THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1951

SMITH AND HOEY—HAND IN HAND

Before Senator Willis Smith was sent to Washington by the voters of North Carolina, he vowed that he would try to follow in the footsteps of Senator Clyde Hoey. By and large he has kept that pledge.

An interim report on 20 outstanding roll call votes in the Senate this year, prepared by *Editorial Research Reports*, shows that Mr. Smith and Mr. Hoey have stood together seventeen times. Only three times has the junior Senator abandoned his colleague.

The first was on a measure setting a manpower ceiling of four million on the U. S. armed forces. This was a compromise between Senators who wanted a 3.5 million ceiling and those who wanted no ceiling at all, and passage of the measure 49 to 41 was considered an Administration defeat. Mr. Hoey stuck by the Administration and voted against the bill. Senator Smith voted for the bill and against the Administration.

The second was on an amendment by Senator McClellan of Arkansas expressing the "sense of the Senate" that the President should not assign additional ground forces to Europe without further Congressional approval." The Administration opposed the bill. Senator Hoey once again stood with the Administration and voted against it. Senator Smith voted for the amendment.

The third was an Administration bill to begin moving Government agencies out of Washington for protection against possible atomic bomb attack. The motion was to "shelve" the bill by returning it to committee "for further study". Senator Hoey voted against "shelving" the bill. Senator Smith voted for it. The motion carried.

His votes in these three Administration defeats indicate that Senator Smith is even more anti - Administration than Senator Hoey. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that on these three votes in which Senator Smith differed from Senator Hoey, he voted with Senator Wherry, GOP majority leader, and Senator McCarran, arch Administration foe among Senate Democrats.

If we may venture a bit of advice to the Junior Senator, it is this:

Though he may have other shortcomings, Senator Hoey has consistently voted right on military questions and foreign affairs in recent years. Senator Smith could do worse than follow his leadership in these areas.

THE BIG TRUCKS ARE STILL SPEEDING

SOME months ago representatives of the trucking industry announced they were assigning their roving safety inspectors to an additional chore — checking speeds of their own trucks and those of other concerns and reporting them to the proper owners.

Last year the State Highway Commission made a survey of truck speeds and found that trucks were the "greatest violators of the speed law, with 48.5 per cent of those units traveling faster than the legal 45 miles per hour." A new survey made this year shows that trucks are still the worst offenders, and that they constitute 51.6 per cent of the violators.

The *Greensboro Daily News*, noting this increase and the further finding that 10.4 per cent of the offending trucks were going faster than the 55-mile-an-hour speed permitted passenger vehicles, is concerned over the reaction of Highway Patrol Chief J. A. Smith, and thinks he is attempting to minimize the danger of speeding trucks. Says *The Daily News:*

"Certainly it does not help the cause of law enforcement or instill greater fear of and respect for the law, which must have been passed in the name of public safety and protection, for the patrol's chief to say that this increased percentage is practically meaningless as an indication of law enforcement, to stress the tolerance which is allowed these speeders and to emphasize the 'discretion' which patrolmen have to show."

The *Daily News* wonders whether these speeding trucks are being called to the attention of the State Utilities Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission, and what these agencies are doing about it. We wonder further what in the world happened to the industry's own highly-touted program of "self-regulation".

A HUMAN PROBLEM

A PORTION of Justice William O. Douglas' book *Strange Lands and Friendly People* (printed in last week's *Life*) makes clear as never before the true nature of the human problem in Iran.

Many of us have thought of Iran as a roughly triangular picture in the map of the Middle East — a politically and militarily dangerous area; Justice Douglas makes it a matter of people, miserable people.

Justice Douglas writes of an ancient, naturally rich land in what was once the cradle of civilization. Beneath the sand and rock of Iran lie treasures of oil on which the British Empire is to a great extent dependent and for which Russia would sacrifice much.

The living standard of the people of Iran is intimately connected with the continued production of Iranian oil and its continued availability to the nations that oppose Communism. Therefore, if we are concerned with our own security we must be concerned with the human problem of Iran.

The inability of the people of Iran to raise their own living standard and the failure of the British to give the Government and people of Iran a fair share of the profits from the nation's oil has resulted in the nationalization of the oil fields of Iran—specifically the fields of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., 53 per cent of which is owned by the British Government and the remainder by private British and American interests.

It cannot be said with assurety that the plight of the average Iranian will improve as a result of the nationalization. The facts as presented by Justice Douglas indicate that the Government of Iran is so corrupt that few profits from the fields would reach the incredibly poor farmers and hillsmen and beggars of Iran—even if the Government were able to make the fields show a profit under what would probably be inept management and operation. Even so, the living standard of the average Iranian cannot be overlooked in considering the problems raised in Iran.

Diagnosis, with the assistance of Justice Douglas' perceptive report on Iran, is not difficult; but therapy is.

How can the United States work effectively to improve the lot of the Iranian peasant?

Point Four? Financial and technical aid?

If that aid could be *delivered* when and where it is needed in Iran, it would be the ideal solution. But past experience and even superficial knowledge of the character of the Iranian Government indicate that Point Four funds would be sliced pie-fashion among the leading politicians with only token amounts going to such real needs as schools for children, medicine, housing and agricultural education.

Obviously the solution would be a strong, U. N.-supervised aid program based on Point Four, with an adequate staff of directors who would make certain that the funds are used for the purpose designated and not for the enrichment of corrupt officials.

That such a staff can or will be created in the near future is doubtful. That the nationalistic Iranian Government would accept such supervision from without is even more doubtful.

Meanwhile, we face a clever and unscrupulous enemy who has made great strides in the underdeveloped areas of the world because that enemy can make promises without necessity for immediate delivery. The historical record of the democracies, particularly of Britain in the Middle East and the Orient, makes it much harder for us to convince the downtrodden of those areas with promises. They will require something concrete to counteract their unpleasant memories of colonial imperialism.

From The Tryon (N. C.) Bulletin

THE POLICEMAN'S LOT

THE resignation of Police Chief Walter L. Roach, brings to mind the many duties of a police officer in any small town. In addition to putting his life in danger each day and night for protection of the public and to do his duty he is the most visible representative of the town government. His appearance, conduct, attention to duty, spirit of courtesy and friendliness in dealing with homefolk and strangers tell everyone what kind of mayor, council and people live in that town. In naming Chief Roach's successor we hope the Commissioners will take the qualifications into consideration. A policeman is also an assistant secretary of the Chamber of Commerce. He directs strangers and in the complicated thoroughfares of Tryon, leads them to places they want to visit. It has been said that Policeman Gash was worth more to Spartanburg as an advertisement for a friendly city than any other man. A policeman must like his work, enjoy keeping the community clean, traffic moving smoothly and everybody happy. It's a big order for a diplomat. But a civic minded man with a smile, a soft voice and a firm hand in upholding the law will have the respect and confidence of all the people including the occasional victims.

Those 85-90 degree days are with us again and that rasping noise you've been hearing the past few nights could have been the mosquitoes sharpening up their biters. Let's not wait too long to get after them boogers.—*Fernandina (Fla.) News-Leader.*

We heard of the automobile salesman turning on the steam the other day . . . he was trying to impress his prospective customer with the near-to-newness of the 1931 vintage he was trying to sell him: "Why it still has the original air in the tires," he said.—*Thomaston (Ga.) Times.*

Every time we pick up a paper we see where some newspaperman or printer has retired. It seems the only man who can't afford to retire is the man who owns the paper and has to keep getting it out.—*Quitman (Ga.) Free Press.*

'You Go Along With That Idea?'

One Editor's Opinion

Kelly Alexander And Race Conflict

By R. F. BEASLEY
In The Monroe Journal

THE ALEXANDER family name has long been conspicuous in Mecklenburg County. They were revolutionists in Colonial days and several of them played a part in the Declaration of May 1775.

And now another Alexander has come into some local prominence. This time it is Kelly Alexander, a colored citizen who is president of the North Carolina section of the Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Kelly commented on the entrance of the four colored men to the law school of the University Northern folks style. He said this was just the beginning and that the matter would be carried on till separate schools were abolished. He also said that suits were being prepared in Lee and Davidson counties for the purpose of contesting separate schools.

* * *

KELLY has already achieved one distinction, to wit, he has been replied to by a Governor of a State, Gov. Scott of North Carolina. But the Governor's words were in no way violent or intemperate. He merely said that Kelly did not speak for the majority of the colored people of North Carolina in his desire to eliminate segregation in the elementary and secondary schools of the State. The most of the Negro leaders, the Governor thinks, do not hold Kelly's view.

Then, he adds, that if such a thing were to come about the Negroes would lose, especially the teachers, for up in that section of heaven known as "The North" where some of the states have laws against segregation, there are few Negro teachers. Those few come in rather in the nature of a temporary fad. The schools are in the hands of whites and the schools are staffed by whites. Perhaps this is the reason why there is no scarcity of Negro teachers in North Carolina. This is a right nice point for the ardent Negro leaders to think about.

* * *

SUPPOSE segregation were abolished and the Negro schools done away as separate institutions. The schools would still remain in the hands of white people. It is not conceivable that Negro teachers would be employed to teach white and colored children. Nor is it conceivable that within any reasonable time the Negroes could prevent this. This is a point where the Federal Court's mandates would cease to run. Even a Federal Court can come to a dead end. It ends where there is no authority to execute it. No doubt the fury of the Association for Advancement of Colored People and their helpful agitators would become furious at this situation. That fury could possibly result in bringing on new race conflicts. Ten years of Federal bayonets never succeeded in taking away from the dominant white population and transferring it to the colored minority anything that it desired to hold. Nor can it be done in this matter of the schools. As long as the white people of the South do not want mixed schools there will be none. Certainly there is no outside pressure that can bring them about.

* * *

THIS writer has no shred of hostility towards any colored person in the world, much less to the whole race. We want to see them have good schools, we want to see them educated, we want to see their present improvement continued, we want them to have jobs and wages commensurate with the work they do. We want to see friendliness, justice and good will between the white and colored people to go on. The stimulus of better wages has already had an uplifting effect and we want to see it go on. It will go on so long as there is work for both.

We therefore deplore the agitation now in progress designed to mix the schools. As Governor Scott says, and as we know from history and human nature, the Negroes would lose. At Charleston they had white professors from up North, both men and women, to testify that separate schools could never be equal because, they said, that separation itself was a mark of discrimination, a humiliation to the colored people, and still marked them as "second class citizens".

Perhaps there is some truth in this. But if there is it can't be helped. These professors and theorists are thinking their own emotions and those of the few leading colored people whose real grievance is that they are not white. If the two races were to amalgamate the few whites left of pure blood would still consider themselves the superior race. And the others would admit it by showing envy.

* * *

PERHAPS it is true, as the anthropologist tells us, that inherently one race is as strong mentally as another, that the manifest difference comes from centuries of better advantages of some races over others. It took centuries to create these differences and it will take centuries to wipe them out.

Certainly the white people of Europe and after them those of America have led in making the modern world what it is, including the idea that possibly there was not in primitive man any inherent superiority in race. But the reality is that in accomplishment the white race has been so superior to the others that it is a fact of life which cannot be brushed aside. Asia has produced wise men, good men, great men, much wisdom, and its ancient civilizations were older and perhaps better than those of the western world dominated by the white race. But Asia has never produced a discovery or an invention without whose adoption from the west they could keep their growing population from famine, disease and final extinction.

All these the white race have done, and while no one would deny that there are many colored individuals who are equal or superior to white people, the white race as a whole has led the world too long to now be ready, to surrender its leadership on a theoretical argument even if such is conceived and promulgated by whites. For all these reasons and in the cause of amity and good will, we hope the agitation will not be carried too far.

Quote, Unquote

A truck occupied by father, age 103; son age in early forties; granddaughter and infant drove into Cities Service Station and while there I. C. train pulled in. Manager P. T. Vick engaged them in conversation and the young woman, about 20 years of age, told him that this was the first train she had ever seen. —Batesville (Miss.) Panolian.

Margaret Truman is off on a singing trip to Paris. Wonder if the President knows how to write those words in French. —Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press.

Fear Of Mud Slinging Keeps Good Men Out Of Government

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

THE NATURE of the paralysis spreading over this Government is in some respects obvious enough. As the seemingly endless controversy goes on over who made what mistakes in the past, one can only recall the words of Winston Churchill spoken in the House of Commons in the dire crisis of June, 1940:

"If the past undertakes to sit in judgment on the present, then surely the future will be lost."

Essential steps to meet the hazards of war, if it should come, and the uncertainties of peace should war be averted are being slighted or not taken at all. Unless it goes on too long, the delay may not be irreparable, since the base has been laid for building strength in the free world and for rearming America.

But there is one aspect of the paralysis that is not so obvious. This is the very tightening constriction of the government's loyalty program, which produces fear, uncertainty and an endless tangle of red tape. Particularly in the Washington area fantastic charges are brought against loyal Americans who have had not the remotest connection with Communism.

In some instances these charges are taken out of the context of the past in such a way as to distort entirely the significance of perfectly innocent actions. Thus someone who supported Russian war relief in the years from 1941 to '45 when the Soviet Union was destroying the common enemy is likely to find himself faced with an "interrogatory" on why he took part in this activity.

In other instances the charges are so completely false as to suggest the possibility of organized malice at work. If this is true, then the deliberate aim would seem to be to keep out of government anyone who does not hold extreme all-out war and anti-democratic views.

Not long ago the voice of America employed the distinguished radio commentator, Raymond Swing, to give political commentary for overseas broadcasts and to act as advisor on the approach of the Voice to the propaganda war with the Soviet Union. Swing, who has been widely acclaimed for his commentaries in such magazines as the Reader's Digest and the Saturday Evening Post, gave up a position with the Liberty network, which paid him far more than a government salary, to take the Voice job. He believed he could make a contribution to an important phase of the national effort to defeat the Communist conspiracy.

Now, however, Swing finds himself under attack from certain reactionary papers. He is denounced because during the war years he lent his name to organizations promoting friendship with the Soviet Union, which was in wartime alliance with the United States. When the war ended, he severed his connection with these groups.

Naturally, Swing was cleared by the FBI and other gencies before he was offered the job. But to one who made the decision that Swing made, with the sacrifice it meant, the reward of having his loyalty impugned can hardly be gratifying to the individual or encouraging to others to follow his example.

LOW MUDSLINGING

The nasty political mud hurled by such smearers as Senator Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin would make most men of prominence think twice before entering government service. When even a patriot of the sincerity of General George C. Marshall, who has served his country throughout his life, is not immune from such mudslinging, then we have sunk low indeed.

In the Spring of 1950 there was an opportunity to put the loyalty and Communists-in-Government issue on a higher plane. A proposal originated in the Senate for a commission of inquiry with the members to be named jointly by the President, Congress and the Supreme Court. President Truman rejected that opportunity. After waiting a considerable time he named his own commission, headed by Admiral Chester Nimitz, whose integrity and devotion to country have been demonstrated throughout his life.

But even if the angel Gabriel had been head of a commission named solely by the President, it would not have gained acceptance, so apparently we are destined to go on inflicting on ourselves the wounds that come from the kind of loyalty program that seems actually by indirection to be determining high policy.

What's 10 Grand A Year If Uncle Sam Pockets It All?

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

THE MOST damning condemnation of the destruction of our old values that I have run onto lately rests in the experience of an advertising executive I know. This fellow, who works, for a major outfit, argued the sum of $75,000 from his budgeters, said dough to be used to hire three salesmen.

The man wanted top-grade guys, which meant that he went shopping among the opposition. He waved a fat $25,000 salary under the noses of some first-class fellows he knew. None was making more than $15,000 a year. And he got no takers.

The answers they gave him were the same: they did not feel that a raise of $10,000 a year justified risking their established security with a new firm. They were unwilling to gamble, they said, because their new net income after taxes would not be enough more to offset the risk they would face in switching jobs. Here you have the practically unparalleled example of a man with both bold hands full of riches, who is unable to find takers.

There was a time when an annual salary of 25 grand represented the wildest dreams of ordinary avarice. Twenty-five thousand clams put you in the yacht-and-town-house class. Two bits' worth of thousands averages out to 500 bucks a week, and for that kind of scratch you could wear mink overalls. Even a few years of that salary would allow a man to store up enough security to keep him comfortable while he lived.

DESTROYS INITIATIVE

But in the case of the frustrated executive you have several men turning down $10,000 raises because, as the most common cliche of our time runs, "you can't keep it." This amounts to depriving money of its worth, and the end result is a destruction of initiative, a crippling of ambition. You eventually wind up with lethargy, the translation of which says let George do it. Letting George do it works two ways — either eventual Communism or Fascism, which means that in any case the control of his personal existence is out of the hands of the individual.

Whatever we have in this land was not built on a gambling, or static security. The original settlers took a great gamble when they took off from England, A great many rugged men and women wound up porcupined with arrows in order that Hollywood and Vine might become possible.

MUST TAKE CHANCES

Many of our mighty moguls of industry today still speak with an accent that is not local to the scene. The vast fortunes that built the know-how that let us win wars were not built on gambling, and I don't mean crap shooting. The development of new industries rests on the availability of risk capital. Our national health rests on a man's willingness to take a chance.

I do not understand this sudden apathy, this non-craving for adventure, which has suddenly to have afflicted us. The young men crave security; they ask about retirement age before they ask about the possibility for advancement. Given the choice of $200 a week refuse them because they are not willing to take a chance. I remember I changed three sets of jobs, once, for a cut of two bucks on one and for a raise of three bucks on the other, merely because the prospects seemed brighter at the time.

Maybe we are watering down our stock as we water down our currency. But when a man loses interest in making money, you have just deprived him of his power. And that goes for a nation, too.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Bank Of China Finances China Lobby

WASHINGTON

IF a Congressional committee ever digs deep enough into the China lobby, it will find an amazing, almost unbelievable, propaganda network aimed at influencing our foreign policy. If the British embassy ever operated such a network, the Chicago Tribune and other isolationists would scream to high heaven and the British ambassador would be recalled.

However, the China lobby has been getting away with it for years. It has been bald-faced and brazen in its moves to contribute to certain Senators' campaigns, to hire powerful figures in the Democratic Party, and to place slanted news articles with the press.

Heart and nerve center of the China lobby is the Bank of China in New York City. Its master-mind is the brother-in-law of Chiang Kai-shek, Dr. H. H. Kung, one of the wealthiest men in the world, who lives in Riverdale, N. Y., and drives into his office at the Bank of China two or three times a week.

Another brother-in-law of the generalissimo is T. V. Soong, who has just acquired a palatial home on Long Island. Few Americans could afford such an estate.

Neither of the two brothers-in-law has lived in China except for intermittent visits for about seven years. Dr. Kung left China shortly after the gold scandal of March, 1944, when he was ousted from the Cabinet and from the governorship of the Central Bank because of a leak regarding the scheduled increase in the price of gold.

This leak made millions for certain Chinese speculators close to the Chiang government, and as a result Chiang not only ousted his brother-in-law but beheaded a minor bank official, Kao Ping-Fang. The latter died shouting that he was the scapegoat for higher-ups who had grown rich on the scandal and were being protected.

Lawyer Louis Johnson

DR. KUNG also controlled the China Tea Co., considered so corrupt that one member of the People's Political Council, Huang Yen-Pei, openly demanded impeachment of its management. Kung was also in charge of the China-American Universal Trading Corp. which handled wartime American aid to China. At present he is reported to have large holdings in the Philippines and Formosa—which may be one reason for the tremendous interest of the Chinese lobby in retaining that island.

Dr. Kung's knowledge of American politics is almost as astute as his knowledge of Chinese finance; and, well before he entered the Truman Cabinet, Kung picked Louis Johnson as his personal attorney.

It may or may not be significant that, later, when Johnson became Secretary of Defense, he was one of the stanchest advocates of American support for Formosa. Johnson also persuaded the State Dept. to transfer an associate of the Johnson law firm, Myron Cowen, from his post as ambassador to Australia to be ambassador to the Philippines, where incidentally Dr. Kung also has important investments.

Dr. Kung has been a caller upon popular Sen. Styles Bridges of New Hampshire, and the Senator likewise has been active in urging aid to Formosa and the Chiang Kai-shek exiles.

When Bridges ran for re-election in 1948 he listed a $2,000 campaign contribution from Alfred Kohlberg of New York, the front man for the China lobby and a friend of Dr. Kung.

'Impartial' China Survey

IN 1948, the same year that Bridges received his contributions from Kohlberg of the China lobby, Bridges appointed ex-Sen. Worth Clark of Idaho as an impartial representative of the Senate Appropriations Committee to go to China and make an "impartial" report on the Nationalist government. Bridges at that time occupied the potent post of chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

The purpose of the survey was to recommend whether more U. S. aid to Chiang was justified.

What most people didn't realize about the supposedly impartial survey, however, was that Clark was not exactly in a position to be impartial. For the ex-Senator from Idaho had long been a member of the law firm which represented T. V. Soong, the other brother-in-law of Chiang Kai-shek. In brief, Clark was a paid lobbyist for the China lobby.

Furthermore, part of Clark's expenses were paid by the Chinese Nationalists, despite the fact that he was supposed to be working for the U. S. Senate and the American taxpayers.

Clark came back with a vigorous recommendation that more aid be sent to Chiang, a recommendation which was duly submitted to Senator Bridges, the friend of Dr. Kung and then chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.