THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1951

SHALL WE UNITE OR PERISH?

THE BLOODY battles continue in Korea and war clouds linger threateningly over the Middle East and Europe. A continual state of tension exists throughout a world which may be plunged, at any moment, into total war.

But there is still time for action which may prevent world-wide war. There is still time to develop the urgently needed unity of the free world, if we act promptly.

On Thursday and Friday THE NEWS printed on this page two articles by Publisher Thomas L. Robinson which outlined the objectives of the Atlantic Union movement, which is a national and international effort deserving of study and support.

The Atlantic Unionists have introduced a joint resolution in Congress which has the publicly announced support of 27 Senators and over 100 Representatives. Other Congressmen privately favor the resolution, which asks the President to invite those countries which sponsored the Atlantic Pact —Canada, England, France, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg—to send delegates to meet with ours in a convention to explore the possibilities of forming a federal union. Other countries, according to the proposed resolution, could be asked by the convention to send delegates to participate fully in it.

In other words, a gathering of citizens, rather than instructed diplomats, would try to work out a federal union, as our constitutional forefathers did so successfully in 1787.

* * *

THE keystone of U. S. foreign policy is the North Atlantic Pact, which joins our government to Canada and the European democracies. Such pacts, or alliances, have existed since history began. And history has proven that they break down when the going gets rough.

Fortunately, instead of going separate ways after squabbling, the 13 colonies decided to replace their alliance, which was based upon the state governments, with a federal union, based upon the individuals in that union. They formed a common government which replaced their dozen currencies with one, abolished tariff barriers between the states, established a common defense, foreign policy, and postal system. The system worked, amazingly well.

Atlantic Unionists believe it is high time to apply the same federal principles, which united the colonial people, to the citizens of the Atlantic, and perhaps other democracies such as Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines.

Other countries, such as Canada and Switzerland, tried federalism. They too found it worked, despite a great diversity in the culture and language of their peoples.

Soviet Russia can be held at bay only if her leaders see that new aggression on its part will be met by the combined military might of the entire free world. And such effective military union requires equally effective political union.

The failure of the democracies to pull together is the result of their lack of political union. Perhaps the most grave shortcoming of the United Nations and the Atlantic Pact is that neither has the power to enforce its decisions.

* * *

ATLANTIC Unionists want to weld a strong nucleus of the free peoples, forming a federation strong enough to enforce democratically-arrived at decisions. To this nucleus, they believe, other peoples could gradually be added, just as our own federal union expanded.

It must be emphasized that if the proposed convention assembled and devised plans for a complete federal union such plans would have to be approved by the legislative processes of the participating nations. However, polls conducted on both sides of the Atlantic indicate that such approval would be forthcoming. The people are a few steps ahead of their leaders.

Advocates of Atlantic Union in this country include some outstanding hard-headed and practical businessmen and statesmen. The president of the Atlantic Union Committee is Owen J. Roberts, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. The two vice-presidents are Will L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State, and Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War. Leader of Atlantic Union's forces in Congress is able Sen. Estes Kefauver (D., Tenn.).

Clarence Streit, the long-time *New York Times* foreign correspondent who fathered the idea of Atlantic Union in his book, "Union Now", Dr. Daniel A. Poling, minister and editor of The *Christian Herald*, Sen. J. Wm. Fulbright (D., Ark.), Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan, and William Phillips, former Under Secretary of State, are typical of the vigorous adherents to this bold application of the federal system which we have found so effective.

For a long time we've tried diplomacy. It hasn't worked very well. Now let's try democracy. Let's at least explore Atlantic Union.

HERE COMES THE KIDS

WITH THE beginning of June and the ending of the school year we see in our mind's eye the annual, pleasant picture of a gang of youngsters rushing down the school steps flinging their books and papers in all directions. Freedom for the entire Summer!

Going along with tradition, the picture would include a swimming hole, a creek bank complete with dog and fishing pole, a cow pasture with stones properly placed for first, second and third bases.

Regrettably, however, the new picture will include a drug store or all-night cafe, an automobile, a neon-lit pavilion at a beach, perhaps cigarettes and a bottle.

You can't condemn the new picture, really; for we all contributed to creating it; it is the inevitable background of the new urban civilization.

Though we can't condemn it, we can direct the activities of our children within its framework. Simply to accept the new behavior pattern—complete freedom for the teen-ager—is to shirk a definite responsibility, the parental responsibility.

We know how difficult it is to tell Jack or Mary that they can't spend that week-end at the beach without a chaperone, that they can't keep the car out 'til three in the morning, that they can't join the other teen-agers at the roadhouse on the highway out of town.

"But the others can do it," they wail.

No, it isn't easy. But it's necessary.

We all bemoan the rising incidence of juvenile delinquency. "What," we echo the ancient plaint, "is the younger generation coming to?" Why doesn't somebody do something? we ask.

Perhaps the answer lies in the term "juvenile delinquency". It's a broad, nebulous term. *It means other people's children.*

Too often we give our own children the family car and three or four dollars and forget about them.

"They're good kids," we say. "They'll stay out of trouble."

Perhaps the parents of the juvenile delinquents are saying the same thing about their youngsters.

Police Chief Frank Littlejohn indicated as much last week.

"One of our greatest handicaps in handling juvenile delinquency cases is the attitude of some parents that we're persecuting their children when we pick them up for reckless driving or breaking a window or committing a nuisance," he said. If the parents were as concerned about the misbehavior of their own children as they are about 'juvenile delinquents' our job would be easier and there would be fewer cases in Judge Catling's juvenile court."

Neither we nor Chief Littlejohn are unmindful of the great stresses and anxieties of our time, stresses and anxieties that contribute to a feeling of "what's the use?" It is also true that it is hard to find wholesome entertainment or occupation that will satisfy the youngsters after they have tasted the "forbidden fruit" of the automobile and the roadhouse.

But if we want to raise a healthy, responsible, balanced generation we must accept our responsibility to it. We must offer it an alternative. No, the old swimming hole and the creek bank and the cow pasture ball field won't do it any longer. We must find a realistic alternative to the "fun" that breeds delinquency.

From The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

KEYSTONE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A NEW judicial system designed to dispense justice for members of the United States armed forces, instead of decisions based on caprice, ignorance or pure malice, has been growing since the end of World War II. The new uniform code for all branches, and the newly appointed civilian Court of Military Appeals, together should prove to be the keystone of that system.

There can be no argument about the need for the uniform code, which is to become effective May 31. For justice for a soldier and justice for a sailor obviously are identical, and the possibility of handing out different kinds of justice because of different judicial systems needs to be removed.

Nor can there be any argument about the need for a civilian high court of appeals, which will be the final arbiter in all serious cases except sentences of death. The President properly will retain ultimate voice over death sentences.

In the past, reviewing authorities have been high-ranking military men, and too often, through no fault of their own, their decisions have been influenced more by military needs than the demands of justice. Too often decisions have been made without knowledge of the customary disposition of similar cases in civilian courts.

But now there will be experienced civilian judges whose opportunity and responsibility it will be to see that important military court decisions are fair, and that they have been arrived at fairly. This Court of Military Appeals should be the ultimate guardian of the rights which stem from every service man's position as a free American.

Of all things! "They" say bootleggers are collecting a sales tax on their white mule mixture.—*Canton North Georgia Tribune.*

'Well, We Seem To Have Got Unification Anyhow'

HERBLOCK
©1951 THE WASHINGTON POST CO.

People's Platform

Letters should be brief, written on one side of the paper. The writer's name must be signed, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editor. The News reserves the right to condense.

Pain In The Neck Dept.

YOJU, KOREA

Editors, The News:

JUST a few short lines to explain who I am and why I am writing. I am Sgt. Ray W. Alexander, and I used to be employed by the Duke Power Co. I drove Bus No. 594 on the Oakhurst route.

Along with a large number of men from our city, I went with the 378th Cmbt. Engr. Bn., North Carolina National Guard, when they were called Aug. 14, 1950. From Charlotte we went to Fort Lewis in Washington, and there received a certain amount of training before we were sent to Korea. We sailed from Seattle, Wash., on Feb. 6, 1951, and arrived in Pusan, Korea, Feb. 24, 1951. It was an uneventful trip, with no stops anywhere. We were in Pusan 27 days waiting for our heavy equipment to arrive. After our equipment arrived and was serviced, we moved up the long dusty road to our first assignment. Now, we have completed three months of service in Korea close to the front lines, but never on the front lines. Most of our work is road and bridge maintenance.

Now the reason for this letter is an article in The Charlotte News about Cpl. ———. You give him the title of "Old Soldier" and "War Vet". This gives us all a great big pain in the neck and an even bigger hernia in the gut. But we are mostly concerned with getting the truth to our families in and around Charlotte, because your article and Cpl. ——— are causing much excess worry and a lot of extra gray hairs. Our families worry too much as it is, but when they read of his many "combat experiences" with our outfit, the families thought we were concealing the facts from them in our letters home. If your good paper is interested in printing the facts as it always has in the past, then we will give the true side of the story.

Cpl. ——— was in the National Guard with the rest of us and was called on the above date. He stayed with the outfit through the training and sailed the same time from Seattle and arrived at Pusan with the rest of us. Now here is an extra good fact for your readers. Cpl. ——— was discharged at his own request before he ever set foot outside the city limits of Pusan. Now, since our good MP's don't make it a habit to shoot at friendly troops in Pusan, we are wondering where he got all his combat time, and where he gets the title of "Korean Vet". How does the draft board classify such a person a "Vet" when he has never even heard gunfire in Korea, much less fired his own gun? Do you think it fair to all of us who are still over here sweating this thing out to put such a hoax in your paper and worry our families to death?

All of the above statements can be proved by checking Cpl. ———'s Army record. But what we would like most to see is for you to publish this letter or at least a part of it, so as not to cause our families that added, unnecessary worry. It wouldn't be nearly so bad if there weren't so many of us from Charlotte.

We receive your wonderful paper regularly and look forward to each copy. We are just interested in the folks back there getting the truth about us.

Here are the signatures of just a few of the fellows who are interested in this matter.

—SGT. GEORGE J. HENRY
—SGT. RAY W. ALEXANDER
—SGT. WESLEY H. PATTON
—PFC. HORACE E. CHANDLER
—PFC. DONALD E. MORRIS
—CPL. VICENTE M. CRUZ
—CPL. CHARLES E. STEWART
—PVT. RAY B. HERNANDEZ
—PVT. JAMES R. BLOODWORTH
—COP. JAMES P. NELSON
—SGT. ALFRED EUGENE CRATER
—PVT. LEONARD T. DOWDLE
—PFC. JAMES EDWARD OUTEN
—PFC. PAUL HOWIE
—COP. JAMES E. PRICE
—SGT. PARKS McCRACKEN
—SGT. CHARLES M. BUSCH
—PFC. BENNIE JORDAN
—SFC. DAL S. PRIVATTE
—SGT. ODELL G. NELSON JR.
—CPL. HOLLIS E. SMITH JR.
—CPL. HAZEL REA
—CPL. CHARLES H. ALLEN
—CPL. HENRY OOSTERHOF
—CPL. KENNETH BOOTHE
—PFC. BILL E. CHASTAIN

Pick And Shovel Action

CHONHAM, Korea

Editors, The News:

IN regards to articles that have been printed in your paper, we, the men of the 378th Engineers would like for you to straighten out some of the facts, so the wives and parents of the men back home won't be so worried.

First of all, the 378th has not been committed to the lines as infantry troops, and the closest we have been to the lines was about fifteen or eighteen miles. The boys that the articles were written about were more than 200 miles from the lines.

I realize that the boys who have returned from our outfit want to give themselves a big buildup, but there is positively no reason for a man to tell such bunk to a newspaper, especially after the men in his outfit have written to their families and told them that they were safe and seeing no action. Sure, we have seen action, but it was definitely not the kind the boys have mentioned. The only kind of action we have seen has been at the end of a pick or a shovel or building a bridge 20 and 30 miles behind the lines.

What's more, we have never even been in Seoul. We left the States on Feb. 6, so therefore you see Cpl. ——— couldn't have reached here in December. And another thing—neither he nor Pfc. ——— left Pusan.

I am asking you to print parts of this letter, so that our wives and families will not be so worried. It makes no difference to the men and myself what he says, but we just don't like the idea of all the stories he told. Because, as you know, if will do nothing but bring worry to our families.

—PVT. JIMMY NORRIS.

* * *

(NOTE: The Editors of The News, being rather tolerant of returning soldiers who improve on their actual exploits in the retelling thereof, have no desire to embarrass two men previously interviewed by The News. Their names have been deleted from the letters. These two letters will set the record straight. —Editors, The News.)

Strategic Air Force Alone Not Enough To Defend West

By JOSEPH ALSOP

WASHINGTON

IT SOUNDS nonsensical to maintain, as General Hoyt Vandenberg did a few days ago while he was testifying on the MacArthur dismissal, that the American Air Force is operating on a "shoestring." After all, a shoestring which will soon be costing the country over $20,000,000,000 a year is a remarkably expensive shoestring. Yet, allowing for the hyperbole which is an occupational failing of Air Force officers, Vandenberg's statement did reflect a deep and sincerely felt fear which is by no means confined to the Air Force.

This fear is that, at the presently planned level of American and Allied air strength, the whole Western strategy for preventing or if necessary winning a world war will prove to be a fake. The best available figures on projected Western and Soviet air strength show very clearly why the fear exists.

PRESENT STRATEGY

American and Allied strategic planning now rests squarely on two basic premises. One is that the American Strategic Air Force, with its capacity to destroy Soviet industry by atomic bombardment, will buy time for the West to rearm. The other is that by 1953-54, when the Russians will have a large atomic stockpile of their own, the West will be sufficiently strong either to deter a Red Army attack in Europe, or to halt it if it is launched.

The first premise is a reasonable premise, thanks largely to former Air Force Secretary Stuart Symington and to Vandenberg himself. In the era of Louis Johnson, Symington and Vandenberg took a calculated risk. Rather than spread thin the insufficient funds allowed them over the whole Air Force, they concentrated heavily on the Strategic Air Command, as the one remaining deterrent to Soviet aggression.

As a result, as Vandenberg testified, the Strategic Air Force now does indeed have the capacity to destroy Soviet industry in case of war, and this capacity will be progressively increased. Vandenberg and the other airmen are not, to be sure, entirely happy about the Strategic Air Force. They would like to see it increased from the forty or so groups now planned in the ninety-five-group program to perhaps fifty groups. They would like to have all their long-range bombers fast jets, rather than propeller-driven, to counter the constant improvements in the Soviet air defenses. They would like more and better long-range reconnaissance planes, and they would like more and better long-range fighter protection.

OVER-ALL DEFENSE WEAK

Yet the fact remains that the Strategic Air Force is capable of performing the terrible task which is assigned to it, which means that the first premise of Western strategy is sound. But the second premise — that a real defense of Western Europe, capable of stopping a Red Army advance, will exist by 1953-54 — is demonstrably unsound. It is this which is causing something approaching anguish in the minds of the best of the planners, both in and out of the Air Force.

The facts are simple enough. It may be wildly optimistic to hope that seventy well equipped Allied divisions will be available for the defense of Western Europe by 1953-54. But even if this target is reached, the Allied divisions will be several times outnumbered by Soviet and satellite ground forces. There is obviously just one way in which this Soviet superiority on the ground can be neutralized. This is by decisive air superiority.

It requires a crystal ball gazer to determine the sort of tactical air strength which the Russians will have in 1953-54. But the best guess available is that the Kremlin should be able to commit about 15,000 planes to battle in Europe at that time. Against this Soviet force, according to present plans, the North Atlantic allies will be able to commit in case of war no more than 7,000 to 8,000 planes.

The conclusion is obvious. Even assuming that the Strategic Air Force acts as an effective deterrent until 1953-54, there will then still be no real defense in Western Europe. The Soviets will remain decisively superior both in the air and on the ground. This means in turn that Western strategy is a fake, because it is based on a false assumption.

Haggling Housewives Can Put Real Crimp In Rising Costs

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

ONE OF THE serious defects of modern American womanhood, housewife division—and of American manhood, too—is that he and she have never learned to bargain, in the European sense. This hatred of the haggle, which our ancestors practiced well, has put us more or less at the mercy of the price tag.

We seem automatically to accept the asking price for anything as its own true value, and this is not so, as the current price war in New York demonstrates. Most of us do not comparison-shop as fervently as we could. We walk in, flip the tag, take the article or not, and leave. This applies to everything from autos to onions. It also subjects us to arbitrary jumps in living costs.

I have never underestimated the power of a woman, having been exposed to them for too many years, and I know the might they exercise economically. A nation of harried housewives, all bargainers, might do some amazing things to this high cost of You Know What.

I am a real bum at bargaining, myself, but I have watched the experts at it, and it has a surprising control on inflation. As practiced by Europeans and Asiatics, bargaining becomes sport as well, and the non-bargainer is not respected. One of the reasons Americans are held in such high contempt abroad is that they will pay the asking price for anything, thereby depriving the seller of an hour's entertainment.

The purpose of the bargain is not to haggle objectionably, but by dignified sales resistance, drive the price of what you seek down to a reasonable level of profit for the seller without seriously crippling the purse of the buyer. The important word in striking a bargain is "No."

In the tradition of David Harum, if the word "No" is repeated often enough in a commercial transaction, the vendor is eventually led to make a proposition: "Well, what will you give?" Somewhere between the proposition and the final acceptance of terms lies the true worth of the commodity.

I know a White Russian princess who has long lived among us, but who still remembers the hard times of China and Europe when she fled the Bolshies and was nearly penniless. She gave the market people a rough workout. Polite, but firm. She bought a three-pound eel the other day for a dollar, instead of $1.50, merely by the exercise of firmness, and was proud of the discount.

When she goes to buy a collection of clothes, she insists on a markdown for the job lot. The saleswoman is always astonished, but the princess invariably gets her bargain.

"I bought some frocks the other day," the princess says proudly, "and when the salesgirl heard me ask her for a discount, she nearly fainted. But I wound up saving $10 on the lot. There is not a day I do not save money by polite insistence on a true bargain. And a bargain is only what things are actually worth."

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Kefauver Walks In, Lucas Walks Out

WASHINGTON

EX-SEN. SCOTT LUCAS of Illinois moodily walked out on the Duke and Duchess of Windsor at a Stork Club dinner the other night—after Tennessee's crime-busting Sen. Estes Kefauver walked in.

The baffled host, New York businessman Charlie Cushing, didn't know it but Lucas has been nursing a bitter grudge against Senator Kefauver. He blames his defeat and loss of his potent position as Senate Majority Leader on Kefauver's Chicago crime probe which came during the Illinois elections.

Kefauver had been at another table in the Stork Club, but was invited to join the exclusive party given for the Duke and Duchess of Windsor. The embarrassment started when Senator and Mrs. Kefauver showed up in street clothes, since everyone else was wearing "black tie" evening dress. To make matters worse, Cushing seated Mrs. Kefauver at the Duchess' table, but crowded Kefauver in at the Duchess' table, where Lucas also happened to be sitting. The naive New York businessman apparently thought all Senators were pals and didn't realize that feuds can be bitter in Washington.

Eyeing Kefauver sourly, Lucas popped up from his seat, muttered something about catching an early train and stalked out of the party.

Airlines Lobby

WHAT the American taxpayer doesn't know about the airlines is that they continue to get a heavy subsidy from the taxpayers, yet simultaneously the taxpayers have no way of knowing how much that subsidy is.

If the railroads got a similar subsidy there would be howls of anguish from the public. But thanks to a powerful airline lobby, the airlines get away with it.

How potent the air lobby is has been illustrated recently by some significant backstage wire-pulling in which President Truman's own subordinates undercut him.

Truman has long advocated publicity regarding air subsidies. Yet Truman's own Air Co-Ordinating Committee, made up of Truman's own appointees, has recently ruled otherwise, and are trying to keep this information from the public.

Chairman of the Truman Air Co-Ordinating Committee is Del Rentzel, Undersecretary of Commerce in charge of transportation. Yet the Air Co-Ordinating Committee has just prepared a confidential paper, No. 93/1A, which flatly comes out instead for the airline lobby's policy of secrecy. This column has obtained a copy of the confidential ACC paper, which bluntly recommends leaving "the Government in control of the degree of disclosure . . . even to the extent of preventing all disclosure of subsidies if circumstances justified."

Hidden Postal Grants

AT PRESENT airline subsidies are hidden in the postal grants, paid out to the big airlines for carrying the mail. Pan American Airways alone received $46,000,000 in mail pay last year. However, the public has no idea how much was a legitimate charge for flying the mail and how much was pure gravy at the taxpayers' expense. Figured on the basis of weight alone, the Post Office paid Pan American nearly four times above the passenger rate.

The President has recommended separating the gravy from the mail pay, and letting the Civil Aeronautics Board pay whatever subsidy is needed and the Post Office pay the legitimate mail costs. In defiant opposition, Mr. Truman's own committee proposes confidentially: "Both amounts . . . would continue to be presented in the budget of the Post Office Dept., and payment to the carriers administered by that department."

Truman also recommended against granting a special exemption for the International lines. This has been pushed behind the scenes by Pan Am, so that if the other airlines are forced to reveal their subsidies, Pan Am would still be exempt. However, the President's committee agreed with Pan Am, instead of with the President, and proposed that, no matter what was done about domestic airline subsidies, "the present methods of establishing and making mail payments to the U. S. flag (international) carriers (should be) unchanged."

It would seem that the President's aviation co-ordinators are working for the big airlines, not for the man who appointed them. Perhaps Del Rentzel, chairman of the committee, can't forget that he worked for American Airlines for twelve years and that Pan American helped put him in his present post.

Merry-Go-Round

PRICE Boss Mike DiSalle gets comfort from a quotation attributed to famed editor Herbert Bayard Swope. It reads: "I cannot give you the formula for success, but I can give you the formula for failure—try to please everybody." . . . Rabble-rouser Gerald L. K. Smith was in Washington recently with a petition of 5,000 names . . . boosting General MacArthur for President. . . . Senate Majority Leader McFarland has written to Democratic Senators, begging them to tend to business. He complained that the Senate chamber has been almost empty, because Senators have been too busy watching the MacArthur hearing, holding investigations and making speeches. . . . A former lobbyist for the landlords is now on the payroll of the Housing Expediter's office, which enforces rent control. He is George Griffith, formerly a lobbyist for the National Apartment Owners. One of his jobs—believe it or not—was to select the Government's advisory committees on rent enforcement!