



60th Anniversary Year  
THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher  
J. R. DOWD, General Manager  
B. S. GRIFITH, Executive Editor  
WILLIAM M. REDDIE, Editor

SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1948

Editorializing On The Radio

THERE ARE a number of things to be said for the Federal decision which limits the right of broadcasters to editorialize on the air, but in a lengthy period of debate on this subject no one has seriously contended that this order does not represent Government interference with freedom of expression in America.

A statement that reached to the heart of the matter was made recently by Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, in an appearance before the Federal Communications Commission to state the broadcasters' case against the FCC's Mayflower decision. Said Mr. Stanton:

"What the Mayflower decision does down to is a distrust of the owners and managers of the American radio stations, and indirectly a distrust of the American people themselves. Radio executives, it is implied, would abuse the right to use their own stations, and their listeners would follow blindly or uncritically. This, I believe, reflects a fundamental misconception of the workings of our democracy, a fundamental lack of confidence in the intelligence and goodwill of the American people. I, for one, have more confidence in Americans and the constructive power of our democracy than I have in the Mayflower decision."

As Mr. Stanton points out, the Mayflower decision was based on the "scarcity" theory, which holds that the radio is a scarce commodity. It is a scarce commodity in the sense that there are only a few large organizations or corporations which could or would control editorial opinion to suit the notions of their conservative owners. That theory has been refuted by the growth in the number of radio stations, particularly in

the last three years. There now are 1,962 authorized FM stations and 1,005 AM stations in the United States and its territorial possessions.

In addition, the scarcity theory does not make sufficient allowance for the fact that control of editorial opinion on the radio could be only a relative monopoly even in a particular station or network. He can dial in and out from one station to another as he pleases, just as he can choose the papers he will buy and whether or not he will read the editorial columns. The broadcaster whose power of control is so great as to attract and hold listeners is headed for failure, just as the newspaper publisher whose readers desert him. As the number of radio stations increases, this punishment will fall on the owner and the station, not on the broadcaster who fails to serve the public's interest.

The broadcasters clearly are entitled to a trial before the American people.

In this country, the citizen is under no obligation to buy a newspaper or read its editorials, or to listen to the programs of a particular station or network. He can dial in and out from one station to another as he pleases, just as he can choose the papers he will buy and whether or not he will read the editorial columns. The broadcaster whose power of control is so great as to attract and hold listeners is headed for failure, just as the newspaper publisher whose readers desert him. As the number of radio stations increases, this punishment will fall on the owner and the station, not on the broadcaster who fails to serve the public's interest.

Word Stronger Than Atom

WE GET no sense of security from an article in this week's Collier's magazine, in which Senator Brien McMahon of Connecticut writes that the "United States of America now has aboveground sufficient radioactive material so that, were it efficiently applied, all human life on the planet would be annihilated."

Efficiently applied? How? Senator McMahon doesn't say that, but he does say that the sense of security that this explosive material cannot be efficiently applied for the purpose of winning the ideological and political struggle in which we now find ourselves engaged with the Communists does us no good except for the purposes of annihilating the planet, apparently.

The Senator points out that the real weapons in the present conflict are not A-bombs or radioactive clouds but words. The issue will be decided not by nuclear fission but by ideas. Mr. McMahon calls for more atomic research but for a great educational program to counteract what he calls the Communists' 30-year war of cables, the gains of the Communists and capitalist order, or particularly the American system.

Senator McMahon's proposed program is designed (1) to counteract the Communist "attacks" against America and to propa-

gate the truth about the democratic way of life, (2) to help Europeans understand the advantages of a free and united Europe, and (3) to bring to the attention of the revolutionary meaning of atomic energy both as a weapon of destruction and as a constructive force.

As he wisely observes, Europe's restoration to economic health under the Marshall Plan must be accompanied by a spiritual revival—a movement to "save the soul of Europe"—if the virus of Communism is to be eliminated. This is propaganda and evangelistic effort, but we are spending for the Marshall Plan and our military machine. The Senator estimates it would take between \$200 million and \$300 million for the next few years. The Soviet Union currently is spending \$120 million to \$180 million for propaganda purposes.

Unless we do undertake such a program, we stand to lose the ideological struggle by default, by neglecting to use our strongest weapon—the democratic idea. The time grows short in which we still can win with ideas and stop the drive toward the use of military force. The question is not whether our words will win but whether we have the wit and the will to use them. They can be applied much more efficiently than the radio-active material.

Rocking The Boat In Crisis

SENATOR WHEERRY'S bill to abolish the Atomic Energy Commission is the most disturbing of several recent signs that military extremists have made too many converts in Congress, particularly among the members of the Republican Party.

Wheerry's proposal to take atomic control from civilian hands and give it to the Army would shake the nation's confidence that this revolutionary new power is being developed for useful local purposes as well as for security ends. It would, in effect, put a military straitjacket on science and immeasurably increase the fear of war.

It is not the Atomic Energy Commission, rather, that is the cause of no case against the present commission headed by David E. Lilienthal but instead is met by evidence that the top Army leadership is completely satisfied with the existing arrangement and wants no change. The Atomic Energy Commission and the representatives of the military are working splendidly together. Secretary of the Army Robert T. H. Anderson and the Atomic Energy Commission have met to discuss the committee this week. "We need not suggest a change."

It is apparent that a drive is shaping up to force the Administration to move faster toward militarization of the nation than

President Truman, Secretary Marshall and their principal advisers deem necessary or wise. In the Senate this week, a group of Republican and Democratic Senators initiated a determined effort to overrule our civilian control of atomic energy. They insisted that our program be stepped up to include 70 combat groups instead of the 55 now planned.

Earlier in the week Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Republican aspirant for President, served notice on the Truman Administration that it was not yet being tough enough with Russia. That warning came at a moment when the Administration was issuing statements, taking diplomatic moves against Russia and pushing mobilization plans, all of which made it plain enough that the United States could not get any tougher without declaring war.

Calls to "get tougher" and demands for more warlike measures than have been called for by the Administration simply are roadblocks to the military's drive to use the political and military strategy which has been worked out by Secretaries Marshall and Forrestal, and they serve to create a war hysteria which may rush this country into premature military action.

From The St. Louis Globe-Democrat

Frame For World Order

ONE of the more concrete contributions to the dream of world government has been the "Preamble Draft of a World Constitution," submitted today for public discussion. It has been framed and offered by an eleven-man committee, headed by Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago.

The suggested government is an intricate scheme, rather than the simple structure of a constitution. It would include a federal convention, composed of elected delegates, one for each 100,000 of population; a President elected by the convention for a five-year term; a one-house council of representatives of 99 members, also elected by the convention; a judiciary, and a "tribune of the people," which would be spokesman for the minority.

The proposal for a world constitution makes effort to reduce to specific plan the age-old vision of world rule, indulged by

poets, philosophers and peoples plagued from generation to generation by incoherent wars, power lusts and futile nationalisms of history. Its forward enters no conceit that this constitution will ever be adopted as offered, but it does present something for peace-hungry citizens of the world to chew upon. As its sponsors explain, the "conceivable circumstances" for a world republic are not at hand, but the vision has never died, and an atomic era makes the hope for reality an accumulating impulsion.

A parliament of races, a government of the world may never come in our lifetime. It is too elementally simple, too basically common, serene. And our civilization hasn't reached the heights of rational simplicity. But it can, perhaps, melt, be evolved in a not too distant future. The charter proposal of these eleven thoughtful men will give impetus to the growing concept.

Marquis Chuds

Republican Target

WASHINGTON  
TWO of the Republican candidates have assumed the Administration for reversing the decision to partition Palestine. The others can be expected to join in, since the target is irresistible.

The late Hugh Gordon once described one of his political adversaries as a revolving blankety-blank-blank, by which he meant that the enemy was a blankety-blank-blank from every conceivable angle. The Administration's Palestine policy is similarly revolving, self-perpetuating mistake.

That is why the target is irresistible. It can be attacked from any angle.

The most obvious angle is that of the pro-Zionists, and their friends who now cry betrayal. Their cry has the searing force of truth. It is the only cry in months ago that the United States took the lead in behalf of partition.

Those who have always believed partition to be unwise and unworkable can now use the reason for what, in their opinion, was the error. It was to wait months of delay and confusion, sharpening and intensifying the Palestine tragedy.

Surely the consequence of the decision for partition should have been to wait months of delay and confusion, sharpening and intensifying the Palestine tragedy.

But the target at which Republican Palestine policy will be directed is even broader than the lack of a carefully co-ordinated policy carried out by men who are playing on the same team.

During his years in the White House Franklin Roosevelt has declined to balance off opposing forces within his own administration. The expedient policy in the Middle East was weighed against the vital and essential. The boss, himself, was entitled to credit for courage and candor. But this is not the way it looks to any objective observer.

People's Platform

Changing Mind And Losing Face

CHARLOTTE

Editors, The News: I KNOW that I am just being silly, but if there is anything that irks me more than (1) a letter to the editor urging a preventive war as our Christian duty, or (2) either in which some poor misguided soul tries to attain to celestial glory in the world to come, and possibly a disenchanted here and now, or (3) if my heart desires—if I say, there is anything that irks me more than these two examples of editorializing, it is a letter to the editor by a writer who, while giving "Charlotte" as his address, yet apparently lacks sufficient local pull to get his name in the City Directory.

Any of these three things can cause a reasonable man to contract ulcers, and I wouldn't want to just shrug off the first two. It's just that the third one gets me the most. When I express an opinion, I don't want to be taken to task by somebody that the City Directory folks couldn't find down, and the editor, who I haven't changed my mind, or why I feel like that maybe the editor is, himself, editorializing. There was a time it seems when I just sort of "felt it." It's not a good feeling. Let's let the middle-of-the-roaders be heard, but let's make them use their right name.

Mr. Joseph P. Balse said I would be the first one to admit that I may be his actual name, but I don't want to be a middle-of-the-roader. It is difficult to tell which end of the stick he is, but it would appear that he doesn't like people (or editors) who change their minds. He should think that I am just dumb, because I haven't changed my mind, or why I feel like that maybe the editor is, himself, editorializing. There was a time it seems when I just sort of "felt it." It's not a good feeling. Let's let the middle-of-the-roaders be heard, but let's make them use their right name.

I say that when Franklin Roosevelt died and left the Presidency in the hands of Harry Truman, America suffered a loss of face that makes any further happenings in this regard unimportant. Our course, under Truman, is plainly marked. One can almost hear him chuckling over Russia's embarrassment at the Trieste controversy. One would like to remind him that chickens have a habit of coming home to roost. There was a time it seems when I just sort of "felt it." It's not a good feeling. Let's let the middle-of-the-roaders be heard, but let's make them use their right name.

—A. E. BASSETT.

Confusion On Marshall Plan

CHARLOTTE

Editors, The News: WILL the end of New Deal charity never come till we have given our last ship, last gallon of oil, last American dollar for material aid to the nations to foster Communism, in the name of relief aid recovery?

This past year they gave Europe 1,400 ships to Europe.

In other words, the United States would begin arming friendly democratic nations just as we did our allies before during the recent war.

1. Forty divisions of the French Army would be armed with U. S. weapons and equipment. French Foreign Minister Bidault said that the French Army had 21 divisions, but after the Czech coup d'etat, he raised the figure to 40.

The Italian Army would get thousands of surplus rifles, machine guns and ammunition, but no new equipment. The Italian Army would be armed as fast as new equipment rolls off the assembly line.

3. Newway would receive surplus naval craft, plus arms for the Norwegian Army. This would bolster the Norwegians to withstand pressure from Moscow.

The Cabinet member who chiefly sold this program to the Norwegian Army. This would bolster the Norwegians to withstand pressure from Moscow.



HERS-LOCK  
AND THE UNITED PRESS

are and planning to give 500 more merchant ships under Marshall Plan. We are sending steel to Europe to build ships while our own shipyards are idle and there is unemployment among our seamen. They claim we are short of steel, short of scrap iron, short of most everything, rationing is desperately needed and prices are too high. We are helplessly and hopelessly prepared for war, we are warned that our Navy is desperately lacking and that we could not keep our war fleet in operation for more than two weeks in case of war.

Russian military might is far superior over the United States and what Russia is already a cold reality. And in the face of all this grim reality, the New Deal in Washington is anxious to pay men fat salaries to campaign for the Marshall Plan to give from our store house while we scrape bottom.

Then claim if we don't support the Marshall Plan Communism will take over in Europe. When the high command of the State and Commerce use the same system to gain control over the American people as Joe Stalin used in Russia, how can you expect the United States to back Communism anywhere? The Marshall Plan is a legal way of putting our desperately needed supplies, weapons, Japan and Pearl Harbor. The only difference I can see in supplying Russia as supplied Japan is that we have been giving Russia first class equipment instead of scrap iron, and when it bounces back it will make Pearl Harbor look like a fire cracker.

If you think that I have been deluding you when I say we are putting out money and resources while Stalin can get control over them, for an example Poland in spite of the fact that Poland has been approved a \$60,000,000 loan to Poland for the purchase of equipment to modernize Polish equipment. In spite of the fact that Poland has been approved a \$60,000,000 loan to Poland for the purchase of equipment to modernize Polish equipment. In spite of the fact that Poland has been approved a \$60,000,000 loan to Poland for the purchase of equipment to modernize Polish equipment.

Officials pointed out that modernizing Polish coal mines would help the Marshall Plan. One of our prominent writers pointed out that this was one of those diplomatic puzzles which harassed the American mind in the war. If this is not a double-cross to the American people in favor of Communism, then you name it.

—P. C. BURKHOLDER.

Quote. Unquote

There are now an estimated 1,000 policemen in the United States. That doesn't include who are always laying down the law to their husbands—Arkansas Gazette.

Anti-Truman Revolt Seethes

DEMOCRATIC Chairman J. Howard McGrath highlighted it up to New York this week in a vain attempt to stem the angry outburst of New York State Democrats over President Truman's renomination bid. Inside fact is that McGrath walked into a burning holocaust.

McGrath's Democratic Party organization has been virtually ridden by the Wallace force, and when McGrath walked into the room, you could have cut the gloom with a knife. However, he entranced the boys not to desert the ship. He also scolded Congressman Arthur Klein for having denounced the President's switch on Palestine.

"What else did you say?" asked McGrath. "You're just making a fool of yourself when you print everything I said about Truman."

"What else did you say?" asked McGrath. "You're just making a fool of yourself when you print everything I said about Truman."

At that point ex-Senator James Mead of New York walked into the room and said that off the "licket."

"When are you going to get that off the 'licket'?" he asked McGrath. "You haven't a prayer of carrying this state with him on it."

Mead had just refused to accept a Truman appointment as Federal Public Commissioner.

McGrath and Democratic publicity expert Jack Redding tried to keep the pressure on McGrath, but the President's Day speech had increased his prestige. But the

Republican Target

WASHINGTON  
TWO of the Republican candidates have assumed the Administration for reversing the decision to partition Palestine. The others can be expected to join in, since the target is irresistible.

The late Hugh Gordon once described one of his political adversaries as a revolving blankety-blank-blank, by which he meant that the enemy was a blankety-blank-blank from every conceivable angle. The Administration's Palestine policy is similarly revolving, self-perpetuating mistake.

That is why the target is irresistible. It can be attacked from any angle.

The most obvious angle is that of the pro-Zionists, and their friends who now cry betrayal. Their cry has the searing force of truth. It is the only cry in months ago that the United States took the lead in behalf of partition.

Those who have always believed partition to be unwise and unworkable can now use the reason for what, in their opinion, was the error. It was to wait months of delay and confusion, sharpening and intensifying the Palestine tragedy.

Surely the consequence of the decision for partition should have been to wait months of delay and confusion, sharpening and intensifying the Palestine tragedy.

But the target at which Republican Palestine policy will be directed is even broader than the lack of a carefully co-ordinated policy carried out by men who are playing on the same team.

During his years in the White House Franklin Roosevelt has declined to balance off opposing forces within his own administration. The expedient policy in the Middle East was weighed against the vital and essential. The boss, himself, was entitled to credit for courage and candor. But this is not the way it looks to any objective observer.

Joseph & Stewart Alsop

The Roosevelt Letter

WASHINGTON

WHETHER IT was an act of courtesy or an act of betrayal, it now seems more than possible that President Harry S. Truman's letter to the White House, whether he resigns or not, raises the question of her continued moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

usually workable, and now and then in his brilliant, untutored ability of political genius. We know, however, that in the last year of Roosevelt's life this political improvisation was inadequate to the terrible problems of the war, and in the chronic hysteria of his critics, whether anyone could have done better is open question.

Mr. Truman inherited the Roosevelt approach, as he inherited the opposing forces in the Administration. Yet he had none of his predecessor's capacity to recognize these opposing forces and arrive at a workable compromise.

**HIS EXPLANATION**

He has talked from time to time about team play and the agreement essential to a co-ordinated team. This is his explanation for getting rid of the New Dealers he felt held to. Yet in Palestine we have the most glaring example of a push, first in one direction and then in the opposite direction.

At the time of the decision for partition, a number of influential policy-makers continued to talk of the need for a team effort. It was determined to bring about a reversal.

That they would succeed was obvious after Warren Austin presented the moral and political side. Division on Palestine a month ago. They argued that reversal was necessary to spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

Whatever the practical benefits, and the coming weeks will tell, the United States has lost heavily on the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

The letter that can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized his error, in the light of the moral and political side. Division at home is increased, and the letter is spread abroad to credit for our purposes and our will to carry out these purposes.

That the letter can be said for Mr. Truman on Palestine is that he recognized