

WORDS, YES, BUT WHAT DID THEY MEAN?

"It well said again; And 'tis a kind of good deed to say well: And yet words are no deeds."
Shakespeare: King Henry VIII

TO THE POINT Richard Barnwell, words were "easy, like the wind." To historian Henry Adams, words were "slippery."

Last week the flow of soft, soothing, slippery words from Moscow steadily gained in volume and variety. Premier Malenkov had started it. In his funeral oration, he spoke of "the possibility of the prolonged coexistence and peaceful competition of two different systems: capitalist and socialist." Last Sunday, addressing the Supreme Soviet, he went even further: "There is not one disputed or undecided question that cannot be decided by peaceful means on the basis of mutual understanding of interested countries. This is our attitude toward all states, among them the United States of America."

Other Communist leaders caught their cue. On Wednesday, Foreign Minister Molotov dug out an old British complaint for Russian help in freeing ten British civilians imprisoned in North Korea nearly a year ago. Molotov said he would see that the question had an "affirmative solution."

On Thursday, the Soviet commander in East Germany, General Chukov, expressed regret over the death of seven British fliers shot down by Communist MIG's, and suggested a conference to avoid future misunderstandings.

Over the weekend came the topser. After years of boasting that Russia had won World War II singlehandedly, while the "capitalist nations" sat back and got rich, Radio Moscow abruptly put on a new record. "The possi-

bility of cooperation was manifested still more vividly during the war against the Fascist states," said a top commentator, Boris Loevsky. "The Soviet Union, the USA and Britain harmoniously co-operated in that war as allies, helping each other and co-ordinating their military efforts. This co-operation had splendid results—a common victory over the enemy."

What did it mean? Diplomats here and abroad expressed deep optimism. They noted that a full week had gone by without any of the customary belittling statements denouncing the West. Even the criticism of the Korean War in the Russian press had a softer tone.

The Eisenhower Administration maintained its posture of cautious optimism. The fact that this nation learned the bitter lesson that the Communist propaganda line shifts and turns at the will of the Kremlin, and that Russian words, of themselves, have no value beyond hinting at possible future Russian actions.

The new Russian regime has a hundred opportunities to show the world that it is willing to give up the plan of world conquest in return for a peaceful co-existence. It can end the Korean War, unblock the United Nations, work out an Austrian peace treaty, open up its borders to information and commerce, free the satellite nations of its iron grasp, disarm... the list is almost endless.

Until it does some of these things, the free world's skepticism will be amply justified. The wolf does not put on the skin of the sheep without a purpose. Until that purpose becomes clear, the free world will suspect, with the Psalmist, that "The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart."

HOME RULE — AN ELUSIVE GOAL

AT THE MOMENT, the status of Representative Regan's "home rule" bill is highly unsettled. So many counties were exempted from it, and so many other Representatives have not been sure whether they wanted their counties exempted or not, that the measure was referred back to committee where it now rests.

Surely the time has come for this modest beginning to move home rule in North Carolina. The act simply authorizes Boards of County Commissioners to fix salaries of County Commissioners. If made applicable to all counties, it would free the counties from a considerable portion of its burden of local legislation. More important, it would place authority where it belongs. County Commissioners are elected to manage county affairs. They have, better than the General Assembly, what compensation is adequate for county officials.

Furthermore, they are close to the people, and painfully aware of public opinion. This would not be prefigured with the taxpayers' money.

DRIVER EXAMINATION PROGRAM IN DANGER

IN EACH of the past three years, North Carolina's driver licensing program has been under the heavy hand of the State's attorney by the National Safety Council. And it is a measure of our progress in this field that, as recently as 1948, the state's program was rated 23th.

A bill passed by the House and pending in the Senate would lower that rating and seriously increase the heavy burden by permitting the renewal of driving licenses by mail. The driver would merely send an affidavit to the Motor Vehicles Division saying that he was in good health, but without any motor vehicle laws or been involved in a serious accident, and that his eyes had been examined recently.

Proponents make but one point in favor of the bill—that it would eliminate the inconvenience of appearing personally before

The General Assembly has traditionally been jealous of its prerogatives in the field of local legislation, and understandably so. The General Assembly serves but three months out of each two-year term. Between sessions, he is a relatively unimportant fellow in local politics. He may be expected to hold on to those powers which add to his political prestige and popularity. For this reason, greater grassroots agitation will be necessary before the goal of home rule is achieved. In this county, for example, reaction was swift and sharp when it was learned that Mecklenburg would be exempted from the Regan bill. The County Commissioners, by resolution, petitioned the local legislators not to exclude Mecklenburg County from the bill, and both County Commissioners and the General Assembly, with commendable strong editorial support to the proposal.

When the people of North Carolina wake up to the fact that they have very little direct authority over their local government, they will be more active in home rule will be achieved. But not before.

From The Wall Street Journal

MAN ON THE HOT SEAT

THE Secretary of Agriculture, as Mr. Benson has discovered, sits in one of the hottest seats of any member of the President's cabinet.

The Secretary of State deals with difficult and complex problems second to none in importance; the Secretary of the Treasury must deal with matters of the highest importance; each of the cabinet officers, directly or indirectly, has to make decisions of consequence. But none is subject to more acute and direct political pressure than the Secretary of Agriculture.

The reason is not hard to understand. The consequences of a foreign policy decision may be grave but in most cases its effects are delayed. A financing decision of the Treasury may have quick effect, but usually any major decision involves technical matters that mean little or nothing grasped by the body of the people. The decisions of the Secretary of Agriculture hit people where it hurts—and often quickly.

Take the matter of butter. Mr. Benson has scarcely used his name in connection with it, but he had to make a decision about continuing butter price supports. The decision could not be postponed. It could not be evaded or disguised. And no matter what each county would expect to be impacted immediately. High price supports hit

the housewife; lower price supports hit the dairy farmer. The result, for Mr. Benson, is politics in the raw.

Secretary Benson has some pronounced ideas on farm policy. He stated them before he took office and he reiterates them, with considerable force, in the current issue of the Farm Journal magazine. True, Mr. Benson has not yet proposed in detail what a farm policy ought to be. But he is quite blunt on what it ought not to be. And since he thinks it ought not to be what it is, he is bound to make a lot of people mad.

Mr. Benson thinks high price supports are bad. He thinks the present ninety-percent-of-parity level is much too high; that it can price commodities (like butter) right out of the market. He thinks any kind of rigid price supports for perishables causes troubles. In sum, he thinks the government ought to stop some of its "help" to the farmer.

That is truly revolutionary talk. We haven't heard anything like that from a Secretary of Agriculture in a generation.

Mr. Benson, of course, is absolutely right. The present farm program is a piece of economic foolishness and, what is more, is impractical. It will lead either to a complete repudiation of farmers by the state or to a wave of reaction against the absurdities which the government would sweep out all farm programs together.



In The Contrast Is A Parable

The Dilemma Of The World

(Recently Dr. Jas. A. Jones, pastor of Myers Park Presbyterian Church, spoke to the Charlotte Philately Museum Group. The following excerpt from his paper discusses eloquently, and with great discernment, the central problem of the world today.)

THE first impression which one gains from such an experience, I think, the solution of the world's dilemma. I boarded a Pan American World Airways plane at Idlewild Airport on Thursday, just before midnight. On Saturday at 11 P. M. I was in Leopoldville, capital of the Belgian Congo. The clock time was just under 48 hours. The elapsed time was actually just under 48 hours.

One hour's ride by car out of Leopoldville and a man is back in the "bus" operator of a culture and of common habits that are today as they have been for three thousand years.

The African with pants and shirt, seen on the boulevards of a metropolitan city, is replaced by a countrified, or brother, who chaps away at his manure field with a short handle hoe, made in a native forge of the crudest of metals, and the ancestors of both have done for more than a millennium.

The mothers with babies waiting for attention at the clinic of the modern hospital find their counterparts, in an hour's walk, when their mothers have their babies before a witch-doctor with his "bwanga" of goat's blood and chicken necks and while they double over the body of their child.

The ten story building gives way to the mud and sticky hut, with thatched roof falling into its one unsheltered room. The Cadillac Fleetwood on paved streets is forgotten as a familiar sight when one sees a bare-footed hunter stalk a monkey through a forest through the obscure paths of tropical forests.

AND then the truth comes upon the mind: One is not a spectator. Here is not something to be amazed at and talked about, strange for its novelty. Here is the very stuff of our human existence. Such contrast is not only to stagger the imagination and tease the recollection. Such contrast is parable of the dilemma of our modern world. It is not fair to say that in less time than a week, one can be buried, rudely and upsettingly, into a situation which points up the very roots of the human problem—and undisturbed, in the haves and the have-nots.

The possession on the one hand, and the deficiency on the other, are not alone, nor primarily, material matters. One group has gadgets, to be sure, that make for comfort and ease of living. The other group is welded by common ideas and purposes separated by two.

It is an admitted fact of civic integrity that the world's area of common community is a detriment to the whole community. It is of moment to

the citizens of Charlotte to note what goes on in Palmer's Alley, as well as to what goes on in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, in the West. Polio afflicts in Myers Park as well as down the ghetto. Within the limits of an urban community people are bound together by a bundle of life, as laws concerning public health and public education manifestly declare.

The traveler who sees the neighborhoods of affluence and poverty, culture and ignorance, health and disease, security and fear in the community dilemma, if he has any real vision about this, the danger and the opportunity with which our modern society confronts the honest and honorable man.

Some months ago a subcommittee of the United Nations met in Beyrouth, Syria. Representatives of all member nations were in attendance. It is reported that no man was over 30 hours from home. Now, we must learn, or for lack of learning, prove we have neither character nor sense, that the world is not a mere collection of islands, each within its own little, not an irrelevant matter that what goes on everywhere.

WE Americans are by nature a generous people. But we are also a parochial people. And perhaps the hardest lesson we have to learn is that generosity toward others can never take the place of an understanding of others. As a matter of fact, of course, that a hungry man will choose bread only when it is disciplined by a true sympathy for those whom we have set out to help. There is more to the good life than flash-frolics and deep freezes and a telephone in every house. That men wash their hands in basins filled from a stream of water, and what men who have water at the turn of a faucet.

And what, above all else, we need to recall is that the issues before us are not such as can be settled by material resources, even as they are not created by the lack of them. It will be admitted, of course, that a hungry man will choose bread rather than freedom, if the price of bread is lack of freedom. Patrick Henry declared "Give me liberty, or give me death," but one could hardly question whether he was speaking for Mr. Henry and the children.

There must be principles for which a man is willing to offer the last full measure of devotion, and our heritage is enhanced in honor because the people of Britain have made the choice. The point to note is that it was not their wealth or their poverty, their health or their illness, their learning or their ignorance which made the choice. The point that made the issue was that the men believed and dreamed and thought. But it is the lack of abundance of British pounds, the monetary generosity or arrogance of the colonial administration that settled the question of American independence.

The preamble to that noble document of liberty is something more than words when it speaks of certain "unalienable rights" being the nature and due portion of every creature under a Sovereign and Merciful God. This is what we must grasp in considering the British bomb in the hands of the Arabs, or Eastern Europe, or China, or Biddieville.

Reds' Border 'Sensitivity' May Explain Recent Attacks

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON
THE MOST LIKELY explanation for the rash of recent incidents on the Soviet air borders lies in a significant moment of the recent war.

It was the time after the Inchon victory, when General of the Army Douglas MacArthur had given President Truman what amounted to a promise that the Chinese Communists would not intervene in Korea. Every country supporting the United States supported Gen. MacArthur's conviction.

In July and August, a couple of Chinese divisions would have been enough to tip the balance against our own hard-pressed forces. If they had intervened then, U. S. troops might have been thrown out of Korea. In early September, a couple of Chinese divisions could have stopped the U. N. invasion of North Korea. The mere announcement of a "preventive occupation" would have brought a U. N. verdict against crossing the 38th Parallel.

Gen. MacArthur reasoned that if the Chinese had already crossed away such opportunities, they would not enter the Korean fighting. "Frogging" the Chinese hands and the North Korean armies had utterly disintegrated. For once, the former Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson agreed with Gen. MacArthur. When the Indian Ambassador at Peking, Mr. B. K. P. Sinha, sent an anguished warning against a drive to the Yalu River, the danger and the opportunity with which our modern society confronts the honest and honorable man.

THE MEN SAW IT. So far as is known, only three President Eisenhower officials argued for the course that now, by hindsight, looks so brilliantly wise—only three. They were the men in the narrow North Korean "waist," where we would now give our eyes to see. One was the former Secretary of the Air Force, Thomas Finletter, who merely pointed out that we had studied out the course to win, and had better be satisfied.

THE OTHER TWO were the chief American experts on the Soviet Union, Charles E. Bohlen and George F. Kennan. Kennan, an American statesman, it was logical to think the Chinese would not come in. They said they could not give solid rea-

son for their view. But they still maintained that the manner in which the Chinese and their satellite leaders had a neurotic sensitivity about their borders. George F. Kennan said that the Chinese were getting too close to a sensitive border; therefore a reaction must be expected. The Soviet Union's warning was ignored, with tragic consequences. Had the warning been heeded, the very Chinese who are now attacking Kennan and Bohlen as bad judges of Soviet behavior, would have been frowned with indignation because "MacArthur's" Air attack on what the Soviets called "four today (as it is what we shall have to face before long). The death of the Soviet Union, the death of the government, has undoubtedly given the Kremlin a sense of security. The Kremlin to order the most stringent patrols of the air borders, and to demand that any seeming trespassers be attacked on sight."

This may be, this could be, but it is not the only reason for the setbacks of the last ten days. Another seemingly unrelated set of facts may be interpreted to support this view.

ZHUKOV'S PROMOTION. In the elevating of Marshal Zhukov was one of the notable features of the new Soviet government. The Soviet Union, it is said, is fair to give evidence; yet Zhukov is Deputy Minister of Defense. The American press is that this indicates deference to the Red Army. But the Red Army is not alone.

Then too, there is the fact that until now, President Eisenhower has not been able to get the sort of verification that used to be heaped on President Truman by the Soviet Union. The American press is that this indicates deference to the Red Army. But the Red Army is not alone.

Anglo-American Relations Subjected To Severe Strain
By MARQUIS CHILDS
ly was a World War II type.

In the years since the war the British have produced jet transports, and they have been the first to pioneer on passenger air routes out of London to Europe, Asia and Africa. The British civil aircraft industry and the British Overseas Airways Corporation have been the backbone of the British industry in America.

This is the source of much offstage muttering in the U. S. Air Force. The British government provides a \$30,000,000 subsidy in order to produce jet transports for a government-owned British air line. Why shouldn't that subsidy have gone into the building of bombers?

The British reply is, in effect, a statement of the kind of dilemma in which they have found themselves since 1945. The jet transports, they say, are a potential source of dollar earnings. As they flow in, they are a potential source of dollar earnings. As they flow in, they are a potential source of dollar earnings. As they flow in, they are a potential source of dollar earnings.

BOMBER PRODUCTION
What Thomas has publicly disclosed is related to another deficiency worrying many Americans. The number of modern bombers Britain has produced since the war is naturally scarce. It is said to be very small. The British bomb in the hands of the Arabs, or Eastern Europe, or China, or Biddieville.

But he probably deserves the support of Congress and the public as of day.

When he stepped into the Defense Department, he was met by just about as bad as indicated by some of the newspaper headlines on the ammunition shortage. The British bomb in the hands of the Arabs, or Eastern Europe, or China, or Biddieville.

Defense Boss
THE man who is getting the most back-biting for his role in the production of the Soviet bomb in the hands of the Arabs, or Eastern Europe, or China, or Biddieville.

Another test being made in Nevada is also being made in Nevada. The test is being made in Nevada. The test is being made in Nevada. The test is being made in Nevada.