THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1952

FOREIGN POLICY UNDER THE GOP

IN JANUARY, 1933, Adolph Hitler became Chancellor of the Reich. Soviet Russia that month celebrated the completion of its first Five-Year Plan. Under it Russia, with the aid of American and German engineers, had built a foundation for her future industrial and military capacity.

In the United States there were 10 million unemployed. Taxes were taking one dollar out of every three of the national income. The recent Limitation of Armaments Conference at Geneva had accomplished nothing. The U. S. concerned itself with external affairs to the extent of sending a representative to the League Council when it discussed Japanese aggression in Manchuria, but Senator Borah and his like-minded colleagues had kept us out of the World Court.

In January, 1933, the Republican Party, which had guided the nation since Wilson, stepped out of power. In January, 1953, after 20 years out of power, it returns to control the executive branch and both houses of Congress.

What can we expect of the Republicans, in the all-important matter of foreign policy?

* * *

THEIR most important and immediate concern will be Korea. Smoldering fires which could erupt into other Koreas exist in Southeast Asia and the Middle East. Latin America, which has been shoved into the background, wants attention. Relations with our Atlantic allies are stagnated.

The Truman Administration's containment policy, which came in for much criticism during the campaign, will be re-examined and possibly revised. An adjunct of this issue will be the determination of policy toward nations now under Communist rule.

Reciprocal trade agreements come up, within a few months, for renewal, bringing with them the whole subject of U. S. trade and tariff policy. The role of the U. N. and regional pacts, foreign aid, propaganda and psychological warfare, organization of this nation's far-flung international agencies will be critically examined. All of these issues, and lesser ones, will be considered within the framework of the Federal budget and tax policy.

No Republican Senator now in Washington ever served under a Republican President. The late Sen. Arthur Vandenberg was the last one to do so. This will be an entirely new crop, if not altogether a new breed, of Republicans. They will have the advantage of a fresh approach—and the disadvantage of lack of prior responsibility.

Heading the important Foreign Relations Committee will be Sen. Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin, who after a period of vacillation has apparently adopted wholeheartedly the internationalism of Senator Vandenberg. His House counterpart, Rep. Robert Chiperfield of Illinois, reflects the isolationism of his Tribune-land home. The Congress as a whole has about the same degree of internationalism as did the two preceding ones. The men who control the expenditures by which this Internationalism is usually reflected, however, are more zealous guardians of the public purse than were their predecessors.

The Republican President will be a man who gained his fame as an international leader, although he severely criticized, during the campaign, many of the foreign policies of the Democratic Administration. And the person most responsible for our foreign policy will be a disheveled, stooped, 66-year-old international lawyer, John Foster Dulles. What can we expect of him?

* * *

UNLESS the man has departed, in the past year, from the attitudes he developed during 45 years of intimate association with our foreign affairs—and this seems unlikely —we can expect that two oft-expressed fears concerning his policies are groundless.

First, it is said that he is overly-concerned with Asia, not sufficiently concerned with Europe.

Asia certainly needs more attention by U. S. statesmen. Few men in either party concerned themselves with it until after China went Communist, and it is well that our Secretary of State is well-versed in Asian affairs.

* * *

Furthermore, much of his identification with Asia results from the fact that from 1950 to last Spring he was assigned, by the Democratic Administration, to Asia, where he competently negotiated the Japanese Peace Treaty.

His words and actions, however, clearly indicate his belief in ever-closer relations with Europe. His *War, Peace And Change*, published in 1939, shows his belief in regional arrangements going far beyond the present scope of NATO. His maiden Senate speech was a refutation of Senator Taft's objections to our entry into the North Atlantic Pact. At various times during the past four years he has urged closer relations between the Atlantic countries.

Secondly, his "liberation" policy for satellite nations is considered by some as a dangerous invitation to war. He has not espoused violent revolution, but advocated our aid to passive resistance, non-co-operation and industrial sabotage. Such aid is easier advocated than expedited. If the sabotage can be augmented by us, fine, but in itself this cloak-and-dagger war will not be of major importance, and Mr. Dulles has not attached as much significance to it as have some of the newsmen and politicians from regions with a large proportion of Eastern European immigrants.

Another Dulles proposal deserves closer study. Containment, he says, is insufficient. What is better? Writing in *Life* last Spring, he said:

> "There is one solution and only one: that is for the free world to develop the will and organize the means to retaliate instantly against open aggression by Red armies so that, if it occurred anywhere, we could and would strike back where it hurts, by means of our choosing."

That is a big order. It would mean that if Russia invades Kashmir or Afghanistan, we would retaliate instantly. And if we're going to hit them where it hurts, we would bomb Russia. If this became our policy, it would mean World War III *at a time Russia chose*. If we did not carry out our threat of instant retaliation, after establishing the policy, U. S. prestige and leadership would sink to a new low.

However, our allies and the majority of Americans would question the establishment of such a policy, which to be effected would require a much greater military and tax program than we now have. Containment, after all, was never viewed as a long-range policy, but rather as a means of drawing a line around communism as the realities of our defenses permitted. And it has been a quite successful policy. If the Republicans can continue to draw and hold the line, meanwhile keeping alive the hope of subject peoples, the GOP will merit praise. Fortunately, Mr. Dulles did not emphasize this idea of instant retaliation in the campaign, and we hope it can be passed off as an ill-advised tactic.

* * *

WHAT can we expect of the Republicans on various specific foreign policy issues? Presumably the Korean decision will rest primarily with President-elect Eisenhower, after his trip to the battle zone. Mr. Dulles believes in assigning various regions to subordinates, and giving them considerable responsibility for formulation of successful policy there. His previous record indicates that he will emphasize the political and economic ties of NATO.

One of the party's greatest tests will come in the matter of trade and tariffs. Our allies, and American taxpayers, prefer trade to aid. Our agricultural exports, which increased by leaps and bounds in recent years, have dropped perceptibly during the past few months. But Republicans have usually, and often overwhelmingly, voted against Reciprocal Trade.

Mr. Dulles will be hard put to change his Congressional colleagues' viewpoint on this score. The same holds true with propaganda and psychological warfare. He wants to step up these activities, but Representative Taber, incoming chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, would scale them down, drastically.

The new President and Secretary of State will have occasion to gratefully remember Democratic Congressmen in their prayers. Yet if both men live up to their deserved reputations as statesmen and conciliators, all Americans may likewise have reason to be thankful that Eisenhower and Dulles are leading the Republican Party and the nation.

From The Atlanta Journal

'HAND IN HAND WE'LL GO'

EVERY DAY in the papers there are stories about men and women who have failed in their union. Never mind whose fault it may have been. Each has lost something and together they have lost a lot.

There was a new story in the paper Tuesday, a story new and yet old as love itself. In Margret, Ala., a tiny mountain town, live a man and woman who have eaten their loaf and drunk their cup and blended their lives for 75 years.

They, Mr. and Mrs. Allen T. Edmondson, celebrated their diamond anniversary on Tuesday. He remembers when he, a farmer's son, glimpsed "the prettiest girl I ever saw". She recalls when she beheld her first and only sweetheart. For three-quarters of a century they have lived the open secret of contentment. They know the answer that one man and one woman can find in each other.

They know all the tenderness that the old Scottish woman spoke through Robert Burns:

John Anderson, my jo, John,
When we were first acquaint,
Your locks were like the raven;
Your bonnie brow was brent;
But now your brow is bald, John,
Your locks are like the snow;
But blessings on your frosty pow,
John Anderson, my jo!

John Anderson, my jo, John,
We climbed the hill together;
And many a cheerful day, John,
We've had with one another;
Now we must totter down, John,
But hand in hand we'll go,
And sleep together at the foot,
John Anderson, my jo.

The man who used to enjoy looking through the family album now has a grandson who likes to show his colored films.—*Washington (Iowa) Journal.*

Some folks are gonna be disappointed when they get to heaven—there'll be people from other denominations they hadn't expected to see.—*Unadilla (Ga.) Observer.*

'Come In — Good To See You'

People's Platform

Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editors. The News reserves the right to condense.

Bear Story

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I AM enclosing Bill Sharp's postscript to his State Magazine story "Crazy Season on the South Toe", which you reproduced in part, in Wednesday's Charlotte News. Bill was our guest at our South Toe River Cottage, near Mt. Mitchell, for this bear hunt. Most of these bear hunters are friends of mine of several years standing.

My friend, Kenneth Whitsett, local artist, was on this bear hunt with us and made the drawing "Seven Mile Ridge Bear Camp", which Bill used in his State Magazine in connection with this story. This bear camp is located about two miles from our South Toe Cottage. Mrs. McEwen was a bystander on a part of this hunt and listened to bear hunt stories for the most of two days and nights.

L. MORRIS McEWEN

Editors' Note—Says Bill: "And here's the best footnote of all. L. M. McEwen of Charlotte, who took me on this hunt, writes to report on the opening hunt. A whopping 316-pounder (dressed) was taken. And it was Prent himself who told me not to believe all these stories about bears dressing out at over 400 pounds!")

Vote Pleased League

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

THE League of Women Voters of Charlotte is gratified—to say the least—with the results of the recent Get-Out-The-Vote campaign. The remarkable turnout at the polls justified the efforts of the many groups and individuals, particularly the co-operative press, with whom we took great pleasure in working.

This was citizen participation at a high level, a goal towards which the League has worked since its inception.

May we congratulate the citizens of Mecklenburg County on a proud and patriotic record!

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CHARLOTTE,
Board of Directors, Betty G. Jolley, Secretary

Nodding Newsmen?

HAMLET

Editors, THE NEWS:

TO casual readers of The Charlotte News it might not be noticeable, but to one who carefully observes the make-up and composition of news items, one would wonder if the news editors were nodding while making up Page 1.

For instance, in the four-star edition of Nov. 27, it appeared that the small headline, "Floats, Beauties To Feature Event", broke right out of the big headline, "Eleven Czechs To Die In Prague Purge Trial". On a second look, I found it referred to your Carrousel festivities.

And in a number of news items throughout the edition, words and letters were missing. You may be excused, however, for Earl Wilson was in town.

Thank you from an old newspaperman.

—J. E. McLAUGHLIN.

Nice B-E-M Day

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

PLEASE accept my sincere thanks for the wonderful hospitality your company extended us on B. E. M. Day. It was without a doubt the finest gesture of goodwill I have observed during the 40 or more years I have lived in Charlotte.

HOWARD MOORELAND,
Principal, Main G. Davis School.

Congressional Quiz

By CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

Q—When will the 83rd Congress convene?

A—The 83rd Congress convenes on Saturday, Jan. 3, 1953. The 20th Amendment to the Constitution prescribes that Congress convene "at noon on the 3rd day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day." Although Saturday isn't usually a legislative day, Congress passed no resolution before the 82nd Congress ended to change the day of meeting.

Q—Just what is the electoral college?

A—It is a body of Presidential electors from the various states. These electors are chosen by vote of the people on election day. Their purpose is to elect the President and Vice-President. Each state is entitled to as many electors as it has U. S. Senators and Representatives.

Q—If Eisenhower should die between now and the meeting of the electoral college, which casts its votes officially to elect the President and Vice-President on Dec. 15, would his running mate automatically become President?

A—If a Presidential candidate dies in the interval between the November popular vote and the December voting of the electoral college, a new choice to fill the ticket may be made by the National Committee or by a convention called by the Committee. Then it would be up to the electoral college to act.

Q. Has there ever been a President elected who was not running under the label of a political party?

A. Yes. George Washington, the first time he was elected. For his second term he headed the Federalist ticket, however.

Truman's Farewell Address Will Be One For The Books

By STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON is a city peopled by ghosts. The new great — the men who will soon wield immense power in this capital of the free world — are almost all elsewhere. The former great, the movers and shakers of only a few weeks ago, now seem actually to have shrunk in physical size, and even to have become faintly transparent, so that one looks nervously at a Cabinet officer, to make certain that the furniture behind him does not show through.

The ghostliest of all the former great is, of course, President Truman. And it is symptomatic of the Washington atmosphere during this curious interregnum that the chief business these days in the White House, that epicenter of world power, is the writing of a speech for the President.

This is to be Truman's Farewell Address — and President Truman evidently hopes that it will be called just that in the future. For the speech is being written with the history books firmly in mind. No other Truman speech has received such careful thought and anguished attention. This is the speech, apparently, for which Truman hopes he is to be remembered, and in the light of which his seven-year tenure of office is to be judged.

UNDECIDED ON ROSTRUM

Much thought is being given in the White House to the appropriate forum for the farewell address. One school of thought favors an address to Congress, between the time when the new Congress convenes and Dwight D. Eisenhower, is inaugurated as President. The halls of Congress, it is argued, will provide the appropriate aura of dignity and history-in-the-making. The trouble is, according to a second school of thought in the White House, that very few citizens will hear the President's historic words, since an address to Congress cannot be delivered at a good radio-listening hour. This second school favors a farewell address in the form of a fireside chat, at a time when the citizens will be handy to their radios.

Clearly, if Truman's farewell address is to have the impact over the years which he hopes, both the violent partisanship which has characterized Truman's politics) utterances, and the dullness which has often marked his more serious efforts must be avoided. Advance reports suggest that the note of humility which marked the President's public statements seven long years ago and which has since been buried under the famous Presidential cockiness will be introduced again in the farewell address.

The President, it is said, will even break all precedent by acknowledging that mistakes have been made in the last seven years. And the peroration will strike the appropriate note of "the king is dead — long live the king," with a plea for national unity and a pledge of loyal co-operation with the new regime. Obviously, however, the speech is not going to welcome the accession of the Republicans to power, nor are Truman's mistakes going to be emphasized at the expense of what he considers his successes.

He really believes, for example, that those twin Truman devils, "the lobbyists and the special interests" will move in to claim their own, with the inexperienced new President powerless to control their avarice. He really believes what he so often said during the campaign — that President Eisenhower will prove the captive of Sen. Taft, and that the basic structure of American foreign policy, of which he is so proud, is therefore in danger.

He also believes that all the troubles that will ensue will be blamed unjustly on the preceding Democratic administration by the Republicans. He has good reason for so believing, since these were precisely the tactics adopted by his own party after 1932. His farewell address will therefore be designed to act as a sort of preliminary makeweight in the minds of the voters, to balance the circus of investigations, into the sins of omission and commission of his defunct regime, which Truman now foresees. Thus the speech is being written both with the 1954 and 1956 elections, as well as the history books, very much in mind.

Something New In Hollywood (TV) Worries Movie Moguls

By MARQUIS CHILDS

HOLLYWOOD

SOMETHING new has been added to the Hollywood scene. It is the $12,000,000 CBS Television Center that was opened the other day with a typical dedicatory flurry.

Illuminated at night this strictly functional building looks like a great gleaming block of ice. But it is not its modern architecture that has jarred this community. As the sign of a swiftly expanding revolution in the entertainment industry, the CBS Center, along with NBC's new television studios here, has brought home the full force of what is happening across the country.

An extraordinary new medium of communication has potentialities that are as yet only dimly foreseen. The statistics are part of a press agent's dream come true. The new CBS building is skillfully designed so that it can be quickly expanded, with present plans calling for construction up to 50 million dollars.

Small wonder, then, that the film industry is nervous about this young giant. The trend of revenue for most of the big movie companies is downward. Some movie theaters are closing and the shadow over the movie industry's huge investment in real estate inevitably deepens.

The princely gamble involved in making a film that costs several million dollars is today a greater gamble than ever before. The biggest gamble of all is the industry's dependence for its very existence on revenue from foreign sales. On the average 41 per cent of sales are in foreign countries. For hundreds of millions around the globe the bright, skillful illusions created by Hollywood are an escape from the drab and often harsh realities of existence.

But these foreign sales are possible only in a world in which the flow of free trade is relatively unimpeded, with foreign countries able to earn dollars by selling their goods in America. Economic dislocation and political upheaval can quickly pare down the 41 per cent that represents the difference between solvency and bankruptcy. Realistic executives such as Frank Freeman of Paramount are thoroughly aware of this relationship.

JOHNSTON KEPT HOPPING

It is why the Motion Picture Producers Association of America hires such an able advocate as Eric Johnston, who spends much of his time around the world capital to another. Brazil imposes a new monetary ban for a new tariff restriction and a valuable market is gone. Inevitably Johnston is also at work on the Point 4 approach for raising industrial and living standards, with the stress on getting private American investment in underdeveloped countries.

With the growth of television the movies have been casting about for a way to get into the new field. Paramount is shortly to try in one small community an experiment in metered television, with householders paying a fee in order to receive a first-rate film on their TV sets. Paramount is also undertaking experimentation with a color TV tube.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Red Trials Shed Light On Noel Field

WASHINGTON

GRADUALLY the story of the three Fields who disappeared so mysteriously behind the Iron Curtain in the Spring of 1949 is beginning to unfold.

Bit by bit it can be pieced together from the current spy trials in Czechoslovakia, the earlier spy trial in Hungary, and by disclosures of refugees.

For three years first a word has been heard of Noel Field, former State Department official and European relief worker who went to Czechoslovakia in May, 1949 and dropped out of sight.

He disappeared suddenly from his Prague hotel room, though later he wired the hotel to keep his clothes, and on July 12 a man named Rene Kimel collected his things and paid his hotel bill.

On Aug. 22, 1949, his brother Herman boarded an airplane in Warsaw, to fly to Czechoslovakia. He disappeared en route. Passengers aboard the plane did not see him fall out. His name was on the passenger list when the plane departed. But when it got to Prague, he wasn't aboard—or so said the Communist police.

Only this week did the Austrian Communist newspaper "Volksstimme" admit what long had been suspected—that the Fields had been arrested.

Meanwhile, on Aug. 3, Noel Field's German-born wife went to Prague to look for him, but disappeared from sight on Aug. 17. Following this, Field's adopted daughter, Erika Glaser-Wallach, went from Washington to Berlin, reported by was met by Leo Bauer, editor of the Soviet-controlled Berlin radio, and has never been heard from since.

For three years, State Department queries have received a blank stare from the Communists, and the world has not known whether the Fields were Communists, American agents against Communism, spies or what.

Moscow Feared Field

HOWEVER, with the recent Czech spy trials, an explanation gradually unfolds. It boils down to this: Moscow had to get Noel Field out of the way before it brought charges against the alleged traitors in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Otherwise, had he been free in the West, he would have denied the evidence. Consequently, he was enticed into Czechoslovakia and arrested four months before the first trial began.

For many of the Communists now on trial were Field's friends. He had known them when they were refugees in Western Europe and when he was helping them as a relief worker for the Unitarian Service Committee.

Field, it appears, had been a Communist, though whether he remained one is not known. Testimony regarding his Communist connections was brought out in the Hiss trial, while Jules Humbert-Droz, president of the Swiss Communist party till 1942, stated in an interview with E. F. Gonda that Field was under Communist orders to take care of Communist refugees and arrange for their repatriation to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Russia.

He was also instructed by Moscow to put them in touch with the OSS, the American wartime undercover service, then operating in Europe. Field had worked with Allen Dulles, OSS chief of Switzerland, during the height of the war and had helped get valuable information from Germany through German Communists. And in 1945, he came to Paris with a letter from Dulles to Capt. Arthur Schlesinger of the OSS, now a professor at Harvard and more recently on the staff of Adlai Stevenson.

Field tried to persuade Schlesinger to make use of his Communist proteges through the OSS. However, Schlesinger informs me that he was suspicious, did not see why the United States should subsidize a group of Communist exiles, and rejected Field's offer.

This is important, for on this turns the crux of the present spy trials in Czechoslovakia and the previous trials in Hungary.

Field Was Refugee Key

AFTER the war ended, Field was given the job of arranging for the Communist refugees to return to their countries. And since he was an American, and the U. S. Army controlled much of the transportation, he was the one man who could get military passes, travel orders, etc.

The Communist exiles whom Field befriended went back to Eastern Europe and became the leaders of the local Communist governments. They became the leaders of their countries. They were 100 per cent Communists, but they were not Russian Communists. And to many of them, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, rather than Russia, came first.

Therefore, when Moscow began to call on the satellite countries for more military support, more wheat, more supplies, many of these leaders chafed. They watched the example of Tito who threw off the yoke of Moscow, and secretly wondered if they could do likewise.

Moscow, meanwhile, was depressing satellite economy to the same low level as Russia's; simultaneously building up Russian economy at satellite expense. The more this happened, the more Titoism spread.

That is the chief reason for the trials of Slansky, Clementis, and Foreign Minister Rjak in Hungary.

Rjak was the first to be tried in August, 1949, on the charge, among other things, of conspiring with the American "spy" Noel Field. Before that charge was made, the Kremlin knew that Field had to be put away. For Field, though a Communist, was an idealist who was spurring on Moscow's ruthlessness and who, if left in the free world, might talk.

Especially he might expose the falsity of the charge that the Titoists were conspiring with the United States. For Field was one man who both knew the truth and as a Communist himself would be believed.

Naturally one purpose of the spy trials is to smear the United States and show us to be plotting against the satellite nations.

Field may still talk. He may be called on as a witness in this or a future spy trial. But if so it will doubtless be under the same circumstances that Robert Vogeler testified in Hungary, and that most witnesses have testified in these weird Soviet trials—after subjection to drugs or a long period of terrorist tactics.