

THOMAS L. ROBINSON... President and Publisher
BRODIE S. GAFFNEY... General Manager
ROBERT H. LAMPE... Advertising Director
OCELL PRINCE... Editor
FRANK MONAGHAN... Associate Editor
R. L. YOUNG JR... Managing Editor
JAMES MCDOWELL... Circulation Manager

SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1959

Editorial Book Review

The Pied Piper Of American Pundits

THE COMMUNIST WORLD AND Ours by Walter Lippmann. Little, Brown & Co. 56 pp. \$2.00.

In Journalism, Walter Lippmann embodies the austere, even ascetic overtones of that originally Hindu word "pundit." He is, in Webster's words, a "learned teacher or critic" and his Brahman exterior in colloquial form makes the most severe requirements of his readers.

Yet the readers relish it, and follow him, even on bad days, as a kind of political Pied Piper. It is this mutual esteem, conveyed in elegant argument, which enables Mr. Lippmann to exact such lofty moral demands as he did four years ago in The Public Philosophy.

In that book he analyzed what he interpreted as the "derangement" of western democracies by Communist government. In typical Lippmann manner, he uncompromisingly demanded that citizens in democracies must become miniature Burkes, accepting the "mandate of Heaven" that leaders are elected to lead. It is understood by the leaders of American, factious democrats of the 1950's.

IN THE COMMUNIST WORLD AND Ours we have another ultimatum. This time "We must learn to keep ourselves armed without working ourselves up into a frenzy of threats and of fear. This is not easy for a democracy to do, but it is necessary. And, once the reason for it is understood by the leaders of American opinion, it can be done." Again it is a challenging order. Few but Walter Lippmann would summon us so categorically to answer it. Surely armament is as much the bitter fruit of reflection as Mr. Lippmann says. To our contemplation while shooting rockets into the air is as necessary for America as to return to the "mandate of Heaven" for democratic governments. In our rational moments we know it, but the tragedy is that we do not live in a 24-hour world of rationality—as the austere and admirable Mr. Lippmann often seems to suppose.

The globe is strewn with anxieties and clashes and The Communist World AND Ours grew for Mr. Lippmann from a trip to the source of many of them—Moscow. The object of that trip was to go to the wellhead of Russian policy in relation to the U. S. In an interview with Russian policy-makers and editors, and, in particular, Mr. Khrushchev, he returned to interpret what he heard and saw in four syndicated columns; and the present book, with slight additions, holds those columns.

LIPPMANN'S most important interview, with Mr. Khrushchev, is a masterpiece of reporting in political theory. His object was to question Mr. K's on the principles and assumptions giving rise to Kremlin policy towards the U. S. He found Mr. K more than willing to talk, if not specifically, at least on points of negotiation. He found him wholly devoted to the Leninist dogma, a man who takes it as a literal destiny of "history" that this is "one world" and that communism is foreordained to rule it. But he also found a man convinced that such a destiny will be achieved short of war, who takes it for granted that no political boundary will be altered by the use of military force. America, Mr. K told Lippmann, refuses to acknowledge a very special kind of "status quo" which is ardently acknowledged by the Kremlin. That is the status quo of the continuing Communist revolution in the world, and particularly in the USSR and China, and the Communist brain trust seemed to Lippmann equally convinced that, after the word of their gospel, the "capitalist" powers will be driven in utter frustration to fight a war against the successes of the Communist example.

This "force of example" Mr. Lippmann continuously cites as the most dangerous challenge to our position.

ADMIRABLY, Mr. Lippmann is not prepared to brand Mr. Khrushchev's exposition as a tissue of pretense designed to lure us into a trap. Rather, the burden of Lippmann's argument is that



Walter Lippmann

much hard discrimination needs to be applied by the Westerner who would understand the "truth" that animates Soviet foreign policy. For instance, Mr. Khrushchev takes it as "truth" that the Western military and industrial communities have a vested interest in the arms race.

It is wise or necessary to question this assertion as falsehood out and out, when so many Soviet tactics flow logically from a belief in its truth? The truth is that in every Soviet "truth" there is a half-truth for the Westerner. In every scrap of ideological rubbish which the Soviets peddle so effectively, the mind is called "neutralist" or uncommitted countries, there is an element of reality. Too often, lacking Mr. Lippmann's vast powers to sort and discriminate, we miss the importance of this point. In his study of Chinese Communist indoctrination of American prisoners of war in Korea, Eugene Kinkead probes about this same point. The deadliness of the conversion technique often lay in the inability of American POWs to discriminate between "truth" and "untruth" and the resulting failure of their argument. The prison camp instructor holds up a map, showing Russia and China ringed with American bases. "Who is the aggressor?" he asks, and the undiscriminating mind is at a loss to answer. The beginning would lie, at a minimum, in recognizing the half-truth which gives rise to Soviet assumptions.

THE impact of this failing should not be lost on the larger plane of Mr. K's thinking. The secret of Soviet power, as Mr. Lippmann and others have said, lies not in the grand strategic lie or deceit. It lies in fanaticism which can seize upon a grain of fact and make it a mountain of Marxist dogma. It lies in the painfully planned and deadly ingenuity of Communist tactics. Yet both strategy and tactics have been touted and heralded for years. The military methods by which the Communists partitioned Indochina with inferior forces were set down years ago by Mao Tse-tung; the indoctrination methods were foreshadowed on the German front in the 1940's—where the Russians were already more interested in indoctrination than in military intelligence. "In this context," as Dean Acheson has written, "sincerity" is a silly, and indeed, a very dangerous word.

The austere challenge to the West which Mr. Lippmann derives from his insight into the awesome "sincerity" of the Soviet mind is less fresh and distinguished, actually, than the insight itself. Most of us, in placid moments, realize that our challenge is to keep strong and at the same time to cease fearing our own image of the Communist threat. Most of us realize that in the face of the psychological and economic assault of communism on unimpeded, unpopulated, under-industrialized countries, we might well make India the workshop of development under free institutions—as he proposes. But first, with the rationality Lippmann urges, we must understand the psychological and political which the Communist mind turns, in lonely and fanatic dedication.

NOW, THE PIOUS SNOW MAN

THE "Abominable Snow Man" of the Himalayas has kept his name alive with almost monotonous frequency. But there is variety in the explanations of what he is—a strange bear, an apelike creature, a hoax, or whatever.

The newest comes from a German missionary who says that nine years ago in the Chinese province of Chinghai he saw one of these creatures and photographed him at close range. They are, says he, native priests who as an act of piety live outdoors in this rigorous climate without clothing. It was 20 degrees below zero when he took the photograph. "Impossible? Possibly. Impossible? Improbable."

For anthropologists believe that primitive man first invented clothing not for protection against the weather or in-

deed for reasons of modesty. Clothing, they say, grew out of adornment.

When Europeans found the Yaguans of Tierra del Fuego, these aborigines had neither invented clothing nor copied that of their neighbors. They put out in small canoes to fish and hunt the temperate waters about Cape Horn, whipped by frigid almost continuous gales, clothed in a coating of grass and wood ashes and huddled in the lee of shields of untanned hides. Yet they had survived for untold centuries. The Himalaya peoples, it could be invented for cost. Perhaps the only devices among them know they are simply dispensing with "adornment."

Is there anything so forlorn as a mercury-round, life, silent, and no children in sight?—TALLAHASSEE DEMOCRAT.

National Security In Pennsylvania Looked Political

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON AS A result of what has the look of a political deal, the question of national security is once again put in the position of seeming to repudiate the often-proposed principle of non-interference with America's allies in order to build up the economy of the last Nov. 1, on the eve of the election. High Scott, Republican of Pennsylvania, announced that a \$175,000 contract for two hydraulic turbines for a dam in Arkansas would go to a Pennsylvania company, the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corporation, instead of to the English Electric Company of London in a close race against former Gov. George Leader for a Senate seat. Scott was looking for any and all crumbs to center for the depressed areas in his state.

REVERSAL But an interdepartmental committee had been set up to determine whether in the interests of "national security" all imports of turbines and generators should be cut off. Three weeks ago Leo A. Hog, director of defense mobilization and civil defense, had he could make no decision on the turbines for Arkansas until the last question had been resolved. Ten days ago he reversed himself and found that in the interests of "national security" the contract should go to the Philadelphia firm because it was one of a limited number of companies possessing the required machine tools.

During all the intervening weeks since Nov. 1 representatives of the English company had been going through an elaborate bureaucratic rigamarole to try to establish their case. While Hog is empowered by the White House to make recommendations in these matters, his office says now that he knew nothing of earlier decision. A spokesman for Scott, now a senator, was unable to recall who in the White House authorized the announcement.

RULES DISREGARDED British Ambassador Sir Harold Nicolson went to the State Department to lodge a strong protest. He said that if the rules were not to be lived up to, then British firms should know it so that they would not go through the costly process of entering bids and trying to push their case over the massive hurdles of Pentagon-State-Commerce bureaucracy. In three previous instances — 1953, '54 and '55 — the English

present Eisenhower budget calls for. The President's budget assumes Rockefeller kind, believe that the economy can be induced to grow an average rate of about 5 per cent, and that this rate is indispensable if we are to provide an adequate national defense and meet the needs of our rapidly growing and increasingly urbanized population.

DEMAGOGIC PRETENSE It is misleading, indeed it is demagogic, to pretend that the issue between these two schools of thought is one between "spenders" and "savers" or between "radicals" and "conservatives." The real question is how much the American economy may produce. If we can produce more, the country will be able to afford a better provision for the needs of its civilian population. If the economy can produce less, the current rate, the country cannot, within the existing tax structure, afford more than

rate of productivity without creating a boom which inflates all prices, including wage costs, faster than productivity increases. The opposition economists believe that a boom without inflation is possible. They believe that if the economy is expanded, the inflation can be kept small, slow, salutory, and under control. The economists to whom the President has committed himself believe that an economy which is expanding rapidly, which has full employment and has full use of capacity, is bound to be inflationary. They have come, moreover, to wonder whether the orthodox devices against inflation—the restriction of credit and a balanced budget—can in fact prevent inflation in a booming economy. Therefore, they prefer a quieter

tempo with a certain amount of unemployment to act as a brake on wages and a certain amount of excess plant capacity to act as a brake on prices.

BULLS VS. BEARS There is here, then, a debate on the grand scale between the bulls and the bears. The bulls will accept a certain amount of inflation because they regard deflation, which means unemployment and the restriction of public services, as the greater evil. The bears, on the contrary, think that inflation is the greatest of the economic evils and, to avoid it, they are reconciled to a certain amount of deflation.

There is here, in the true sense of the words, a great debate. Let us rise to its importance.

The 'Bulls' Take On The 'Bears' In A Great Debate

By WALTER LIPPMANN

WASHINGTON IN THE debate, which has now begun on the President's budget, the underlying issues turn on different theories about the rate of which the present economy can grow. In order to fix in mind the dimensions of the issue, we may note that over the past 50 years the average annual rate of growth has been 3 per cent. During the post-war period of 1947-1953 the average has been nearly 5 per cent. During the past six years it has been only, perhaps not quite, 2 per cent.

GROWTH RATE It is fair to say, I think, that the difference between the administration and its critics is this. The administration hopes to reach the 50 year average of about 3 per cent, and would not be happy if the average rate were only 2 per cent. The critics of the administration, who include most

of the Democrats as well as the liberal Republicans of the Nelson Rockefeller kind, believe that the economy can be induced to grow an average rate of about 5 per cent, and that this rate is indispensable if we are to provide an adequate national defense and meet the needs of our rapidly growing and increasingly urbanized population.

It is misleading, indeed it is demagogic, to pretend that the issue between these two schools of thought is one between "spenders" and "savers" or between "radicals" and "conservatives." The real question is how much the American economy may produce. If we can produce more, the country will be able to afford a better provision for the needs of its civilian population. If the economy can produce less, the current rate, the country cannot, within the existing tax structure, afford more than

rate of productivity without creating a boom which inflates all prices, including wage costs, faster than productivity increases. The opposition economists believe that a boom without inflation is possible. They believe that if the economy is expanded, the inflation can be kept small, slow, salutory, and under control. The economists to whom the President has committed himself believe that an economy which is expanding rapidly, which has full employment and has full use of capacity, is bound to be inflationary. They have come, moreover, to wonder whether the orthodox devices against inflation—the restriction of credit and a balanced budget—can in fact prevent inflation in a booming economy. Therefore, they prefer a quieter

tempo with a certain amount of unemployment to act as a brake on wages and a certain amount of excess plant capacity to act as a brake on prices.

BULLS VS. BEARS There is here, then, a debate on the grand scale between the bulls and the bears. The bulls will accept a certain amount of inflation because they regard deflation, which means unemployment and the restriction of public services, as the greater evil. The bears, on the contrary, think that inflation is the greatest of the economic evils and, to avoid it, they are reconciled to a certain amount of deflation.

There is here, in the true sense of the words, a great debate. Let us rise to its importance.

'Be Glad He's Hibernating — There's Been Talk That He Was Dead'

People's Platform

The Octopus Has Many Tentacles

Charlotte Editors, The News: I FIND your inconsistent outbursts on communism, Communism and Communist influence in this country more tragic than enlightening.

In an editorial of Jan. 21, you were hectoring the fact that Radio Station WPTX during Christmas in an Radio Moscow each Sunday evening. You state, "We hope listening away from their loudspeakers with a new and healthy respect for Soviet cunning; a new determination to do what is necessary to combat it." Eloquent and rather senseless sounding words, Mr. Editor!

But the cold fact is those words emanate from the same editors who only recently came out editorially against the question of Communist affiliation on University of North Carolina job application forms. Thus the words ring a bit hollow and leave me with a definite canny feeling. As a result of your lowering the standards of the Communist question on UNC job application forms, it appears in contrast with your previous "sincerity" is a silly, and indeed, a very dangerous word.

The austere challenge to the West which Mr. Lippmann derives from his insight into the awesome "sincerity" of the Soviet mind is less fresh and distinguished, actually, than the insight itself. Most of us, in placid moments, realize that our challenge is to keep strong and at the same time to cease fearing our own image of the Communist threat. Most of us realize that in the face of the psychological and economic assault of communism on unimpeded, unpopulated, under-industrialized countries, we might well make India the workshop of development under free institutions—as he proposes. But first, with the rationality Lippmann urges, we must understand the psychological and political which the Communist mind turns, in lonely and fanatic dedication.

Film Biographies

HOLLYWOOD has always loved a good biography. I can remember dozens from the early days of my moving-glass days, starting with George Arliss as Richelieu—or was it Richelieu as George Arliss? I was always struck by the fact that the lives fell into such ideal dramatic patterns, combining humble beginnings and later court teasers and laughter, romance and nobility, in exactly the right proportions. Only now, I realize that the script writers were tampering with the truth, adding a pretty little here, erasing a nasty little there, and making their fellow notorious rummies and miserably sprinking greatness over one and all—William Faulkner. "Seen Any Good Movies Lately?"

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON CONGRESSMAN Francis Walter's Un-American Activities Committee has been bombarded with letters urging an investigation into Arkansas Gov. Orval Faubus' past background. Faubus was student body president of Commonwealth College when it was run by the Reds. The governor has already asserted that his name did not appear on the list of Commonwealth student leaders exposed in 1953 by Arkansas' Joint Legislative Investigating Committee.

'United Front'

This is a true, but the truth also is that coincided its interest in Communist front in Feb. 1953. Faubus was elected to office on the "UNITED FRONT" ticket two months afterward. Subsequently the May Day 1955 edition of Commonwealth College. Forthrightly reports "Orval Faubus, young farmer school boy from Jones, Ark. (was) elected to two offices. Faubus is both student body president and member of the executive committee of the student body. Faubus, being student body leader after the Arkansas Legislature had exposed Commonwealth College as a Communist front."

Green's Revolt

Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have been trying for six months to coax Chairman Theodore Francis Green, now in his quarters in the new Senate Office Building. But the much-loved 61-year-old Rhode Island Democrat has stubbornly refused to budge. He likes to walk in the morning and he also likes his old headquarters. Finally he agreed to appoint a three-man subcommittee to "consider" the move. He promptly named himself chairman with authority to make the first decision.

Close To Mutiny

When new quarters were offered last summer, he said he was contented with the old rooms and instructed the Rules Committee to give the space to some other committee. Whereupon his fellow committee members almost started a mutiny. Green, however, refused either to budge or let them vote on the move. In the morning he and he also likes his old headquarters.

Fuss & Fuming

"It's too late," he declared triumphantly. "The rooms have already been released." When they told him it just so happened the option was still open, Green fussed and fumed. The old rooms, he asserted, were what he had wanted. The senators have accepted them—William E. Borah of Idaho, Jay Pittman of Nevada.



Was The Governor's Background 'Pink'?

WASHINGTON CONGRESSMAN Francis Walter's Un-American Activities Committee has been bombarded with letters urging an investigation into Arkansas Gov. Orval Faubus' past background. Faubus was student body president of Commonwealth College when it was run by the Reds. The governor has already asserted that his name did not appear on the list of Commonwealth student leaders exposed in 1953 by Arkansas' Joint Legislative Investigating Committee.

Close To Mutiny

When new quarters were offered last summer, he said he was contented with the old rooms and instructed the Rules Committee to give the space to some other committee. Whereupon his fellow committee members almost started a mutiny. Green, however, refused either to budge or let them vote on the move. In the morning he and he also likes his old headquarters.

Fuss & Fuming

"It's too late," he declared triumphantly. "The rooms have already been released." When they told him it just so happened the option was still open, Green fussed and fumed. The old rooms, he asserted, were what he had wanted. The senators have accepted them—William E. Borah of Idaho, Jay Pittman of Nevada.



'National Security'

Electric Company had the same experience. Last time was on low bids for generators for the Chief Joseph Dam on the Colum-

bia River in the State of Washington. The then secretary of the firm, Charles E. Wilson, ruled in favor of Westinghouse on grounds of employment. The British press burst in on any protest.

DILLON'S PART The present instance, the Green's Ferry Dam in Arkansas, is the first time that "national security" has been given as a reason for rejection. It raises the larger question of how meaningful is the administration's declared policy so long as depressed areas exist and unemployment stays over 4,000,000. The question is also being asked as to what part Under Secretary of State C. Douglas Dillon, supposedly in charge of foreign economic affairs, may have played.

The trend appears, to some critics, to be more and more in the direction of shutting the door to foreign goods. The quotas imposed on lead and zinc continue in force. To permit the pressure of local interests to determine worldwide economic policy is not, as his contrary, that inflation is the way to win the cold war. It may prove to be the way to lose it.

There is here, then, a debate on the grand scale between the bulls and the bears. The bulls will accept a certain amount of inflation because they regard deflation, which means unemployment and the restriction of public services, as the greater evil. The bears, on the contrary, think that inflation is the greatest of the economic evils and, to avoid it, they are reconciled to a certain amount of deflation.

There is here, in the true sense of the words, a great debate. Let us rise to its importance.

People's Platform

The Octopus Has Many Tentacles

Charlotte Editors, The News: I FIND your inconsistent outbursts on communism, Communism and Communist influence in this country more tragic than enlightening.

In an editorial of Jan. 21, you were hectoring the fact that Radio Station WPTX during Christmas in an Radio Moscow each Sunday evening. You state, "We hope listening away from their loudspeakers with a new and healthy respect for Soviet cunning; a new determination to do what is necessary to combat it." Eloquent and rather senseless sounding words, Mr. Editor!

But the cold fact is those words emanate from the same editors who only recently came out editorially against the question of Communist affiliation on University of North Carolina job application forms. Thus the words ring a bit hollow and leave me with a definite canny feeling. As a result of your lowering the standards of the Communist question on UNC job application forms, it appears in contrast with your previous "sincerity" is a silly, and indeed, a very dangerous word.

The austere challenge to the West which Mr. Lippmann derives from his insight into the awesome "sincerity" of the Soviet mind is less fresh and distinguished, actually, than the insight itself. Most of us, in placid moments, realize that our challenge is to keep strong and at the same time to cease fearing our own image of the Communist threat. Most of us realize that in the face of the psychological and economic assault of communism on unimpeded, unpopulated, under-industrialized countries, we might well make India the workshop of development under free institutions—as he proposes. But first, with the rationality Lippmann urges, we must understand the psychological and political which the Communist mind turns, in lonely and fanatic dedication.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON CONGRESSMAN Francis Walter's Un-American Activities Committee has been bombarded with letters urging an investigation into Arkansas Gov. Orval Faubus' past background. Faubus was student body president of Commonwealth College when it was run by the Reds. The governor has already asserted that his name did not appear on the list of Commonwealth student leaders exposed in 1953 by Arkansas' Joint Legislative Investigating Committee.

'United Front'

This is a true, but the truth also is that coincided its interest in Communist front in Feb. 1953. Faubus was elected to office on the "UNITED FRONT" ticket two months afterward. Subsequently the May Day 1955 edition of Commonwealth College. Forthrightly reports "Orval Faubus, young farmer school boy from Jones, Ark. (was) elected to two offices. Faubus is both student body president and member of the executive committee of the student body. Faubus, being student body leader after the Arkansas Legislature had exposed Commonwealth College as a Communist front."

Green's Revolt

Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have been trying for six months to coax Chairman Theodore Francis Green, now in his quarters in the new Senate Office Building. But the much-loved 61-year-old Rhode Island Democrat has stubbornly refused to budge. He likes to walk in the morning and he also likes his old headquarters. Finally he agreed to appoint a three-man subcommittee to "consider" the move. He promptly named himself chairman with authority to make the first decision.

Close To Mutiny

When new quarters were offered last summer, he said he was contented with the old rooms and instructed the Rules Committee to give the space to some other committee. Whereupon his fellow committee members almost started a mutiny. Green, however, refused either to budge or let them vote on the move. In the morning he and he also likes his old headquarters.

Fuss & Fuming

"It's too late," he declared triumphantly. "The rooms have already been released." When they told him it just so happened the option was still open, Green fussed and fumed. The old rooms, he asserted, were what he had wanted. The senators have accepted them—William E. Borah of Idaho, Jay Pittman of Nevada.

rate of productivity without creating a boom which inflates all prices, including wage costs, faster than productivity increases. The opposition economists believe that a boom without inflation is possible. They believe that if the economy is expanded, the inflation can be kept small, slow, salutory, and under control. The economists to whom the President has committed himself believe that an economy which is expanding rapidly, which has full employment and has full use of capacity, is bound to be inflationary. They have come, moreover, to wonder whether the orthodox devices against inflation—the restriction of credit and a balanced budget—can in fact prevent inflation in a booming economy. Therefore, they prefer a quieter

tempo with a certain amount of unemployment to act as a brake on wages and a certain amount of excess plant capacity to act as a brake on prices.

BULLS VS. BEARS There is here, then, a debate on the grand scale between the bulls and the bears. The bulls will accept a certain amount of inflation because they regard deflation, which means unemployment and the restriction of public services, as the greater evil. The bears, on the contrary, think that inflation is the greatest of the economic evils and, to avoid it, they are reconciled to a certain amount of deflation.

There is here, in the true sense of the words, a great debate. Let us rise to its importance.

rate of productivity without creating a boom which inflates all prices, including wage costs, faster than productivity increases. The opposition economists believe that a boom without inflation is possible. They believe that if the economy is expanded, the inflation can be kept small, slow, salutory, and under control. The economists to whom the President has committed himself believe that an economy which is expanding rapidly, which has full employment and has full use of capacity, is bound to be inflationary. They have come, moreover, to wonder whether the orthodox devices against inflation—the restriction of credit and a balanced budget—can in fact prevent inflation in a booming economy. Therefore, they prefer a quieter

tempo with a certain amount of unemployment to act as a brake on wages and a certain amount of excess plant capacity to act as a brake on prices.

BULLS VS. BEARS There is here, then, a debate on the grand scale between the bulls and the bears. The bulls will accept a certain amount of inflation because they regard deflation, which means unemployment and the restriction of public services, as the greater evil. The bears, on the contrary, think that inflation is the greatest of the economic evils and, to avoid it, they are reconciled to a certain amount of deflation.

There is here, in the true sense of the words, a great debate. Let us rise to its importance.

People's Platform

The Octopus Has Many Tentacles

Charlotte Editors, The News: I FIND your inconsistent outbursts on communism, Communism and Communist influence in this country more tragic than enlightening.

In an editorial of Jan. 21, you were hectoring the fact that Radio Station WPTX during Christmas in an Radio Moscow each Sunday evening. You state, "We hope listening away from their loudspeakers with a new and healthy respect for Soviet cunning; a new determination to do what is necessary to combat it." Eloquent and rather senseless sounding words, Mr. Editor!

But the cold fact is those words emanate from the same editors who only recently came out editorially against the question of Communist affiliation on University of North Carolina job application forms. Thus the words ring a bit hollow and leave me with a definite canny feeling. As a result of your lowering the standards of the Communist question on UNC job application forms, it appears in contrast with your previous "sincerity" is a silly, and indeed, a very dangerous word.

The austere challenge to the West which Mr. Lippmann derives from his insight into the awesome "sincerity" of the Soviet mind is less fresh and distinguished, actually, than the insight itself. Most of us, in placid moments, realize that our challenge is to keep strong and at the same time to cease fearing our own image of the Communist threat. Most of us realize that in the face of the psychological and economic assault of communism on unimpeded, unpopulated, under-industrialized countries, we might well make India the workshop of development under free institutions—as he proposes. But first, with the rationality Lippmann urges, we must understand the psychological and political which the Communist mind turns, in lonely and fanatic dedication.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON CONGRESSMAN Francis Walter's Un-American Activities Committee has been bombarded with letters urging an investigation into Arkansas Gov. Orval Faubus' past background. Faubus was student body president of Commonwealth College when it was run by the Reds. The governor has already asserted that his name did not appear on the list of Commonwealth student leaders exposed in 1953 by Arkansas' Joint Legislative Investigating Committee.

'United Front'

This is a true, but the truth also is that coincided its interest in Communist front in Feb. 1953. Faubus was elected to office on the "UNITED FRONT" ticket two months afterward. Subsequently the May Day 1955 edition of Commonwealth College. Forthrightly reports "Orval Faubus, young farmer school boy from Jones, Ark. (was) elected to two offices. Faubus is both student body president and member of the executive committee of the student body. Faubus, being student body leader after the Arkansas Legislature had exposed Commonwealth College as a Communist front."

Green's Revolt

Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have been trying for six months to coax Chairman Theodore Francis Green, now in his quarters in the new Senate Office Building. But the much-loved 61-year-old Rhode Island Democrat has stubbornly refused to budge. He likes to walk in the morning and he also likes his old headquarters. Finally he agreed to appoint a three-man subcommittee to "consider" the move. He promptly named himself chairman with authority to make the first decision.

Close To Mutiny

When new quarters were offered last summer, he said he was contented with the old rooms and instructed the Rules Committee to give the space to some other committee. Whereupon his fellow committee members almost started a mutiny. Green, however, refused either to budge or let them vote on the move. In the morning he and he also likes his old headquarters.

Fuss & Fuming

"It's too late," he declared triumphantly. "The rooms have already been released." When they told him it just so happened the option was still open, Green fussed and fumed. The old rooms, he asserted, were what he had wanted. The senators have accepted them—William E. Borah of Idaho, Jay Pittman of Nevada.

Finally he agreed to appoint a three-man subcommittee to "consider" the move. He promptly named himself chairman with authority to make the first decision.

Korean Revolt

Handsome Washington antique dealer Byung Choll Koh, a 55-year-old Korean, put on his Homburg the other day and picked the White House all alone in 20-degree weather. He had locked up his Connecticut Ave. shop which caters to such VIPs as Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, Justice William O. Douglas, and Mrs. Allen Dulles, to protest President Spengler Rhee's latest police-state security laws.

Economic Aid

Dulles has sent word to Fidel Castro of Cuba that the U.S. is ready to help the new Cuban government with economic aid. It was Milton Eisenhower who urged Dulles to rush this offer to Havana. As a result, Castro has given his assurances that American investments will not be confiscated. Ex-Ambassador Earl Smith reports that Fidel Castro is by no means a Communist but his brother Raul is well to the left. The overwhelming majority of Castro's followers, say the ambassador, are sincere anti-Communists but there are some Reds supporting him.

Standing Up Again

The bolder emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie, who once stood up against Mussolini in the League of Nations, is now standing up against another dictator in Egypt, Col. Nasser. The Emperor has asked the U.S. to help him. The emperor of Ethiopia or he will place the matter before the United Nations.