THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1951

A STRIKE AGAINST THE PUBLIC

AT THIS EARLY STAGE, it is impossible for the people of Charlotte and the five other Carolina cities threatened with a bus strike Thursday to weigh the merits of the company and union positions. Although negotiations for a new contract have been under way since February, few of the pertinent facts were made public prior to the issuance of the strike call by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen last night.

It is not too early, however, to point out that this is the worst kind of a strike, in that it is a strike against the people rather than against the company. It will not unduly burden the Duke Power Company to shut down an operation that has lost money in recent years. But it will impose a great hardship upon the countless thousands of citizens who depend on the public transportation system for their daily livelihood.

Furthermore, there is some reason to suspect that the dispute is partially jurisdictional. The Duke Power Company has contracts with two unions. Drivers and mechanics in Greensboro and Durham are represented by the Amalgamated Union, an AFL affiliate. In December, 1950, the Amalgamated Union signed a contract containing substantially the same wages, rules and working conditions offered the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen two months later. The BRT, in declining to accept that offer, has created the impression that it is interested partly in discrediting the rival union by gaining a more favorable contract.

It is a regrettable fact that North Carolina has no law for dealing with strikes by employees of public utilities. Last year a similar impasse between Duke and the BRT was solved by an extra-legal voluntary fact-finding proceeding inspired by Mayor Victor Shaw of Charlotte and the mayors of the five other affected cities. Recommendations of the fact-finders were accepted by the company. The BRT continued working under those recommendations, but no contract was ever signed.

Without adequate machinery for dealing with public utility labor disputes, the people of Charlotte, Winston-Salem, High Point, Salisbury, Greenville and Spartanburg will have to fend for themselves in the difficult days ahead. Facing such chaos and confusion as will result from a bus strike, the people have every right to insist that the union and the company ponder long and deeply the probable effects of this action in the few hours remaining for calm deliberation.

ANOTHER INVENTORY NEEDED

THE *Greensboro Daily News* makes a point that has been largely overlooked in the hubbub over Governor Scott's call for a "no whitewash" investigation of North Carolina's electric power production.

"Of course," says the *Daily News*, "there will be folks who feel that an alert Utilities Commission would keep on hand an inventory of electric power facilities in North Carolina. In which case, all a Governor would have to do would be to telephone or send a messenger to the Commission offices for what he wanted to know."

Not having access to the Utilities Commission's records, we haven't the slightest notion what might be contained therein. We would have assumed that a continuing inventory of electric power supply and demand would be a basic part of the system. Else how could a Commission possibly fulfill one of its main functions—the guaranteeing of adequate service to the consumers in return for the granting of a private monopoly franchise?

Ah, well, this is not the first time that North Carolina's woefully understaffed and technically deficient Utilities Commission has come up lacking. The Commission controls franchises for municipal transportation systems, but has no facilities for determining whether urban dwellers are adequately served. It hands out telephone rate increases, but has neither the inclination nor the technical experience to probe behind claimants' figures to see if they are fair.

Let us, by all means, proceed with the Scott-ordered inventory of electric power. But isn't it a good time to make a similar inventory of the State Utilities Commission to find out wherein it falls short of fulfilling its great public obligations?

EASY AS PIE

HOW easy it is sometimes to enslave human beings—physically and mentally.

Last week *Time Magazine*, in a cover story on Juan and Evita Peron of Argentina, showed just how easy it was: easy as pie. And not pie in the sky, either. That is the secret of the success of the Perons; they don't just promise, they give.

The gimmick is that pretty soon they will run out of things to give and have to start taking.

The gimmick has afflicted every modern dictator from Huey Long to Joe Stalin. Long began his reign in Louisiana by telling the poor folks every man should and would be a king. Like a grits-and-cornbread Robin Hood, Huey Long took from the rich and gave to the poor—until wealth and power became less a novelty and more a necessity to him.

Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Peron—all of them began by telling the poor that it was their inning, that under them the poor would inherit the earth.

Three of them—Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin—gave until the country had nothing else to give, until they had to reach into the pockets of their neighbors to maintain their nations' new living standard.

They are beginning to feel the economic pinch in Argentina this year. Inflation is a real threat. Already Peron has shown indications of having less to give (he used the army to break a strike of a previously-favored labor union last Fall, giving the union the surprise of its life).

There may come a time soon when the resources of Argentina become insufficient to maintain the living standard Peron's *descamisados* are becoming accustomed to.

Recent history tells us what will happen then.

DIPLOMATIC THRUST

ORDINARILY diplomatic exchanges make for heavy and laborious reading, but the U. S. reply to Russia's note on the Japanese peace treaty was a neat bit of verbal fencing.

Russia had raised anew the question of Formosa, declaring that the wartime Cairo agreement provides that "the island of Taiwan (Formosa) and the Pescadores Islands should be returned to China".

Not so, said the United States. The Cairo Agreement provided that "*Manchuria*, Formosa and the Pescadores shall be restored to the *Republic of China*."

And then, in suave but biting language, the U. S. note continued:

"In view of the known acquisition by the USSR of zones of interest in Manchuria, the United States Government is prompted to inquire as to the significance of the present avoidance by the Soviet Government of reference to the restoration of Manchuria.

"Furthermore, in view of the fact that the Government of the Soviet Union has itself pointed out on numerous occasions that the 'Republic of China' (the Nationalist regime on Formosa) is not identical with what the Soviet Government now refers to as the 'Chinese People's Republic', the Government of the United States inquires of the Government of the Soviet Union whether it in fact now desires that Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores should be restored to the 'Republic of China'."

Touche!

From The Christian Science Monitor

EUROPE GAINS

INDUSTRIAL production in Western Europe not only has regained prewar levels but now stands 30 per cent above what it was in 1938, according to a report by the Economic Co-operation Administration.

This is one measure of the efficacy of the Marshall Plan. Another is the reduced number and influence of Communists in Marshall Plan countries. Another is the three-to-one contribution of the beneficiary countries in the more than $2 billion worth of plants built with American aid.

Some Americans ask apprehensively, "But aren't we equipping potential competition for ourselves in this process?" Dirk U. Stikker, Dutch Foreign Minister and president of the Organization for European Economic Co-operation, gave an answer to that when he told the Council of Europe the other day that the North American and the European economic system "are interrelated and that the prosperity of each of us depends on the prosperity of all."

Even within Europe the development of larger free trading areas has accomplished something and promises much more. Starting with the Benelux Customs Union and the European Payments Union, there now is hope for the Schuman Plan and there is the example of defense co-operation through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It does no good for such moves to go so rapidly as to be visionary in their application. British resistance has caused the Council of Europe to set aside for the present any efforts to merge all Western Europe, including Britain and Scandinavia, into a federation. But much can be and is being accomplished by intergovernmental co-operation through the Council.

One reason for America's vast mass-production industrial development is its enjoyment of the world's largest free trade market. Within this realm the eastern industrial area has gained rather than lost from the growth of agricultural prosperity in the West and even from increased industrialization and buying power in the South during the last 25 to 50 years. European prosperity can similarly work a two-way benefit.

Mr. Fred Tolbert is recuperating from a fall off a scaffold while doing work on the new Methodist church, but he isn't going to sue for fear of having to donate enough money to pay the damage.—*Omega (Ga.) News.*

Ain't We Got Fun!

People's Platform

Letters should be brief, written on one side of the paper. The writer's name must be signed, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editor. The News reserves the right to condense.

Speeding 'Safety' Busses

RICHMOND, Va.

Editors, The News:

RETURNING to Richmond from a business trip through the state of Virginia, Thursday, May 11, I was driving north on U. S. Highway 1, about five miles south of Dewitt, when two Trailway busses passed me at a high rate of speed. These two busses were loaded with small children and I noticed a large sign on the side of the bus reading, "Charlotte, North Carolina, School Safety Program." I was curious to learn what type of Safety Program your city was sponsoring that would carry small children over our highways at such a terrific rate of speed.

I caught up with these two busses when they slowed down to 60 miles an hour as they passed through Dewitt. Between Dewitt and Dinwiddie (approximately four miles), their speed was never under 72 miles an hour. Between Dinwiddie and Petersburg I clocked these drivers doing 84 miles an hour. For a space of at least two miles my speedometer did not get under 82 miles an hour. Frankly, my car has never been that fast before; however, I was still determined to get the numbers of these busses and, in Petersburg, it was, of course, necessary for them to slow down for heavy traffic, but even in the city limits they made 35 miles an hour until they hit a stop sign. It was then that I drove up alongside of the bus and took note of the sign which read "Charlotte, North Carolina School Safety Porgram Sponsored by Charlotte Police Department and Charlotte Motor Club."

The Trailway bus numbers were Q-1607-1608. The license number of the latter was 58171. Incidentally, these two drivers went through a school zone in the city at 35 miles an hour at 3:15 P. M., while the school children were leaving the school and some were attempting to cross the streets.

Having business in Petersburg, I made no further attempt to trail the busses, but I have wondered if they reached their destination safely. I have seen many flagrant violations of our traffic laws but none to equal this. This is my first attempt at reporting such violations, but being a father of an eleven-year-old child myself, I feel sure the parents of these Charlotte children will be interested in this matter.

—JAMES HARRIS
(1911 Cornell Ave.)

A Way To Get Unity

CHARLOTTE

Editors, The News:

ACCORDING to the press, President Truman is quoted in his recent speech before the National Conference of Citizenship as saying: "Never was there a time when right decisions were necessary than at this time" and "The hardest thing in the world is to face the real facts".

I can partially agree with the President as to the hardest thing to do. However, I would say, "The hardest thing in the world to do is admit you are wrong", while "the easiest thing in the world is to spend other people's money". I think it could not be disputed that in both these respects Mr. Truman is extremely proficient. Mr. Truman stubbornly refuses to face the hard facts and admit a wrong and then try to remedy that wrong. As he sees it anyone who disagrees with him is wrong. It is extremely tragic that Mr. Truman stubbornly refuses to recognize the fact that his Secretary of State long ago lost the confidence of nearly all of the people as well as perhaps most members of Congress. Mr. Truman's silent approval of the corruption revealed by recent Senate investigations and his refusal to consider the recall of Ambassador O'Dwyer from Mexico have shaken public confidence in the President's integrity.

I think Mr. Truman can expect an upsurge of unity in this country if he will recognize that the people have some intelligence as well as himself.

Mr. Truman is right in saying the right decisions were never more needed than now and unless he welcomes wise counsel, even though it is contrary to his opinion, he will do the country a service if he will step down and take Secretary Acheson with him.

—R. C. BOLEN.

Needed Reform

BIRMINGHAM, Ala.

Editors, The News:

WITH THE coming of great wealth in America, the so-called reformer ceased to exist and partly, perhaps, because any aspirant to such an honored title knew well in advance that it would elicit derision and public contempt. However, big estates have been converted into what is known as foundations. These foundations, tax exempt, propose to carry through certain programs of value to the public welfare.

These foundations were set up by men mostly of the industrial and banking field and usually of our larger northern cities. Many of them have done a world of good and including the well-known Rockefeller Foundation which cleared the U. S. Army and the Southern people of the muchly publicized hook-worm. This foundation saved countless number of lives and rescued many from a lifetime of suffering. The late John D. Rockefeller will ever be known as one of the greatest manufacturers of the world.

However, the basic need of a continuous work which could be possible only by large foundations in the South are not being touched by any agency other than government or state.

Here in the South, a great need is that of educating the owners of dumb brutes to see to it that they are given ample water and food and that they are not abused.

Up in Boston, there is a Humane Society whose duty it is to educate the public on ways and means to protect the dumb brutes from useless suffering and abuse. It is doing a successful work and those who travel up there, will bear me out in stating that usually the animals there are better fed and better housed. In such a work by a well-financed organization, the Scriptural quotation, "The groans of dumb brutes will rise up against you in the days of judgment", could be effectively combined in a program of education which would reach a lot of those who otherwise might allow their animals to suffer for water, food and to be abused.

—W. L. SHADDIX.

Foundation Of Pact Against Soviet Needs Strengthening

By JOSEPH ALSOP

LONDON

FROM THIS angle of vision, at least, the United States appears to be entirely preoccupied with internal controversy. It is time for Americans to look abroad again, however, and not in the direction of the Far East, either. For the very foundations of the Western alliance against Soviet aggression are trembling and cracking here in London.

As any sane man must realize, that foundation is the Anglo-American partnership, which is the hard core of Western strength. A crisis in the partnership has now been brought on by the repercussions of the MacArthur controversy in America, and by the effects of the Persian oil squabble in Britain.

In effect, the Persian oil squabble is rapidly becoming a pistol pointed at the heads of both partners, requiring them both to define, once and for all, their relationship to each other. This is so for a simple reason. It is becoming increasingly unlikely that the British can arrange any acceptable compromise of the oil dispute with the highly irrational Iranian administration of Dr. Mohammed Mossadegh. If the issue cannot be negotiated, the British must then choose between passively allowing their vital oil resource to be expropriated, or sending troops to Southern Iran to protect it.

But in this choice, the United States is immediately and inextricably implicated, as Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson has already been plainly told by Sir Oliver Franks. For the British cannot venture to send troops to Southern Iran, running all the grim risks of this action, unless they can be sure of American support. As a minimum they must have American support in the United Nations, where they will be charged with aggression by the Iranians, and will surely be convicted without our active aid.

A later report will explore the Persian oil problem in detail. It is enough to say here, in the present report on the Anglo-American relationship, that losing the oil resource will be a fatal blow to Britain's status as a world power. Furthermore, if we in the United States now refuse to stand by our ally in this dark hour, this blow will ultimately be blamed upon us.

It is tragic that this choice should be forced upon the American Government at a time when all judgments are clouded by the MacArthur controversy. Yet in a way, it is also appropriate. What is now happening in fact is like one of those turning points in a marriage, which has for a long time been going from bad to worse, until both husband and wife suddenly realize they must behave differently towards one another if the home is to be kept together. If we behave boldly and generously, all may yet be well.

TWO-WAY STREET

Specifically, the British have received a sharp lesson in Persia on the need for a partnership to be a two-way street. The majority of them have also concluded that the idea of bribing the Chinese Communists with a seat in the United Nations and with Formosa was never, after all, a very good one. The time is almost ripe for a close co-ordination of the once divergent American and British policies in the Far East. If this can be achieved, and the Persian hump can be got over, the troubles of the past will belong to the past.

The source of those troubles, it should be remembered, was the original American decision, taken by President Truman immediately after the 1948 election, to neglect the defenses of the West. Anyone could foresee—and it was repeatedly predicted in this space—that neglect of the West's defenses would lead to a mood of appeasement among our more exposed allies. And that is precisely what occurred, producing all the strange manifestations of British policy in the last ten months.

It is tempting now, of course, to use the Persian problem as the excuse for making the British swallow a dose or so of the conscious rectitude they have been ladling out to us until recently. But if the nations of the West are not to be destroyed piecemeal by Soviet aggressions that appear ever more imminent, the time has come to pull together, to make a bold common front, and to march forward in unity.

Can Emancipation For Poor Man At Last Be On Its Way?

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

IT HAS BEEN some time since I courted trouble with the womenfolk, and so I guess this is as good a point as any to raise a new ruckus. There is a judge out in Cleveland who just put himself out of the popularity business, distaff department, by stating flatly that the fact of matrimony is not sufficient reason for alimony.

Judge Samuel Silbert denied an alimony request from a disenchanted bride of a month. He said that no heart balm should be available unless a lady has enriched the union with work, love, devotion, or worldly goods.

"This woman is strong, young and capable," Judge Silbert said. "Let her work."

I kind of ride along with the judge. Let us consider that a man sacrifices his youth, beauty and income to a union, and the whole deal turns sour. The unhappy couple strides into court, and the man behind the desk snarls something to the effect that you got to pay her half the salary and besides, she gets the piano and the custody of the canary.

JUST WHY?

Why? Except in cases of flagrant cruelty and/or infidelity, the lady is no less vulnerable to criticism for the failure of a marriage than the man. There was a time, perhaps, when a grass widow proved up as damaged goods in the marital marts, because dames weren't generally working in them days and a one-time loser was outcast by polite society. But it isn't so anymore, when the women go to war and Congress and claim superiority instead of equality.

If we allow that the old lady starts to beat you with a stick and forbids you to play with your toys and is pretty altogether unbearable, why do you have to underwrite her future if the upkeep of no children is involved? You can not hurt her financially by your association, since she lived off the fat of the land, and if you decide you don't like each other any more you split the mutual loot and part friending. Except it doesn't work like that.

In the average divorce the lady can be the most poisonous shrew in the suburbs and still stalk off with the lion's share of the old man's life. She can cripple him with alimony until he can't buy himself a beer to help him drop his broken dreams. She can take him for the furniture and censor his future plans for another marriage. In about 80 per cent of the cases she is awarded the custody of the kids, unless she is starkly shown to be an unfit mother.

IT'S OUTMODED

The system of divorce is as creaky as a farmhouse floor. We have, on the one side, all embattled womanhood clamorously proclaiming its equality and on the other, grasping greedily for all the perquisites of femininity which reach all the way back to the time when they were known as the weaker sex and had to be protected by law.

To paraphrase the wise words of the judge in Cleveland, a woman who does not contribute to the success of a marriage is not entitled to a free ride for the rest of her life just because she made her old man miserable, and vicious versa. The gal who has shared the un-struggling hard times and who has invested her effort in the success of a husband is sure entitled to her slice of the available pastry, fifty-fifty, and to some insurance that she won't suffer when she's unequipped to work.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

JCS Believed MacArthur Rash Leader

WASHINGTON

THE Senate's ruling that star witnesses in the MacArthur hearings will not have to testify regarding confidential conversations presumably will hold for confidential conversations between Gen. Omar Bradley and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

However, some of their private reactions during the MacArthur discussions are significant. Inside fact is that the Joint Chiefs were extremely nervous about the idea of ousting MacArthur and took care to avoid the word "recommend" in reporting to the White House that MacArthur be fired.

Instead, and after considerable private debate, they decided to use the words "militarily advisable". Therefore, a report that it was "militarily advisable" to relieve MacArthur was signed by all four of the Joint Chiefs.

Despite this compromise-wording there was no question among the Joint Chiefs that MacArthur should go. There were three general reasons for this view, and it is interesting that none of them really agreed with Truman's reasons—namely, MacArthur's flouting of orders by discussing foreign policy.

Reason No. 1 was the fact that the Joint Chiefs considered MacArthur too rash as a military commander and likely to let American forces in for more trouble.

Tying MacArthur's Hands

THAT was why they actually tied his hands with the military directive regarding the bombing of Chinese bases. They decided that he could bomb Chinese bases if—and they were two very big ifs—1. The Communists threw in enough air power to jeopardize our ground troops; 2. If the Chinese attacked any UN ships or installations outside Korea.

But MacArthur was given a further directive that before he could do any bombing in either of the above categories he must first consult the Joint Chiefs. In other words, what might provoke MacArthur into bombing Manchuria might not be enough to provoke the Joint Chiefs. They didn't trust his judgment, were afraid he would interpret these conditions far more liberally than they.

Reason No. 2 was the fact that MacArthur was not one to take suggestions or guidance from the Joint Chiefs. While it is JCS policy not to dictate to the commander in the field, they do reserve the right to give general guidance and make suggestions.

And they were quite provoked during MacArthur's November advance into North Korea that he ignored their warning that there was no battle communication between General Walker's 8th Army and General Almond's 10th Corps. When the Joint Chiefs warned MacArthur about this, he replied, rather coldly, that there was sufficient liaison.

However, the Joint Chiefs, still not satisfied, asked MacArthur a second time why General Almond and his 10th Corps were operating independently of the 8th Army, leaving a big gap between the two forces. MacArthur replied, unconvincingly, that General Almond and his 10th Corps were drawing Chinese pressure away from the 8th Army.

Later, when the Chinese struck, they picked the hole that had worried the Joint Chiefs, and smashed right into the vacuum between the 10th Corps and the 8th Army.

Reason No. 3—However, what finally got the Joint Chiefs really sore at MacArthur was his statement about using Chiang Kai-shek's troops in Korea killed the Universal Military Training bill.

For months the Joint Chiefs had set their hearts on passing Universal Military Training for the first time in the history of the nation. But two days after MacArthur's statement urging that we use Chiang's Formosan troops, the UMT bill was dead. MacArthur had killed it. For Congress was under immediate fire from the voters to use Chinese troops instead of our own.

After that the Joint Chiefs needed no urging from the White House to state that it was "militarily advisable" to relieve MacArthur.

Merry-Go-Round

EVEN though they disagree with Nebraska's Sen. Ken Wherry, most Democratic Senators like him. The other day Democratic Sen. Bill Benton of Connecticut was talking about the need for education in television, with only about four Senators listening. Benton concentrate Wherry walked up behind and whispered: "Do you want a quorum call?" . . . This would have brought a full Senate back to listen to Benton's speech, which Wherry thought important. . . . GOP Senator Knowland of California also commands the respect of the Democrats. It is obvious from his speeches and cross-examination that he really works. . . . Jim Duff of Pennsylvania, though a freshman, already has become one of the outstanding Senators. His father was a Presbyterian preacher and so was his wife's father—which may be why Duff is a crusader.