THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1954

For A Tough Issue, A Compromise

WITH the general philosophical proposition that the human race ought to set aside at least one day a week for rest, relaxation, and reflection, THE NEWS is in agreement. Sunday is such a nice day that we automatically tend to resist any commercial encroachment upon it.

But on the proposition that Sunday should be set aside by civil law as a day of worship, THE NEWS disagrees with the Charlotte ministers who so earnestly and so eloquently pleaded their case against earlier Sunday evening movies before the City Council last week.

The present issue before the City Council is whether movies inside the city limits should be permitted to remain open between the hours of 6 and 9 p.m.

Theater owners have petitioned the Council to change the law so that they will not have to close during those hours. Their spokesman cited the unfair competition from drive-in movies across the city limits, which have no such restrictions; he argued that television stations, restaurants, service stations and many other businesses are free to operate during those hours; and contended that a legal ban against movies violates the separation of church and state tradition.

A group of Charlotte ministers contended, on the other hand, that the Council has already passed on the church-state question; that changing evening movie hours would be just one more encroachment upon the Sabbath and that it would invite others; and that laws governing Sunday commercialism reflect the majority faith, without violating the rights of the minority.

In our view, the good Christian observes Sunday according to the rules of his church and the dictates of his conscience. He does not need to lean upon the law as a crutch to support him in a moment of weakness. He decides for himself what kind of activity on the Sabbath his religion permits him.

The great strength and power of Christianity has not developed from secular law, but from its Divine inspiration and the zeal of those who, holding to the faith, want others to share its comfort and promise.

It is the conviction of THE NEWS that civil law should never be used to enforce religious practices. However, most American cities, reflecting the wishes of a majority, have placed some restrictions on commercial recreation on the Sabbath. Perhaps there is no perfect answer, but many cities, large and small, have compromised by prohibiting any form of commercial recreation during the Sabbath morning only. Apparently it has been a happy compromise—and one that we commend to the City Council.

That having been said, it was entirely unnecessary, and it smacked of buck-passing in its most flagrant form, for the Council majority to ask the County Commissioners to close down movies across the city limits. The Councilmen knew, from the statement of the man they pay $9,084 a year to advise them as city attorney, that the County Commissioners had no such authority. They should have stood up for counting in the presence of the contestants, as Councilman Albea wanted them to do.

Scott Entry Assures Real Battle

W. KERR SCOTT'S announcement that he would seek nomination to the U. S. Senate in the spring Democratic primary was almost anti-climactic. It had been obvious for months that the former governor was already in the race, and running hard.

But it is in the nature of things political for a formal announcement to be made. So Mr. Scott called a special Saturday afternoon news conference, handed newsmen a statement that voiced his philosophy of progressive government, and answered all questions tossed at him with his usual frankness and forthrightness.

The former governor will be a formidable opponent for young Alton E. Lennon, who was appointed by Gov. William Umstead to fill the Senate seat held by the late Willis Smith. Scott is an experienced politician. He is well known. He is a hard campaigner. And the road and school programs launched under his administration have turned out to be very wise investments.

Scott was a controversial figure while he was governor. Not only did he boldly advocate large scale programs that taxed the imagination, but he seemed to go out of his way to belabor his critics and opponents in a manner that was calculated to alienate them forever.

A wise and seasoned politician, Scott does not underestimate his opponent. Lennon was not well known when he was named to the Senate seat, but he put the long 1953 Senate recess to good use, making scores of speeches all over the state. Lennon is also a tireless campaigner and a rugged fighter, and he will benefit from the support of the Umstead administration.

It ought to be a good contest in which there will be clear, definable issues. Lennon is basically a conservative on domestic policies, Scott a progressive. Scott is more strongly an internationalist on foreign policy. There will be many issues, domestic and foreign, upon which the two candidates will offer different viewpoints, and this should give the people a real choice.

While the memory of the bitter 1950 Smith-Graham campaign is still fresh, we voice the hope that the Scott-Lennon scrap will stay within the rules of political ethics and morality and that reason rather than emotion will determine the decision of the voters.

Straight Talk To The GOP

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON, Sen. William Knowland and Rep. Charles Halleck picked the right forum for their warning that the Democrats will win the 1954 Congressional election unless the Republican Party unites behind President Eisenhower's leadership.

The three high GOP officials spoke at a Lincoln Day dinner in Washington. In the audience were a goodly number of Republicans in Congress who have not yet joined the Eisenhower team.

Lack of party harmony so far is not, as Sen. William Knowland said, the product of a Democratic scheme to "divide and conquer" the Republicans. The GOP was already divided, before Chicago and after. And it would have been conquered in the 1952 election had not President Eisenhower pulled many a GOP congressman to victory.

This is a critical year for the Republican Party. It controls Congress by the narrowest of margins, despite Mr. Eisenhower's landslide personal victory. Even a small voter trend away from the party in power—customary in off-presidential elections—would give Democrats control of the House, and perhaps of the Senate. And such a division of authority and responsibility might very well produce a legislative stalemate, at a time in world history when the United States must be able to act decisively in domestic and foreign affairs.

The Republican Party holds its own future in its hands. Its success in the November elections will be determined by how unitedly and how efficiently it compiles a record of achievement to lay before the voters.

From The St. Louis Globe-Democrat

HORATIO AT THE BANK

THE Horatio Alger books (in which we firmly believed) taught that the typical bank president was aloof, astute, infallible, unapproachable and completely immune from the baser emotions like sympathy.

If he ever cried real tears, they came in brittle, miniscule, sternly-audited quantities. Anything less than a foreclosed widow, aged and bent under the burden of starving children, frost-bitten feet and negotiable collateral, couldn't even start him blinking.

But then the banker was fiscal king; to condemn or question was lese majeste. As holder of the world's scarcest and most sought-after job, he was entitled to his cool little idiosyncracies. If you didn't like it, you could find a leisurely bank-presidenting job of your own—ha, ha.

Horatio ought to be around now. Particularly to read the all-points-emergency bulletin being broadcast by the Missouri State Employment Service. This erstwhile last-ditch haven of the mine-run jobless man is advertising desperately for someone to take a job as bank president in a "small, thriving Missouri community." Aside from helping move the furniture into a new building, he will have only to supervise loans, investments, employes and whatever else a rural bank president is supposed to supervise.

Which should prove to misguided Horatio: (1) Common labor has reached the striped pants class, or (2) bank presidenting has gotten to be real labor.

The State Democratic Committee rescinded a move to expel those who voted for Eisenhower. So now there'll continue to be a Democratic Party in Florida.—FORT MYERS (FLA.) NEWS-PRESS.

Nothing is more conducive to a bipartisan policy than an even-steven count in the Congress.—KINGSPORT (TENN.) TIMES-NEWS.

'Bossy, What Sharp Horns You Have'

Analysis Of New Regime

The Soviet Committee System

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

THE DEFECTION of Yuri Rastovorof, the young Russian who chose freedom in Tokyo, is a minor episode in a big process. With an unorthodox passion for publicity that hints of competition with the Central Intelligence Agency, the Army Intelligence has claimed that Rastovorov was wooed by its agents. In fact, he was a Beria man, who defected when he got the call home that was pretty sure to be a sentence of death.

In the original list of those purged with the late Lavrenti Beria, one of the most significant names was that of the deputy minister of foreign affairs, Dekanozov. Dekanozov was Beria's inside man in the Foreign Ministry. His removal was only the first step in a far flung clean-out of Beria men holding key posts abroad, in the Soviet foreign service.

Significantly, Beria's MVD agents have not been replaced by other, better trusted secret policemen in the most delicate of all foreign posts—the Russian missions to the satellites. The new viceroys have been drawn from the Communist Party hierarchy. This is the origin of Pop-off in Warsaw, Firubin in Prague, Pavel Yudin in Peking, and Ilyachev, who is now playing an important part in the Berlin conference.

MALENKOV 'CHAIRMAN'

Cutting the secret police down to size—in itself natural after Beria's fall—is in turn thought to be only one feature of a general levelling and equalizing tendency in Moscow. The word is going 'round among the Russian experts, both here and abroad, that the Soviet Union is being run by a committee system. The Premier, Georgi Malenkov, it is said, is simply the chairman of the board.

These ideas, of a Soviet committee system rule, and of Malenkov's status as a chairman, have already gained the status of political cliches. Curiously enough, the moment when the cliches were born can probably be identified.

For some time now, the Soviets have been showing unusual politeness to the British and French Ambassadors to Moscow. The same line has been taken with both — that French, British and Russians are all "Europeans" together; that there are no problems they cannot settle between themselves; that all troubles arise because of the American connection, and so on. The shrew British Ambassador, Sir William Hayter, is said to have replied by reminding his interlocutors that other people also had friends outside Europe — Russia had China, for instance.

The French Ambassador, Louis Joxe, has received the largest share of these attentions, being granted a series of interviews with Molotov in the period before the Berlin meeting opened. Hayter was accorded the special privilege of an interview with Malenkov, however, soon after he reached Moscow to take up his post. Molotov was present; and at this meeting Molotov came perilously close to correcting Malenkov, putting in that "the Prime Minister means thus and so" after Malenkov had made a statement.

There was a startling difference between this curious demonstration and Molotov's former relation with Stalin, who delighted in showing his power by humiliating his faithful Minister of Foreign Affairs in the presence of important foreigners. The deduction was obvious, that Molotov now enjoys a real and altogether novel measure of independence in his own special field.

Westerners have a few insights into the real workings of the Soviet hierachy. Much tends to be made of little. The whole theory of the committee system and Malenkov's role as a mere committee chairman appears to have originated from this single incident. Nonetheless, the theory looks like it is being confirmed by fragments of evidence that have gradually accumulated.

For example, the space accorded the more important Soviet leaders in the Russian and satellite press is currently measured out on a strict fair-shares basis, with Malenkov getting only a few sticks of type more than his colleagues. There is not the slightest tendency to distinguish Malenkov or any other individual by the slavish praise that was always meted out to "the divine Stalin".

ROLE AT BERLIN

The Berlin meeting has also produced interesting indications. In former conferences, Molotov merely roared the lines that were given him by the Kremlin. He could never settle any issue without interminable references to Moscow for instructions. He had to go on talking until he got new orders.

At Berlin, Molotov has made his public demonstration for the record on each successive issue —the agenda, China and so on. But when the demonstration was over, he has immediately got on with the next order of business. Clearly, he has a novel freedom of decision, within certain limits.

Any committee system, of course, is likely to produce its own internal tensions. A struggle for ultimate mastery is probably still going on. But on the one hand, there is no evidence that this struggle will weaken Soviet power, which was wholly unaffected by the fall of Beria. And on the other hand, the new committee is still carrying on Stalin's old policy, but much more dangerously, with much greater skill and flexibility.

People's Platform

Meet, Don't Outlaw, Churches' Competition

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

THE appearance of Mr. Warren before the city council in favor of a tighter rein of blue laws in Charlotte both saddened and amazed me. I was amazed because I thought the days of puritanism had long disappeared with the smoke of the last human being executed in a witch's fire. I was saddened by the thought of the damage done to the clergy as a whole by this action which seems to take unfair advantage of a few business men.

The setting up of taboos and unfair legislation is no answer to the problem of empty churches on Sunday night. Such behavior only antagonizes potential church members. The answer rests in sincere, positive action and better homiletics. In this day of the thermonuclear bomb people want and need religion and they will gladly flock to hear a clergyman who knows and attends to his business. Such petty action as outlawing competition will never solve any problem.

—STANLEY KRAMER.

Ike's New Military Policy Will Get Senate Scrutiny

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

WHILE the headlines have not yet begun to reflect it, the administration's "new look" in military policy has produced a ground swell of doubt and criticism that will make news before too long. The doubters are to be found both in the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill.

In a speech shortly before he left for the Berlin conference, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles defined the way in which American diplomacy would conform to the new military policy. Aggression anywhere will be met by "instant retaliation" directed not at the periphery but at the centers of Communist power. Dulles thereby seemed to rule out limited wars and to say that the next conflict would inevitably be an all-out atomic war.

Certain Senators are planning a full dress debate at the earliest opportunity in which they will try to determine whether this was in fact the meaning of the Dulles speech. They will ask some searching questions about the new policy which places even greater reliance on the fantastic weapons of the atomic age. As now contemplated, this will not be a partisan attack on the administration's foreign - military policy but rather an attempt to get what is felt to be much needed clarification.

The suspicion persists that the policy was tailored to meet the economy demands laid down by leaders. In recent speeches, both Gen. Matthew Ridgway, chief of staff of the Army, and Gen. Charles Bolte, next in command, have indicated their grave doubts about the deep cuts in manpower now being made and in prospect. Bolte, in talking to the United States Armor Association at Fort Knox, Ky, was especially frank in questioning whether atomic firepower could replace manpower on the ground.

Part of this may be discounted as a proprietary interest in maintaining the established order. But it also represents a real concern lest the public be encouraged in the popular post-war illusion that push button warfare with magic missiles has all but eliminated the blood, sweat and tears of the old order of warfare.

Many Americns persist in believing that a few massive raids by American bombers on enemy centers would eliminate all threat of danger and allow America to live again in isolated peace. They conveniently ignore the peril of atomic retaliation by fleets of bombers, at least two-thirds of which would today be able to get through the continental defense system constructed thus far.

The Eisenhower team in the Pentagon is bent on keeping any opposition to the new policy strictly in the family. Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson and his deputy, Roger Kyes, have shown that they have a rough way with those on the team who sound off on a contrary note.

Yet when military men talk privately, their doubts and uncertainties are greater even than those they express publicly. They raise two big question marks. The first is with respect to the quantity of the new weapons now available or likely to be available. Military critics suggest that the public has been led to believe that the new weapons are already in full production whereas the number is extremely limited. In the words of one doubter of high rank, they are fantastic in effect and fanastic in cost. As an example, a single shell fired from one of the new type weapons costs $10,000. If it misses, the $10,000 is just an empty bang. So the economy held out as bait to Congress may be a false hope.

In connection with these question marks, a so-called small war has been going on in Indochina for more than seven years. The French who have taken heavy casualties through the years are fed up with that seemingly endless conflict. A new government in France might suddenly dump the problem of Indochina on Washington as the British abruptly put the responsibility for Greece up to te Truman Administration.

For this reason some sources are beginning to suggest that American ground troops will soon have to go into Indochina to save the situation. This suggestion does not, of course, come from any responsible source. In fact ground commanders react violently against even the remote possibility of such a step. They point out that the handicaps would be infinitely greater than in Korea where the United Nations forces had the ocean and the Navy on three sides and a complete air umbrella.

What is more, Red China would almost certainly retaliate by sending in Chinese Communist forces. And that might well be the signal for World War III. Before the reduced budget is approved the lawmakers want to know more about all these matters.

Sharks, Bunnies, And Bugs Give Aussies A Bad Time

By ROBERT C. RUARK

SYDNEY, Australia

THREE or four things remain constant in Australia, unchanging down through the years. One, of course, is the hostility of Melbourne toward Sydney, and t'other way 'round. Another is the shark-patrol sirens that herald my infrequent visits to the beaches, in search of Sunday morning health.

A third is the perennial quarrel over drinking hours, and a fourth is the unceasing warfare of the animals and birds and bugs toward Australians. In the latter category, I still think that Australia will someday be conquered — not by the teeming Asian hordes — but by a mixed array of rabbits, birds, sharks, locusts, beetles, emus, wallabies and pigs.

The basic bitterness of the battle between Sydney and Melbourne always has escaped me. From beer to babes, from horses to climate, from food to fun and from hell to breakfast, the battle roars happily on. It is a mark of infantilism, because the two towns cannot be compared any more than Los Angeles with San Francisco, or New York with New Orleans.

People will come up to you with a perfectly straight face and ask: "Don't you think Melbournians are more sincere than Sydneysiders?" And the only answer is that I have known some powerfully insincere people in Melbourne and some very sincere ones in Sydney, and exactly the other way around.

I cannot comment on the liveliness of the two embattled cities, except that maybe there is a noisier night life in Sydney, but I have been reduced to bleeding shreds and tatters in both towns, and whether one gets shredded in a pub or in a private home does not lessen the octanage of the punishment. I have suffered equally from excessive hospitality in both.

One of these days I hope to go surfing in this area without benefit of the air-raid sirens that herald the presence of sharks, or call them. At present and in the past, every time I wet a foot in the Pacific the siren goes and I retreat to the comparative safety of somebody's house, where there is generally a party in progress. Occasionally I wish ruefully I had stopped to take my chances with the sharks.

The sharks seem to be just one facet of the cospiracy to take Australia away from the Australians. Last time out, an eagle swooped down and took a baby away from its mother in Kings Cross. A shark leaped into a boat and attacked a couple of fishermen. The rabbits were busy eating the country out of house and home, and the emus and wallabies and roos were kicking down the fences to let the rabbits in.

Then they developed myxomatosis, a disease to kill off the rabbits, and were doing fine until the rabbits developed an immunity, and now we are breeding a tougher, huskier line of bunny, which carries two pistols and a flame-thrower.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Burns Sees Upward Business Trend

WASHINGTON

SEDATE AND scholarly Dr. Arthur Burns, the ex-Columbia professor, now chief of Ike's Council of Economic Advisers, went to great pains in explaining to senators why he had to testify about business recession in secret.

Then after finally getting permission to talk in secret, he told the senators almost nothing they hadn't already heard in public.

Dr. Burns, appearing before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, explained that he had been searching his soul as to whether to testify at all. The way he looked at it, he had a confidential relationship with the President. However, he had given the matter deep thought. Since cabinet officers are expected to testify, Burns decided he, too, had an obligation to appear before Congress—if requested. However, he had to insist that no transcript be taken of his remarks.

Sen. Douglas of Illinois, an ex-professor of economics at the University of Chicago, promptly challenged him. Burns then went into a lengthy explanation, pointing out that in speaking off-the-cuff, he was apt to oversimplify a complex situation or to state an idea more positively than it ought to be expressed. Therefore, he preferred to keep his remarks informal. If a transcript were made, he said, it would make his testimony appear more formal than it actually would be.

There was also the possibility, he continued, that he might say something that would appear to be in contradiction of the President's economic report. He hastened to assure that he didn't mean he disagreed with the President's report in any detail. But in the course of speaking, he said, some statement of his might come out on the record that would appear to contradict the President. If that happened, he added solemnly, and his remark were made permanent in transcript form, he would feel constrained to resign within the hour.

Sen. Douglas started to object further, but Sen. Flanders of Vermont urged that Dr. Burns be given the right to testify without even a transcript being taken.

As a result, Burns was allowed to proceed behind closed doors without his words being recorded. However, his testimony was perfectly safe and could have been transcribed without embarrassing the President or anyone else.

Burns didn't deviate an iota from the President's economic report. He admitted that we are going through what he called a "Mild contraction." But he insisted there is no reason to believe it will become any more severe, and there is good reason to believe the economy will start picking up again in late spring or early summer.

Indochina Dilemma

From two different sources, President Eisenhower has received increasingly disturbing reports about the situation in Indochina. It is so bad that he has been seriously considering sending U. S. troops to Indochina to train native troops.

One report to the White House has come from John Foster Dulles in Berlin who says the French Assembly is getting nearer the point where it will vote to pull out of Indochina altogether, abandoning it to the Communists. Dulles has warned that something must be done quickly or the French will take just such a step.

The second report comes from the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur Radford, who claims that the real solution in Indochina is the efficient training of native troops. Radford proposes sending a top U. S. military man, with experience in either Greece or Korea, to train Indochinese natives.

This would save French lives, and, he believes, would result in some real resistance against the Chinese - equipped Communists who since the end of the Korean war have received trainload after trainload of munitions, obviously diverted from the Korean front.

Radford's plan is now under study by the National Security Council, which feels strongly that something must be done to prevent communism from overrunning all of Southeast Asia. However, Eisenhower is loath to send American troops to Indochina even for training purposes. So far there has been no decision.

Pipeline

Foreign Minister Eden has reported to Prime Minister Churchill that the Berlin conference may not wind up a complete flop after all. Eden says that Foreign Minister Molotov has secretly hinted he wants to conclude some trade agreements for nonstrategic goods from Britain.

Secretary of State Dulles can't find anyone to head the overseas library program since Sen. McCarthy began sabotaging it. So far, nine people have turned the job down.

The new hydrogen-bomb tests early next month will cost the government between $80,000,000 and $100,000,000.