

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALLOP

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, JANUARY 5, 1953

AFTER SIX YEARS, REALISM AT THE U.N.

BY NOW, the average American must be thoroughly convinced by the mass of charges and countercharges regarding the loyalty of Americans employed by the U. N. The important thing to ascertain, to most Americans, is that the U. N. and its employees are trustworthy.

The U. S. attitude toward Americans has gradually, but drastically, changed, from a "hands-off" policy in 1946 to the recently declared policy that requires such employees to be checked by the FBI. The change was slow in coming—State Dept. officials should have recognized the need for it long ago, instead of being prodded into it by the grand jury and the McCarran Subcommittee. But the change was definitely good. It should assure Americans that the U. N. warrants their faith and support, an attitude which is vital to the success of the organization.

Back in 1946, James P. Byrnes, then Secretary of State, directed that no recommendations regarding prospective American employees of the U. N. should be filed by any State Dept. official. The U. N. Secretary General, said Mr. Byrnes, "had the exclusive and full authority to hire and fire United Nations employees."

This "hands off" policy apparently continued during the subsequent Marshall administration of the State Dept. In January, 1949, Secretary Acheson took over. His Assistant Secretary of State for U. N. Affairs, John Hickerson, according to his own testimony, that year worked out with the State Dept. a highly confidential arrangement under which the United States Government was to identify for the Secretary General the United Nations employees by the United Nations, or confidentially, to the United States, who would appear to be members of the Communist Party or under Communist discipline."

Proceeding under this policy, 31 Americans have been dismissed from the U. N., but none of them until this Spring, and fifteen of them, not until after the McCarran Subcommittee and grand jury probes began. Some Americans still working for the U. N. had "adverse comments" filed on them by the State Dept., as long ago as the Spring of 1950.

These "adverse comments" did not include detailed information—State Dept. officials testified that they could not furnish this data to the international organization, under our security regulations. But, as Trygve Lie revealed last week, our State Department was inexcusably tardy in giving pertinent information to the U. N. as well as most diplomats from Byrnes on, apparently giving that security clearance by the U. S. would be contrary to the Charter, which states that "the Secretary-General and the staff shall not be subject to any political instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the organization."

However, the consulting lawyers Lie called in recently came to the reasonable conclusion that U. S. approval of its nationals at the U. N. is permissible, and we may now

A SOUND PRINCIPLE—IF EXTENDED

THOUGH we are in general agreement with the point made by Senators Byrd, Williams and George, the suspicion lingers that they are protesting too much about President Truman's recommendation that General Eisenhower, Vice-President-elect Nixon, and Speaker Martin be granted tax exemption on part of their income.

As a general proposition, the three Senators are on solid ground. They say they are against a special tax exemption for anybody — be he President or pauper — and that the three officials should pay income taxes on every penny they earn.

We'll say that, with an extra proviso, i. e., that the exemption plan be truly equalized. As of today, the tax laws are shot full of inequities. The depletion allowance for oil and mineral prospecting, for example, is clearly excessive, but Congress, instead of decreasing

it, has increased it. The U. N. and the State Department. And we may hope that the State Department, under Dulles, takes care of its correspondence with the U. N. without the one- and two-year delays Lie reports.

The U. N. World, in an editorial reprinted on this page last week, effectively made the point that there is no conflict between loyalty to the U. S. (and many other democracies) and loyalty to the U. N. But a Communist, of whatever nationality, takes instructions from an authority external to the U. N. and therefore violates the Charter. And there again we come upon a fundamental contradiction of the U. N. from which there is no escape in this divided world.

But it is better to recognize that logic does not always prevail, in international as well as in national government, than to toss in the sponge because of the complexity and absence of logic in some of the procedures. From such recognition we may proceed to the best available solution. In finally coming around to the proposition that all Americans working for the U. N. should be screened by the FBI, an agreeable solution to this particular issue has been found.

GOOD IDEA DEPT.

ONE of the maddest men we talked with during the campaign last Fall was our neighbor. He was a duly registered Mecklenburg resident, and voted in the primary. In October his company transferred him to the West Coast. So about a week before election he and his wife went to work in the new office, to cast, they hoped, absentee ballots. Sorry, they were told, but because you're leaving the state before Election Day you won't be eligible to vote.

Of course they couldn't have time to establish their residence in their new home state either. So they couldn't vote at all, even in the Presidential election. County Election Board Chairman W. C. Davis reports numerous similar instances. And most of them are from states having laws similar to North Carolina's, which take the franchise away from persons who are moving, or who recently moved from one state to another.

A few days ago Governor Lodge of Connecticut called this situation to the attention of another governor, and suggested that a state aimed at working out uniform laws, perhaps by having qualified voters to cast ballots in one state or the other, be started right away. We're all for that idea.

Certainly every qualified U. S. voter should be permitted to vote for President, even though he moves from one state to another around election time. And likewise, moving from one county to another within a state should not prevent any voter from marking the state ballot. Governor-elect Unstead and the Assemblymen should do what they can to make these changes.

It seems ready to extend the principle further. Moreover, the man on a fixed salary or wage does not have the opportunity given to many businessmen of writing off as business expenses some of his routine costs of living.

We have no quarrel with the idea that the President of the United States ought to pay his income taxes like everybody else. If Mr. Truman is right when he says the President's expenses, and those of the Vice-President and Speaker, are higher than for other government officials, then the proper remedy is to pay them more money.

The three Senators who have spoken out on this question are most convincing if they follow through and call for a re-examination of all tax exemption allowances with the aim of putting everyone on virtually the same basis.

oaths, how applying only to union officials, be extended to company officials. Better to recognize the ineffectiveness of such oaths, and take them off the books altogether, rather than to extend a useless procedure. As the House Un-American Activities Committee has realized, a person may be a member of the Communist Party the day before, or the day after, he takes such an oath, making it meaningless.

The Senator's provision for continuance of Taft-Hartley's request for an 80-day no-strike injunction in emergency disputes is in order. The important thing for the next Congress to do is establish some machinery to take care of the situation in the 90 days by before an agreement is reached. Taft would have Congress deal with each such case as it comes up. Well, if it did, Congress could take them off the books altogether, or seize them, neither of which would settle the dispute, or authorize arbitration. Instead of handling each case individually, in the heat of a pending strike, it would be better to set up a board to handle labor court cases that could arbitrate the dispute.

Hunters should not drink, says a bulletin. Perhaps it would be wiser to say drinkers should not hunt. It's easier to keep drinkers from hunting than to keep hunters from drinking. —Kingpost (Tenn.) Times

He would tighten union security provisions in some industries using casual labor, compelling workers to join the union in three or four days, instead of the 30 days provided by Taft-Hartley.

He urges stricter compliance with the ban on the closed shop, which is circumvented by bootleg arrangements in some states.

He wants employers relieved of participation in administration of union-negotiated work and pension plans, even though they contribute to them. And he'd like to add a couple of "conservative" members to the NLRB.

He would permit employers to fire Communist in union shops, after these Reds had been ousted from their unions. This right employers certainly ought to have. They certainly ought not to have, and many would not want, the right to fire anyone who belongs to any of the 200-plus organizations listed by the Attorney-General. The Internal Security Subcommittee and its new chairman, Senator Ferguson, favor such discrimination. But we hope Senator Taft throws his weight against it.

We disagree with the Senator's proposal (concurrent in by President-elect Eisenhower) that the requirement of non-Communism



Upcoming Legislation

Changes In Laws Panned

By Congressional Quarterly

PRESSURE groups and lobbyists won't be the only people with tailor-made bills ready for the hopper when the 82nd Congress gets down to the business of making laws later this month. Many Congressmen themselves have already announced plans to introduce new legislation.

One of the most controversial issues of recent Congressional sessions has been the Taft-Hartley labor law. Labor unions generally have called for its repeal, some critics have urged keeping the law but amending it, and others have wanted the Act to remain unaltered.

Sen. Robert A. Taft (R. Ohio) who authored the bill, has outlined a long list of amendments which he will back. But he insists that the "basic principles" of the Taft-Hartley Law should not be changed.

NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS
The last requirement that union officials file non-Communist affidavits was attacked from a new quarter Dec. 27 when the House Un-American Activities Committee said that the provision now was "working to the benefit of members of the Communist Party engaged in the field of labor."

Many industrial groups, including the National Association of Manufacturers, have asked for the elimination of nationwide bargaining contracts. Such an amendment nearly was approved when the House passed it in 1947.

Concerning this point, Taft recently said, "If nationwide strikes can be dealt with by any other way, we might have to consider a limitation of nationwide bargaining to prevent monopoly in labor as in industry."

I have many times regarded such a law as very difficult to draw, and I do not believe it is going to be necessary. A lot of inconvenience is justified to keep the field of collective bargaining as free as possible.

The new Chairman of the House Labor Committee, Rep. Samuel R. McConnell, Jr. (R. Pa.), told a reporter "We are certainly going to have changes in the labor-management relations law. I certainly anticipate them, but how they will be made I can't say."

McConnell was credited with working out a mine safety bill in the 82nd Congress which was accepted to management and labor and he reportedly thinks the same can be done in the field of labor-management relations legislation.

TAX REDUCTION SIGHT
The problem of taxes has brought forth many statements from Congressmen concerning hoped-for reductions.

Rep. Joseph W. Martin Jr. (R. Mass.), to be Speaker of the House in the new Congress, has said he thinks a tax cut may be possible. However, Senate GOP leaders are not quite as hopeful. Sen. Styles Bridges (R. N. H.), Senate minority leader in the 82nd Congress, said he wants to see the budget balanced before cutting taxes.

Sen. Eugene D. Millikin (R. Colo.), new Chairman of the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee, said he would be foolishly to cherish more than a fond hope for tax cuts until Congress gets a close look at the budget President Truman will submit to Congress.

Rep. John D. Dingell (D. Mich.) has announced he will introduce a bill early in January to abolish many excise taxes and substantially reduce a long list of others.

WINE AND COPPER
At least two Congressmen have plans for new legislation on import taxes. Rep. Hubert B. Scudder (R. Calif.) has proposed that Congress should be required before import duties could be lowered below a point where American industry would be injured. At present the President can lower tariffs at his discretion under certain provisions established by Congress.

Scudder said his amendment is inspired by reductions in the tariff on wine which have resulted in an increase in the importation of foreign wines.

Rep. James T. Patterson (R. Conn.) said he is taking steps to see that Congress continues the suspension of import duty on copper which expires Feb. 15, 1953. He said he wants the suspension to continue as long as copper remains scarce.

Sen. Hugh Butler (R. Neb.), new Chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, said he favors statehood for Hawaii. He predicted the committee will approve a state bill for Hawaii and send it to the floor "reasonably early." In the past, Butler has opposed Hawaiian statehood and he still is in opposition to such status for Alaska.

Michigan's Rep. Dingell (D.) said he will ask the 83rd Congress to provide for the construction of 100,000 miles of superhighways in the United States. The plan is for a checkerboard of multi-lane superhighways running east and west and north and south across the country. He said the roads would provide greater security in time of national emergency. He advocated tolls on the roads.

Rep. McConnell (R. Pa.) said he thinks Congress will continue Federal aid to states for construction of school houses in congested areas of vital importance.

Many other Congressmen have announced plans to introduce new legislation in 1953. Among them are:

Direct national primaries and national election reforms, medical aid for veterans, universal military training, mine safety regulations, detection and punishment of criminals, Civil Service retirement and pay reforms, termination of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sale of government business enterprises to private industry.

They found, however, that this was not unanimous. "My party, Mr. Chairman," piped up Senator Morse of Oregon, "has already caucused and is ready to report."

"As the Independent Party" continued Morse, who is the sole Independent in the Senate, "we have decided that we should have a showdown. The 83rd Senate cannot be obligated by the rules of procedure of the 1st Senate. We should make our own rules for the 83rd Senate just as the 1st Senate made its rules for itself."

"Regardless of what the Republicans and Democrats do," he concluded, "the Independent Party will always be ahead of you."

Tokyo Commander
A GROUP of Congressmen recently inspecting the Korean War front said with great gusto that Clark loaded for bear.

Texas Congressmen O. C. Fisher and Frank Wilson had their axes particularly sharpened for Clark because of the battle of the Rapido River and the fact that a Texas National Guard division—the 38th—was badly mauled during the siege of Cassino.

Before the conference ended, however, the Congressional Guard division's top commander in the Far East.

"You go on to Korea," Clark told them in Tokyo, "and when you get back, let me know what you think. I'll answer any questions."

Clark did answer any and all questions, convinced

extensively about these issues, and about domestic issues also, as opportunity arises. He also expects to travel widely this year after his return from abroad, keeping close touch with key party leaders.

His old friend Stevenson has become "Mr. Democrat," in the coming years of Republican rule. The question remains whether or not he holds no public office, and who was badly beaten as his party's standard bearer in 1952, his party's real and recognized leader, Mr. Democrat.

Wendell Willkie attempted a similar feat after the 1940 election, and he failed. But Stevenson's friends, at least, believe that Stevenson can succeed. There is no deep split on the paramount issues of foreign policy among Democrats, as there was among Republicans in 1940.

Stevenson, by contrast, was certainly not forced on an unwilling party—the party forced itself on him. Unlike Willkie's, his party credentials are not unimpeachable. And although he has enemies, especially among the Southerners, he is not so unpopular that his enemies will need a party symbol and party spokesman. Only Stevenson can fill the bill.

TRUMAN IS OUT
Harry S. Truman cannot fill it—and as a matter of fact, he does not want to. Truman has repeatedly assured Stevenson that he has come to have a genuine personal respect for him. But he is in no position to do so, simply because he is automatically ruled out as a contender for the presidency by the obvious possibility of his own potential source of party power.

The decision to take Stevenson's decision active to seek the real leadership of his party rather than to let Stevenson's nomination in 1956. On this point, Stevenson is of course confident in no-one. But just as he is confident in no-one, so is he in the Democratic nomination for 1956, he is a power to be reckoned with in the Democratic nomination race. He may succeed where Willkie failed.

If he does succeed, he should be able to supply the informed and realistic leadership that the administration must have, if our political democracy is to function as it should.

Majority Leaders A Power, But He Has Responsibilities

By JAMES MARLOW

WHEN he was just another Republican Senate freshman, Taft was a luxury he can't take advantage of in his new position of power and responsibility as Republican floor leader.

Taft is a hard-working man. He's also a sensitive one. In other years he could make a plant his headquarters and march off the floor without having to defend it or argue about it.

And like any other senator in his position in the past, he always had the privilege of walking out if someone on the other side was too big for his ears back and he didn't like the quality of the pins.

Not so for the floor leader. He has to stick around even when the other side is trying to tear his roof in with brick-bats. He has the responsibility of guiding through to final passage the legislation his administration wants.

Vice President Barkley, when he was a senator from Kentucky, and the late Sen. Warren G. Harding didn't seem to have much in common but both had a sense of humor which served them in good stead.

Day after day, year after year, the Congressmen the war was in competent hands.

As the conference closed, Clark turned to Congressmen and said, "Does your district like in Connecticut?" he asked. "My father was appointed to West Point from there in 1888, and died and died there. In fact, the family is buried there."

Kearns said that his district did take in Connecticut on the hill. Said General Clark, "I would appreciate it if you would let me know how my district is getting on."

Kearns promised to do so, and as was so good as his word. He took a special trip to Connecticut, found out some new shrubbery around them, took pictures and sent them to Clark.

Pentagon Politics
GENERAL EISENHOWER may not know it, but a backstage wire-pulling match is going on inside the Pentagon over who should step into General Van Fleet's boots as 8th Army commander in Korea.

Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army chief of staff, is trying to get Van Fleet's job. Gen. Maxwell Taylor, in the job. Eisenhower has hinted privately that he would like to see his own former deputy, Gen. Al Gruenther, replace Van Fleet.

Taylor's supporters have quietly undertaken to convince Eisenhower that Gruenther is so urgently needed in Europe that he cannot leave his post. Taylor is on an "in-place" tour, so he'll be all ready to take over from Van Fleet.

Whoever gets the job will probably end up as Army Chief of Staff.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Brownell Will Name Honest Attorneys

NEW Attorney General Herbert Brownell is going to specialize in picking top-notch U. S. attorneys throughout the country. He knows that corruption begins at the grass roots, and that the U. S. Attorney's office is the place where it can easily originate.

One of the best men Brownell picked by Brownell is Warren Olney III, as U. S. Attorney in Northern California. Olney is former counsel to the California Commission on Governmental Reform, and has done much to focus attention on California corruption.

In Southern California, however, Brownell has named as U. S. Attorney an honest, well-meaning gentleman named Ebel Younger, husband of one of the most prominent Republican ladies in California.

Some years ago, Younger worked for the FBI and was the FBI's secret agent inside the Longhorns' when the case of Harry Bridges was being handled. His identity was supposed to be known only to J. Edgar Hoover and a few top G men. He made the fatal error of leaving a carbon copy of a report at the FBI in a wastebasket in one of Bridges' hotel rooms.

It was labeled: "To the FBI from Special Agent Ebel Younger."

Naturally, Bridges' associates picked it up, and Younger was booted out of the Bridges organization. The FBI, mortified, put Younger to work filing reports.

Independent Party Reports

A GROUP of Congressmen favoring abolition of the Senate filibuster gathered in the office of Senator Lehman of New York—most of them Democrats. Present also were Irving Ives of New York and Jim Duff of Pennsylvania. Republicans, and Wayne Morse of Oregon, Independent.

After considerable discussion it was decided that the

caucus should not agree on anything definite, and that they should be particularly careful of what they told the press.

"We must say that we discussed the problem generally," remarked one Senator, "and be careful not to antagonize our own party caucuses."

"My party, Mr. Chairman," piped up Senator Morse of Oregon, "has already caucused and is ready to report."

"As the Independent Party" continued Morse, who is the sole Independent in the Senate, "we have decided that we should have a showdown. The 83rd Senate cannot be obligated by the rules of procedure of the 1st Senate. We should make our own rules for the 83rd Senate just as the 1st Senate made its rules for itself."

"Regardless of what the Republicans and Democrats do," he concluded, "the Independent Party will always be ahead of you."

Tokyo Commander
A GROUP of Congressmen recently inspecting the Korean War front said with great gusto that Clark loaded for bear.

Texas Congressmen O. C. Fisher and Frank Wilson had their axes particularly sharpened for Clark because of the battle of the Rapido River and the fact that a Texas National Guard division—the 38th—was badly mauled during the siege of Cassino.

Before the conference ended, however, the Congressional Guard division's top commander in the Far East.

"You go on to Korea," Clark told them in Tokyo, "and when you get back, let me know what you think. I'll answer any questions."

Clark did answer any and all questions, convinced

extensively about these issues, and about domestic issues also, as opportunity arises. He also expects to travel widely this year after his return from abroad, keeping close touch with key party leaders.

His old friend Stevenson has become "Mr. Democrat," in the coming years of Republican rule. The question remains whether or not he holds no public office, and who was badly beaten as his party's standard bearer in 1952, his party's real and recognized leader, Mr. Democrat.

Wendell Willkie attempted a similar feat after the 1940 election, and he failed. But Stevenson's friends, at least, believe that Stevenson can succeed. There is no deep split on the paramount issues of foreign policy among Democrats, as there was among Republicans in 1940.

Stevenson, by contrast, was certainly not forced on an unwilling party—the party forced itself on him. Unlike Willkie's, his party credentials are not unimpeachable. And although he has enemies, especially among the Southerners, he is not so unpopular that his enemies will need a party symbol and party spokesman. Only Stevenson can fill the bill.

TRUMAN IS OUT
Harry S. Truman cannot fill it—and as a matter of fact, he does not want to. Truman has repeatedly assured Stevenson that he has come to have a genuine personal respect for him. But he is in no position to do so, simply because he is automatically ruled out as a contender for the presidency by the obvious possibility of his own potential source of party power.

The decision to take Stevenson's decision active to seek the real leadership of his party rather than to let Stevenson's nomination in 1956. On this point, Stevenson is of course confident in no-one. But just as he is confident in no-one, so is he in the Democratic nomination for 1956, he is a power to be reckoned with in the Democratic nomination race. He may succeed where Willkie failed.

If he does succeed, he should be able to supply the informed and realistic leadership that the administration must have, if our political democracy is to function as it should.