THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

60th Anniversary Year

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

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1949

SWORN TO COMMIT TREASON

THE convenient flexibility of the Communist line of reasoning, and the calculated treachery inherent in the Communist oath have never been revealed in such a cold, brutally clear manner as in the statements of two European Red leaders last week.

French Communist Maurice Thorez and Italian Communist Palmiro Togliatti, in separate statements, confirmed what the world has thought for a long time — that the first loyalty of any Communist, no matter where he lives, is to Moscow, a loyalty so strong that he would unhesitatingly commit treason against his own nation if that nation became involved in hostilities with Russia.

The Thorez statement is a perfect example of Communist dialectics. Soviet Russia, he said, is "by definition" incapable of aggression. Therefore, if another nation becomes involved in a war with Russia, no matter what the circumstances, that nation is, *per se*, the aggressor. If, in defending "freedom" and "democracy" Russia should pursue the troops of the other nation across its borders, Communists who reside in that nation would automatically join with Russia and take up arms against their own nation.

Thorez was asked how it was that the Soviet Union invaded Poland in 1939 if it was incapable "by definition" of aggression. His answer: Since Marshal Edward Smigly-Rydz and other members of the Polish Government had fled to Rumania, there was no Polish Government against which to make an aggression.

Togliatti, in a newspaper interview, declared:

> I have no information to support the idea that the Soviet Union has the slightest intention of attacking any country . . . As to the hypothesis that a Russian Army would pursue on our soil an aggressor, I think in this case the Italian people . . . would have the evident duty to aid in the most efficient way the Soviet Army in order to give that aggressor the lesson he deserves.

In New York the United States Government is trying to establish, by a slow and cautious legal procedure, whether or not it is a crime to urge and advocate overthrowing our Government by force.

In France and in Italy, Communist leaders annointed by Moscow admit openly that Communists not only advocate the overthrow of their governments by force but, in the event of war with Russia, would turn traitors and fight for Russia.

If we needed any reminder of the real nature of Communism, we now have it.

THE BEER - WINE PROBLEM

THE substantial sentiment in Tar Heelia, among both Prohibitionists and ABC advocates, in favor of changes in the present beer and wine laws is quite understandable. It reflects growing concern over disturbances and disorders directly traceable to urban and highway beer joints, roadhouses, and the like.

Few people are blaming the beverages themselves; rather the fact that open consumption on the premises encourages imbibers to substitute stronger drink without being detected, and thus violate State laws about consuming hard liquors in public.

The beer industry, naturally concerned over the loss of business as Drys sweep county after county, is one of the promoters of a bill which would continue consumption on the premises but set up a separate State agency to issue and revoke licenses and to police establishments where beer and wine are sold. At present, County Commissioners have little leeway in awarding or refusing licenses and, in smaller counties especially, are often subjected to political pressure in exercising what leeway they do have.

In theory, such a separate agency, cloaked with adequate powers and given a sufficient staff of officers, would be free from political pressure in policing establishments where beer and wine are sold.

Many people would go even further and institute the package sale principle for beer and wine. Presumably, in ABC counties, the beverages would be handled by ABC Boards. In non-ABC counties, licenses might be issued by the State ABC Board to grocery stores and drug stores. Such a plan will appeal to people who oppose any kind of public consumption of alcoholic beverages, but will surely be opposed by distributors, wholesalers, and retailers who handle beer and wine now.

Either of these solutions, or some variation thereon, would help to restore law and order by minimizing the disturbances which occur in beer-wine dispensaries. And any action by the Legislature to that end, within the framework of local option, will doubtless meet with a favorable reception throughout the state.

AUTO INSPECTION ENDS

THE speedy way in which the State Senate killed the motor vehicle inspection law accurately reflects the temper of the people of North Carolina—at least the articulate portion thereof.

Those drivers who have been irritated or inconvenienced by the law — or rather by the way the law was administered—became bitter and energetic opponents. They made their complaints known in a loud outcry against the law.

The rest of the people, who, admitting the shortcomings of enforcement, nevertheless favor the principle of vehicle inspection, were silent. Some of the newspapers of the state urged retention of the principle in a more moderate law, but few individuals bothered to notify members of the Assembly that they felt that way, too.

Furthermore, there was no way to prove that the inspection program had much effect one way or another. There was a striking reduction in highway fatalities; but there was an increase in accidents. Proponents and opponents thus had statistics which largely canceled each other.

Net result was that the Senate, once it got its hands on the House measure, ran it through in record time despite a brilliant and impassioned defense of the inspection principle by young Senator Julian Allsbrook of Halifax County.

There is little likelihood that a substitute program will be adopted. Had the Senate really been interested in a more moderate law, it would have kept the House bill in committee for a while as a lever to force the House to compromise.

Perhaps it is all for the best. But if, in the next two years, there is a substantial increase in number of accidents, injuries, and fatalities, that great silent voice of the people may make itself heard, this time in favor of another inspection law.

From The Asheville Citizen

IT'S A JOINT OPERATION

IN ATHENS at the time of Pericles, it is said, taxes were paid largely by foreigners and slaves. North Carolina has few of the former and none, we guess, of the latter, but it has a tax problem which goes bouncing back and forth between Governor Scott and the 1949 General Assembly. The question is, who will take the ball and carry it?

The Citizen has yet to be convinced that any heavy new tax levies are needed to "go forward" in North Carolina. Nor is she convinced that the best method to make progress is to whittle away at existing tax schedules, which some legislators are of a mind to do. We are convinced that if new programs are initiated by the Scott Administration it bears some responsibility in pointing out sources of revenue—some of which may have to be tapped if, say, North Carolina proposes to do the right thing by a progressive school program.

In any event there ought to be a sharing of concern as well as responsibility between Governor and Legislature on the matter of revenues. Mr. Scott has made what looks like a proffer of help, though he is no less skittish than some of the lawgivers. "Several legislators," he said Tuesday, "could band together and introduce such (tax measures) . . . If a group was sincerely interested enough to ask us we would do so providing they didn't in turn jump on us like a pack of wolves."

If new revenues are indicated in North Carolina, surely the State is of such temper that it can explore them without a knocking together of heads upstairs and down in the Capitol building and the unleashing of any wolves for a descent on anyone. There was a time when a tax proposal was not a thing as a universally popular tax Or, as Edmund Burke put it: "To tax and to please, no more than to love and to be wise, is not given to men."

But let us have the benefit of everybody's thinking at least for purposes of contemplation.

The individual who parades around in a white robe to scare somebody and has to hide his face for fear the public will find out who he is, is certainly ashamed of his antics himself and why shouldn't his whole community be ashamed?—*Laurens (S. C.) Advertiser.*

Do you cuss the gossips? They deserve cussing all right. But when some one turns up with a piece of juicy, racy scandal, do you shake your head and say, "Not another word, I don't want to hear it." Or do you look intensely interested and say, "You don't say! Can it be true?" — *Lamar (Mo.) Democrat.*

Why there should always be an England: Pubs in Liverpool are forbidden to install juke boxes. Such common sense deserves to live forever.—*New Orleans (La.) States.*

Oh for the good old days before the elections when everybody was talking about reducing taxes instead of raising them—*Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press.*

Now that the dollar buys a little more, look for step two in the mysterious workings of economic law: A slight increase in the difficulty of acquiring the dollar. — *Jackson (Miss.) Daily News.*

'I'll Huff And Puff And I'll Blow Your House In'

Marquis Childs

Treaty Oversight

WASHINGTON

THE long shadow cast by the decision taken by Norway and the United States is as yet hardly apparent. Only with events that are expected to flow from this decision will its far-reaching consequences be realized both here and in Western Europe.

But it is not too early to bring home to Americans the responsibility this country must bear for inducing Norway to join the Atlantic alliance. To join, it might be added, before the alliance has taken a definite form or been accepted by the participating nations of Western Europe.

The declaration by the State Dept. that arms from the United States would go only to countries in the alliance appears to have been the clinching factor with the Norwegians. Behind this declaration was a prolonged campaign of persuasion on both Norway and Sweden. The Swedes were given a clear intimation that unless they quickly made up their minds to come into the alliance, the U. S. would have to decide that Sweden was strategically indefensible.

From one American who knows Scandinavia well has come a note of grave warning. Lithgow Osborne, U. S. Ambassador to Norway from 1944 to 1946 and now head of the American Scandinavian Foundation, has made available to several Senators a memorandum setting forth cogent reasons why the State Dept. should hesitate before disrupting the unity achieved by the three Scandinavian countries.

IMPORTANT POINTS

While the die seems to have been finally and fatally cast, the Osborne memorandum is important since it underscores so heavily the significance of the step that has been taken. For that reason excerpts are printed here. Osborne presented two points for immediate and urgent consideration as follows:

"1. Withdrawal of our opposition to a mutual Scandinavian defense alliance. In view of the rugged democratic character of the Scandinavian peoples and their unquestionable ideological sympathy with the West, an independent position for them seems unimportant. In fact, the more 'neutral' such a defense pact is, the more it works in our favor in that it furnishes less provocation to Russia. Under it we would, it is true, be precluded from any active collaboration with the Scandinavians on defensive measures; on the other hand, we also would be relieved of additional moral obligations which would certainly devolve on us, if one or more of the Scandinavian countries joined the Atlantic pact at our insistence.

"2. A statement that any Western European democracy or group of democracies which is prepared to defend itself against aggression will be eligible to receive military supplies. Why should the Scandinavian countries be treated worse in this respect than Turkey, Greece or Korea?

"The high degree of unity of the northern democracies is one of the bright spots in present-day Europe. It is one of the corner-stones on which the reconstruction of the continent depends. Its disruption would be unfortunate for us as well as for Scandinavia. To destroy it now for the sake of securing one or two more members of the still-non-existent Atlantic pact seems at the best doubtful wisdom and at worst extremely dangerous."

Regardless of the official terms of the pact, the grave moral responsibility of the United States, as Osborne points out, can hardly be overstressed. That responsibility is to the Norwegian people who for four years endured the sinister tyranny of Nazi occupation.

How the masters of Soviet Russia in the Kremlin will react no one may predict with any certainty. Their reaction may well be one of fear, prompting them to take advantage of the treaty with Finland, permitting Russia to use Finland as, in effect, a military base, contrary to popular impression. Russia's reactions often can be explained more readily by weakness and fear rather than by strength and arrogance.

People's Platform

The Right To Vote

ALBEMARLE

Editors, THE NEWS:

YOUR editorial of Monday, Feb. 21, entitled, "The 'Right to Vote'", was one of the most scintillating examples of the inanity of wet arguments that I have been privileged to read in a long time. In the first place, the whole article is a red-herring to draw attention away from the real issue; and in the second place, the herring itself suffers from malnutrition.

The whole thing is so completely fallacious that it is a temptation to take up every sentence, but to avoid undue length, let's just look at a few statements.

In your point No. 2 which seems to be your major thesis, you state: "It is not a principle which the Drys are espousing but an expediency."

If, for a moment, we granted this as true, why do you aim it at the Drys? It is quite obvious that, prima facie, this is in any case equally true of the wets and has been through these years in which they have opposed the express will of the people of our state as indicated in the only referendums we have had (1908 and 1933), but do you mention that? Not at all!

This same statement of yours could very truthfully be re-stated this way—"The expediency which the Drys are espousing is a principle of democracy." And whatever your opinion about it may be, the truth of it is implicit.

In your very last statement, after citing the situation if North Carolina should be dry, while South Carolina and Virginia remain wet, you say, "Do the Drys really think it would be harder for a resident of Gaston County to get his liquor in South Carolina than in Mecklenburg County?" There is a point there, but although you show concern for the "rights" of the ABC counties, you show not the slightest concern for the counties that want to remain dry but border the ABC counties. At the repeal of the eighteenth amendment President Roosevelt promised that dry areas would be protected. We have never had this protection, but we can have a larger measure of it by having the state dry, than by having it pockmarked with wet counties.

Incidentally, by "local option," do you mean counties, as you have indicated, or do you mean cities, such as Charlotte and Asheville?

Your first premise was theoretically true. "1. The people already have a right to vote under the local option system—a right the Drys have been using to ban beer and wine in many counties of the state." But while you have your crying-towel out for the ABC counties, how about the counties that have wanted to vote on this question, and who have been prevented from it, thus far, on the most absurd technicalities, through the buying power of the liquor industries? And how about those who have voted dry, but who are prevented, or at least delayed, from enforcing this expressed will of the majority, by the obstructing tactics of the wets? Since I know of some of these cases, I am quite sure that a newspaper with your coverage knows of them too.

I would suggest that in your next wet editorial you get together with some of the boys to avoid this confusion. Because the gets have made it quite clear in the counties that they don't want local option either. They have spent quite a bit of money in a lot of the counties to try to prevent local option from going into effect. But somehow I don't recall your worrying about such rights, except when it appears that Dry victories are imminent.

—L. R. AKERS JR.
Pastor, Main Street Methodist Church.

The Right To Hate

ASHEVILLE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I SELDOM notice criticisms of my letters to the press. In writing, I say what I think is right and proper, then let the readers judge for themselves.

But a Mr. Combs in your People's Platform (Feb. 16) takes exception to some statements of mine in a former letter. He also indulges in some personalities which were only important if taken to suggest a lack of logical argument.

I understand him to claim that Churchill had no part in President Roosevelt's decision to enter World War II. I have only Churchill's word for it. After his conference with Roosevelt, in a speech in Parliament defending himself against errors with which he was charged, he said, "All the errors I have made are more than offset by my bringing America into the war." He brought us into the war. The inference is we would not have gone into it if he had stayed at home. As to Japan, she was an ally of Germany's and it was to be expected she would do her part.

It is well nigh certain that had we not been up to our eyes in conflict with Germany and Italy, Japan would not have opened war against us. She would have had no reasons for doing so.

I said, "Right to hate," not "Ought to hate." It is a matter of choice with individuals. I am not an Angloman. I am an American; I love my country and I hate all who deliberately wrong her. I believe that a man who does not hate his country's enemies does not love his country much and can not be counted on to help her voluntarily in case of need.

North Carolina's schools are all right and are not in the least responsible for my stupidity even if Mr. Combs thinks otherwise. I was past middle age when I came here from another state.

—JOSEPH SELBY.

The People's Platform is available to any reader who cares to mount it. Communications should be less than 300 words, typewritten if possible, and on only one side of the paper. Libel and obscenity will be deleted—otherwise anything goes. Each letter must be signed. — Editors, THE NEWS.

Stewart Alsop

Integrated Effort

WASHINGTON

REPORTS from Berlin appearing in this space have posed the question, "What sort of Germany?" What are the real objectives of American policy in Germany? This is as important a question as any that confronts the United States. And it is highly significant that at long last the United States Government is now making a serious effort to find an agreed and intelligent answer.

An attempt is now being made to draft a whole series of agreed policy papers dealing with all aspects of American policy in Germany. The preliminary drafting is being done by a four-man committee, which is now quietly meeting two or three times a week in the State Dept.

Chairman of this committee is George Kennan, brilliant chief State Dept. planner. Richard M. Bissell, able deputy ECA administrator, speaks for the ECA, which has a vital interest in the German problem. Robert Blum, special assistant to Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, represents Forrestal and the Defense Dept. The Army is represented by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, American commander in Germany, are represented by Assistant Secretary of War Tracy Vorhees, who may succeed William Draper as Under Secretary of War and chief Washington spokesman for Gen. Clay.

These four men will not, of course, make German policy independently. The policy papers they draft will be referred back to the organizations and individuals they represent, including Gen. Clay. Moreover, each preliminary paper will be sifted through another, higher committee. This committee consists of Secretary of State Dean Acheson as chairman, ECA Chief Paul Hoffman, and Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall. If Acheson's committee approves a paper, it will be referred in turn to the National Security Council and the President for final decision.

What this means is simply that the period of improvising policy in Germany is coming to an end. Because the United States Government has had no really clear objectives in Germany since the war, policy has necessarily been made on the spot by Gen. Clay, in response to the actual situation as Gen. Clay has found it.

In the process, Gen. Clay has been forced to decide — and has decided — what sort of Germany he and sort of Germany we do NOT want. We do not want a Western Germany kept in a permanent colonial status, at or near the starvation level. We do not want a Germany in constant danger of being drawn into the Kremlin's orbit. And we do not want to be forced out of Berlin by ruthless Soviet pressure.

These things have already taken effect. Western Germany is coming back. The Russians have been frustrated in their efforts, first to gain control of all Germany, and second to force the Western powers out of Berlin. Having decided, more or less by default, what kind of Germany we do want, it is now necessary to decide what kind of Germany we DO want. This is the immensely difficult task to which the Kennan committee, the Acheson committee, and the National Security Council have now addressed themselves.

The policy papers which result will be, and should be, secret. Nothing would be more damaging than to advertise to the world, and especially to the Soviet Union, a blueprint of American objectives and intentions in Germany. Yet the fact that the State Dept., the Army Dept. as spokesmen for Gen. Clay, and the ECA, are all taking part in the effort to draft agreed policy papers on Germany is itself significant and encouraging.

There has been this secret about the bitter disagreements within the Government on German policy in the past. When German policy was in the offing, the Army Dept., the State Dept., and the ECA have been apt to treat each other as sovereign, independent, hostile powers. If the American policy-makers can reach agreement among themselves on American policy toward Germany, a long step forward will have been taken.

There remains the even more difficult task of reconciling American policy on Germany to the whole range of American policy in the world, and especially in Western Europe.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Thumb-Nail Sketch Of General Vaughan

WASHINGTON

QUITE a few people have written or wired me asking what manner of man is the famous Gen. Harry Vaughan in whose defense President Truman hurled the abbreviation for an unprintable name last week.

The answer is that Vaughan is a roly-poly, easygoing, sometimes blustery sort of person, who is very difficult to dislike, even if you don't appreciate his particular brand of humor—which the President does. In fact, it is largely because of Vaughan's role as court jester plus his shaggy-dog loyalty, that the President has him around.

Vaughan's humor, which has taken the form of turning a pig loose in the office of J. Edgar Hoover and of berating his boss with barrack-room language for playing the wrong card at poker, is usually difficult to print.

Milder examples of Vaughanian wit include:

"The cockroaches in Gallinger Hospital should have service stripes, because they've been there since the Civil War." And apropos of efforts to settle strikes: "The Nation's going to hell in a hand-basket." Regarding the sickness en route to Bermuda: "I feel fine. What the hell, it tasted just as good coming up as it did going down."

Nobody can blame the President for wanting a little relaxation—and if he enjoys the type of humor dished out by Harry Vaughan, then that gentleman may serve a useful purpose and might be immune from newspaper comment. However, since he also plays a part in influencing our foreign relations, and since some 1,600,000 American boys in the armed forces must salute the uniform of a major general, then it should be within the bounds of fair comment to scrutinize more closely Vaughan's earlier experience and present career.

Vaughn In Australia

FIVE years before Harry Truman became Vice-President, Harry Vaughan was a Missouri manufacturer's representative for the Hines Co. of Milwaukee, the T. J. Moss Tie Co., and the Heim Binder Co., also of Milwaukee. Salary—$4,200.

Then, in 1939, Vaughan came to work for Senator Truman as secretary. Came the war and Truman hit the headlines as head of the Truman Committee. Vaughan secured a commission as lieutenant colonel, went to Australia where he served as provost marshall at Brisbane. He didn't get along too well with General MacArthur and came home.

Army Press Relations, when asked about General Vaughan's record in Australia, said that it could not go into details without querying the officer himself, in this case General Vaughan. No official record is obtainable, therefore, as to the exact area where Vaughan served in Australia, or why he was transferred. Friends said, however, that he was a good rear-area officer.

A photo is in existence taken of Colonel Vaughan in Australia with two other colonels, all obviously inebriated, over the caption "Three Full Colonels."

Back in Washington, the Army, always astute regarding Capitol Hill contacts, assigned Colonel Vaughan to be liaison officer with his old boss, the Senator from Missouri. Truman, by that time, had become the most powerful Senator on the Hill, with the power to investigate the Army, Navy or anything else. So Vaughan's appointment as go-between for the Army with Truman was considered a tenstrike.

Came Truman's election as Vice-President and Harry Vaughan became his military aide. It was the first time in history that a Vice-President ever had a military aide. But Truman wanted it, so the Army was delighted to please the man who might some day be in the White House. A few months later and both Harry Truman and Harry Vaughan were there.

Vaughan's Monkey Wrenches

NOBODY would begrudge General Vaughan his seat at the right hand of the President, his medals, his limousine, his titles or his flunkeys, or his $12,000 salary, if it were not for the fact that the General is not satisfied to remain a court jester. He insists on poking his hand into the delicate machinery of Government.

And whenever he does so, he nearly always inserts a monkey wrench.

In 1946, for instance, as Europe faced bleak starvation, Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson asked the American public to forego liquor in favor of bread. The grain allocation for distilleries and brewers was cut. Some months later, as hunger abroad increased, the grain allocation for distillers was cut again.

At this point, General Vaughan telephoned the Agriculture Department, got Anderson's assistant, Nathan Koenig, on the wire, and stormed:

"What do you mean changing the distillers' quota again without informing me? I'm the one you are to deal with on that. I had assurances that the quotas were not to be changed, and I want this order rescinded immediately."

Vaughan was so vituperative that Koenig got Secretary Anderson, then out of town, on the long-distance phone, and recommended that the cut for distillers be rescinded. General Vaughan, Koenig warned his chief, was in no mood to be trifled with.

"Tell the General," replied Anderson, "that he was not confirmed by the Senate to act as Secretary of Agriculture."

Just what General Vaughan's interest in the liquor industry is not known, though it is known that he remains plentifully supplied by an ex-bootlegger, John Maragon. Maragon's relationship with Vaughan and Truman is so close that he actually turned up at the Potsdam Conference along with Jimmy Byrnes, Winston Churchill and Premier Stalin.

Reaction To Truman And Pearson

HERE are some of the editorial reactions to Mr. Truman's speech defending Vaughn:

The Tulsa, Okla. Press — "Not only is the propriety of the President's aide in accepting a medal from the military dictator in question, but whether or not the right of free speech in this country, including the right to criticize any office holder, should be curtailed in addition also.

"The Free Press has no hesitancy in saying that right or wrong Mr. Pearson has the constitutional privilege to criticize the President of the United States or his aides. Deplorable, indeed, would it be if that privilege were not inherent in American citizenship.

"The President may be acclaimed by the average poolroom loafer for his intemperate language but decent people will not condone it."

The Pueblo, Colo., Star-Journal—"When any President so far forgets the dignity of his office as to publicly call anybody anywhere a 'S.O.B.' he stoops to the lowest kind of alley language which smells of the vintage of the Pendergast machine at Kansas City of which Mr. Truman is the admitted protege.

"Mr. Pearson did not even criticize the ability or loyalty of General Vaughan or his military usefulness to the President. He only criticized the propriety of the General in accepting any recognition from the dictator in Argentina so diametrically opposed to all of the principles of free men in a democracy which the United States fought to maintain. Therefore 'S.O.B.' is rather commonplace, Mr. President."