by 55 per cent. This must be measured against the gravity of Britain's plight since the end of World War II to understand its significance.

From the outbreak of war in 1939 through 1945, the British threw into the battle most of the resources that had made it possible in other years to balance their budget with the world. Through various investments—investments, shipping and so on—they could pay for the imports essential to feed a population that cannot sustain itself on England's limited acres of tillable land. At the same time, colonies and dependencies severed ancient ties.

This meant the kind of belt-tightening that may looking on from the outside thought impossible, and it may still prove impossible. Yet the progress reported by Cripps was extraordinary. Between December, 1947, and June of '48, the volume of British exports rose from 120 per cent to 138 per cent of the volume for 1938. It is now believed to be well above the target figure of 140 per cent of prewar.

Marshall Plan aid definitely helped in this recovery. But, as Cripps pointed out, the British net contribution of $282,000,000 in grants this year to other European countries is not insignificant.

Anyone who has been in England since the war knows what sacrifices are back of this record. It means a monotonous level of living with almost nothing left over for even little luxuries.

NORWEGIAN BEAVER

A letter from a friend in England recently says that, in the face of a meat shortage, no wonder, than at any time, "Norwegian beaver is being sold. The suspicion is prevalent that this is nothing more than rat. There is siege fare for you.

On the sporadic black market, horse meat sells for 50 to 60 cents a pound. A broken-down cart horse will bring $200 to $225 from a black market slaughterer.

Officially, Cripps is here for the annual meeting of the governing board of the World Bank of which he is vice-chairman. But he will talk with American policy-makers about Britains most pressing problem today.

That problem can be summarized this way: What will happen to the program to increase exports, and thereby correct the unbalance in world trade, in view of Britain's beginning re-armament and re-mobilization program?

A solemn Parliament has heard, in recent days the steps the Government in London is taking because of the deadly seriousness of the crisis between East and West. The cost of taking those steps was not included in a budget cut to an austerity pattern.

UNHAPPY ALTERNATIVE

What Cripps is likely to say while he is here is that Britain cannot afford to pay for re-armament without risking the wreck of carefully laid plans aimed at bringing the precarious British economy back into balance once more. Already broad hints have come from London that some new form of lend-lease will be necessary if Britain is really to re-arm to meet the threat of new aggression.

In recent months, many Americans have felt critical and even bitter toward Britain. British policy in Palestine has seemed to some to be hopelessly anchored in a past that will never come again. Others have been skeptical of the British experiment in democratic socialism.

But in spite of all disagreements, the partnership of Great Britain at this moment of terrible peril and uncertainty is of paramount importance. Ignoring the strategic considerations, which loom even larger, we must say that here are a people who believe in the things we believe in and who will stand up for them.

James Marlow

It Was In Writing

WASHINGTON

THERE is a crisis now over Berlin between Russia on one side and, on the other, the United States, Britain and France.

The Russians won't let the other three send supplies into Berlin—except by plane—to their troops there or to the Germans living in their part of Berlin.

But how did this happen? How is Russia able to shut off the other three from sending supplies into Berlin by train or truck?

For one thing, Berlin is deep within that part of Germany which is occupied by Russia. The city is surrounded by Russian troops.

But that raises another question: How did we ever let ourselves get into a fix where we would have our troops entirely surrounded by Russian troops?

It all started away back when the four wartime Allies saw that Germany was going to be beaten and that they'd have to do something about running the country until it could get on its feet.

LONG, LONG AGO

In 1945 representatives of the Big Four powers, meeting in London, agreed on this:

They divided Germany into four big zones: One to be occupied by American troops, one by Russian troops, one by British troops, and one by French troops.

In each zone the military chief was to be supreme commander and carry out the policies of his own Government for running that zone.

This was all worked out at a time when Russia and its three big Allies were on very friendly terms. They let Russia have a very big chunk of Germany for its zone.

And there, deep within the Soviet zone and entirely surrounded by Russian troops, was Germany's biggest city, Berlin.

Then, as a symbol of the control of the four powers had over Germany, they agreed on this:

Just as they divided Germany into four zones, so they divided Berlin into four sectors. The Americans kept troops in their sector, had control over the Berliners living in that sector and were more or less responsible for them.

The same was true for Russia, Britain and France. Each had its own troops in its own sector of Berlin and controlled the Berliners living in its sector.

OKAY FOR THREE YEARS

Because Berlin was deep within the Russian zone of Germany, the other three nations had to send supplies into their sectors of the city by train or truck that had to pass through the Soviet zone.

For a long time, almost three years, the Russians let them do this without an agreement in writing.

(American officials say that, although there was no written agreement, it was clearly understood between them and the Russians that the Americans had a right to send their supplies overland by train and truck to Berlin.

(The Russians deny this.)

But—and this is important in view of what is happening now—We did have an agreement in writing with the Russians that we could use certain airlanes to send our planes into Berlin.

Earlier this year, when relations between Russia and the other three nations grew critical, Russia refused to let them send any more supplies to Berlin by train or truck.

But — remember that written agreement about the airlanes—Russia did not try to stop us from sending supplies into Berlin by plane.

We're still doing that, and have been for months, at great cost. There's question whether, in spite of our air strength, we can send enough supplies into the non-Russian sector of Berlin when Winter comes.

Ex-Ghostwriter

SAGACIOUS Judge Sam Rosenman of New York, who used to write speeches for both Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman, gave a private disgnosis of Truman's campaign talks the other day that would have delighted the ears of Dewey forces.

Chatting with a close friend, Rosenman declared: "I don't know who is writing this stuff the President has been delivering from the platform, but it will lose him more votes than he will win.

"In my opinion, the President is harping on that Wall Street-against-the-farmer-and-everybody-else theme too heavy. That type of appeal doesn't register any more, except maybe with the Wallacetes. The farmers are too well off this year to be frightened by Wall Street."

Judge Rosenman said he was glad to have offered his advice on Truman's speeches, "for whatever it was worth," but added that "some people around the President apparently think I am a bad influence."

Rosenman didn't name names, but it was jealous Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder who euchred Rosenman from riding on the President's train.

"I helped prepare the President's convention acceptance speech and his message to the special session of Congress," Judge Rosenman told a friend, "but I haven't been called in since."

Red Designs On Germany

HERE is a paraphrase of a recent intelligence report which throws light on Russian secret designs regarding Germany:

Russia will ask withdrawal of all troops from Germany, secretly plans to send her troops back into Germany a year later. It will be easy to find a pretext.

Reason: Russia has stripped all she can get out of her zone of Germany, which was an agricultural area in the beginning and lacked the machinery Russia wants.

Part of Russia's plan to move back into Germany a year after withdrawal includes a series of wildcat strikes in America to harass troop movements and discourage the U. S. from sending troops to assist in "restoring order"—or helping along whatever the Russians use as an excuse to march back into Germany.