

Brownell's Proposal Goes Too Far

QUARTERBACK EISENHOWER'S team is midway through the second quarter of the game. But already many of the first-stringers have quit. Forty-four high-ranking officials have quit or given notice of departure to play the President is rightly concerned about this exodus of manpower and brainpower. But more will quit, and fewer men will be willing to take their places, if one of Attorney General Herbert Brownell's suggested changes in the "conflict-of-interest" statutes become law.

Present law prohibits former federal employees from handling, for two years after they leave the government, any matter they have dealt with while working for Uncle Sam. A court has ruled that this law applies only to proceedings involving a claim against the U.S. for money or property.

Mr. Brownell wants the law to apply to proceedings that involve regulation by government agencies—like Federal Trade Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission. We have nothing but praise for that proposal. It will help to deter government employees from making unwarranted decisions favorable to a private organization, then getting a job outside government as payment.

But, in addition, Mr. Brownell would prohibit all former federal workers from ever representing private interests in a matter they were concerned with while in government. That proposal goes much too far.

The present two-year limit discourages connivance. A government worker, tempted by an outside job offer, is not likely to be influenced in his decisions if he has to wait that long for the payoff. But it is patently unfair to prohibit him from forever putting his experience in government to work by representing private interests before government agencies.

Government workers are disadvantaged now, salary-wise. Many of them continue their work nevertheless, from a sense of patriotism, with the expectation of using their experience profitably outside of government.

Mr. Brownell's drastic proposal would convince many worthwhile men that government service is simply not worth its price. It should not become law.

One Way To Bet On A Sure Thing

THE jubilant Chamber of Commerce report on Charlotte's 1954 industrial expansion should sweep away any traces of uncertainty about the city's economic future. In the months to come, new firms will create thousands of new jobs in the community. Other site-seeking firms are eyeing the Queen City as a possible new home.

According to Fred A. Henninger, chairman of the local chamber's industrial committee, 64 firms are being carried in the industrial department's active files right now. Most are looking for distribution facilities and branch offices. But five are manufacturers of hard goods and appear to be excellent prospects for the Charlotte area.

Every new job created in Charlotte means more new blood for the city's economic life stream. This fact was underlined recently in a comprehensive survey of industrial growth in nine counties by the U. S. Chamber of Commerce. Add 100 new industrial jobs to the community and here's what you get in addition:

Seventy-four new jobs in other lines of work, 112 new households, 296 increase in population, a \$360,000 jump in retail sales, a \$590,000 increase annually in personal income, a \$270,000 bump in bank deposits, four new retail establishments, 107 new car registrations, 70 new residence telephones.

The lesson is clear. The community that can add new jobs by the hundred will be paid off in multiples of a hundred. It's a blue-chip investment.

Back To The Golden Age Of Peril

THE comic opera adventures of those five faint-hearted raft voyagers off the California coast didn't dampen the spirits of the man-against-nature set one whit. The call of the wilds is echoing urgently around the globe. Another raft will set out any tide now from South America, bound for the South Seas and high adventure. Naturally, a log will be kept and a book will be written. There always has to be a book.

These man-against-nature affairs may seem to possess all the unalloyed make-believe of a Disney cartoon but they are very real and very business-like. Charles Moore tells a friend who was taking the curative lulls, known as planters' punches in the Bahamas last winter. He lived off a springboard one day and before coming up for air met five authors on the ocean floor at work on manuscripts about undersea adventures.

We are also told that the Himalayas are suddenly populous with mountaineers carrying alpenstocks, dehydrated lunches and plans for chapter one. Every certified jungle in the world has at least one literary adventurer who, with pack

FROM THE RICHMOND TIMES-DISPATCH  
A DAY OF THE ABNORMAL NORMAL

IN THE current issue of the VIRGINIA QUARTERLY REVIEW, LEWIS Mumford provides a dismal picture of our life and times: "Hate, fear, suspicion and violence have become almost endemic. In America, abnormality is fast becoming the norm: automatism, our overriding providence, and irrationality itself the criterion of reason."

On a day when the headlines advise us that "No End Is Seen to H-Bomb Atom Tests," it is easy enough to find evidence—on the surface, at least—that we are indeed living "under the sign of Caligula." The retreat to barbarism sometimes seems to be increasing its pace; and whether this stems from prosperity, an age of wars and rumors of wars, or, as he suggests, the outstripping of our mores by science and technique, we cannot say.

But there are other things to take into consideration. Whether it means anything or not, church membership in the United States is at an all-time high; and Billy Graham, just back from Europe, asserts the demand for religious outlet in that continent is tremendous.

Whether it means anything or not, Americans apparently are so certain that the ultimate horror weapons never will be used that they largely ignore the warnings that flow from Civil Defense.

Whether it means anything or not, we cannot give up the hope that our civilization, or what passes for civilization, will muddle through yet that the over-evaluation of physical power and scientific truth which Mumford sees as the price of modern man's soul will shake

down into something like the "peaceful coexistence" international leaders keep mentioning as a possibility.

Thus, while it is difficult to challenge Mumford's diagnosis directly, at least we can contend that, come Eden or Armageddon, it will serve no purpose for us to yield supinely to the hate, fear, suspicion or violence, any more than to the abnormality, automatism or irrationality he finds at every hand.

There have been "times that try men's souls" before. And the souls have always triumphed, ultimately, over the times.

"Why," asks a correspondent, "do men lift water in both hands to rinse their faces when washing? I never saw a woman do it." Well, it's news to me that women don't use both hands. I'll answer your question if you'll answer mine. Men use both hands because it's the efficient way to get enough water to the face. Now, why don't women use both hands?—LEXINGTON LEADER.

The American people today are eating more ice cream, saving a federal dairy ration. This isn't strange. There are more people and the weather is warmer.

—NEW ORLEANS STATES.

All that is required to handle the two-year shelf, save an expert, is plenty of love. If you do not know how to love, high shelves off keeping things on will also help.—LAUREL (MISS) LEADER-CALL.

Pome In Which Is Offered A Probable Diagnosis Regarding A Bad Possibility: If you do not know how to love, high shelves off keeping things on will also help.—ATLANTA JOURNAL.

People's Platform  
Herb Seawell Is Disgusted

Editors, The News: I READ your editorial of July 15 and am concerned. You used the wrong word. I was not disappointed about the district attorney's business. I was disgusted. I am still disgusted to think that the national administration ignored and by-passed not only the Republican organization and our newly elected Congressmen, but practically every official citizen of North Carolina, Democrat and Republican.

Upwards of half a million folks in North Carolina voted for me for governor and I love North Carolina and all the folks living in this state. I know of my own knowledge that those in authority took special delight in delivering a rebuff to the state of North Carolina. It was a calculated thing. It was egotistical and done with a "holier than thou" attitude. It was typical of power put into the hands of "little minded" men who decided to operate behind their own backs and practice iron curtain, and then demonstrate to the folks of North Carolina their personal power and magnificence.

This kind of personal magnificence not only smacks of Fascism but it also has considerable elements of seriousness behind old-time methods of "carpet bagging."

It isn't a question of paragon. Republicans have been out of office so long they have learned how to make their own living. They do not need jobs.

What happened was an arrogant demonstration of contempt for the wishes and opinions of the best citizens of North Carolina and I don't like it a bit. I am disappointed. I am disgusted and I ask you to make this correction.

—H. F. SEAWELL JR.

An Appreciation From Chamber Of Commerce

Charlotte Editors, The News: MAY I express to you, on behalf of the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, our very sincere and deep appreciation for the very excellent support your newspaper gave to the dedication of the airport terminal building Saturday, July 10.

Certainly the event would have suffered greatly without this excellent support—indeed we are grateful.

—JAMES H. GLENN  
Executive Vice President

Local TV Viewers Are Captive Audience

Editors, The News: Charlotte MAY I get my two cents worth in on the "re-run film shows" on television screens? This is a bad situation. Something should be done.

Is it the network feeding these "used programs"? Or is it our local outlet? Whoever is at fault should remedy the situation at once. We are a captive audience as far as TV is concerned. But we will not add a little spice and variety to the situation.

In the meantime, can't we have an explanation from the stations? It isn't very much to ask.

—EDDIE REESE

U. S. Didn't Have Nations It 'Lost'

Editors, The News: PITTSBURGH ANSWER TO Francis M. Brownell's letter about his forthcoming trip back up North. I say as an ex-New Yorker (Newburgh, N. Y.) that, if he should be back here, I'm content where I am and I hope it continues as it is.

—RUDY RUGGIER

High Noon In Washington



Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON IMPORTANT backstage huddles have been taking place among both Democratic and Republican senators regarding Joe McCarthy. Upon these huddles will depend the outcome of the big test vote on McCarthy which Sen. Flanders of Vermont is bringing to a head next week.

(Editors' Note: Since this column was written, Sen. Flanders has decided to abandon his attempt to remove Sen. McCarthy from his committee chairmanships. Instead, Flanders will seek to have the Senate formally censure McCarthy next week.)

The huddling among Republican senators has been to urge Flanders not to vote for McCarthy. Some senators, such as Saltonstall of Massachusetts, have said:

"The huddling among Republican senators has been to urge Flanders not to vote for McCarthy. Some senators, such as Saltonstall of Massachusetts, have said:

"For I'll have to vote if I defeat me."

Saltonstall referred to was the strong McCarthy sentiment among the

Boston Irish and the fact that he faces a tough re-election fight. This was why he ducked having the Army-McCarthy probe referred to his Armed Services Committee as the White House originally suggested.

By no means a radical, Flanders began life as a machine-tool designer, now owns his own factory, is a millionaire. He was president of the Bryant Churning Grind Co. until elected to the Senate, is director of various insurance companies, was president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, has a distinguished record as an engineer.

And having watched McCarthy from the sidelines for four years, he is convinced the Republican Party cannot shrirk the responsibility of voting for or against McCarthy. He is too optimistic.

Flanders thinks he has 12 Republican senators who will vote with him. Other senators say he is too optimistic. But whether right or wrong, Flanders is determined to call for a showdown vote.

Backstage huddling among Democratic

How America Backpedaled On The Indochina Issue

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSON

WASHINGTON UNDER Secretary of State W. B. Acheson's journey to Geneva fortunately closes a period of dizzy gyrations in American policy.

The background story is as curious as it is instructive. Probably the best place to begin is in the Eisenhower-Churchill-Dulles-Eden "diplomatic weekend," as it is now called at the State Department. At that time, remember, Pierre Mendès-France had already become French Premier, with the avowed aim of getting peace in Indochina. And here in Washington, those policymakers who wanted American intervention instead of a new Munich in the Far East, had already been routed.

In these circumstances, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Churchill discussed and agreed upon the kind of Indochinese "settlement" that America and Britain could accept and guarantee. The terms they approved rather closely resembled the terms of an "honorable settlement," as defined in Paris by Premier Mendès-France.

In brief, the President and Sir Winston concluded that it would not be too bad if North Viet Nam—the Red River Delta—passed under Communist control, while Southern Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos were forbidden to communism.

DIFFUSE LINE SET Thus, they decided, there would be a defensible line in Indochina. They also decided, the line in Indochina could be guaranteed, and we could say to the Communist world in effect, "if you cross this line to grab the rest of Indochina, we shall fight."

These decisions fitted very neatly in turn, into the major decision of the diplomatic week-end. This was the decision to proceed without delay to form a United Nations defense community, in order to halt Communist aggression in this whole crucial area.

For reasons both moral and domestic—political, however, the President held firm on one point. If the French reached a reasonable Indochinese settlement with

Guatemalan Test: Can U. S. Fulfill The Red Promises?

By MARQUIS CHILDS

At San Marcos University in Lima, Peru, a full-scale debate has been initiated by the students to cover such questions as whether the United States has a right to a Communist government if the people wanted that kind of government and whether intervention by the United States was in any way justified.

UNCLES' LAST CHANCE Unless the conference at Rio is to be just another feast of good-will oratory and, therefore, futile or worse than futile, Washington must come up with something big and bold. In the wake of Guatemala some Latin-Americans are saying that this is a last chance for the United States to make a short of a new approach that wins wide support, the choice will be increasingly between right-wing dictatorship and communism.

To state the problem in economic terms is an oversimplification. It is essential in the first instance to understand the desires and aspirations, the upsurge of hope and grim determination in masses of people who have for so long felt that they had no control over their own destinies. If this tide is to be turned into the channel of freedom and democracy, American officialdom must establish a first-hand relationship with the new leadership coming into being. No longer will it be enough to know and work with a few of the "right people."

This is an advantage communism has had—dedicated agents who never surrender. When they are driven out, they take to the hills and live with the peasants in the same harsh, grinding existence. To the simple and usually illiterate peasant the promises of imagination and creativity must be more weight than words that come from a distance that often seems impossibly remote.

In other words, the attraction of the non-Communist world—its dynamism—must be at least as great as the spurious attraction of communism. That is the real test and the months just ahead, with the only Communist government established in the hemisphere now swept out of the way, will be critical.

Solons Divided On McCarthy Shutdown

senators is over how they should line up on the Flanders vote. If most of them agree with Flanders, McCarthy will lose his chairmanship. If they control one-half the Senate.

However, the likable and elusive leader of the Senate, Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, has decreed otherwise. Exactly two years ago, Johnson was in about the same position on the same issue. A Senate subcommittee had just adopted unanimously the most devastating report on McCarthy's finances ever made on a fellow senator. And the big question was: "What action should Democratic senators take?"

Johnson ruled "No action at all." Other senators, such as Fulbright of Arkansas and Hennings of Missouri, believed the Senate should force McCarthy to resign. McCarthy then and there. So did Neely of West Virginia.

Republicans were then busy challenging other senators, but not McCarthy. They challenged Democratic Sen. Chavez of New Mexico and their own Republican colleague, Langer of North Dakota, by refusing to let them take their seats permanently as they walked down the center aisle. They faced the humiliation of being subject to later vote and investigation.

But as the senator from Wisconsin walked up the rostrum to take the oath, not one voice rang out in challenge—despite the fact that only a few hours earlier a critical 400-page document on McCarthy's finances had been unanimously adopted and published for every senator to read.

Texas Oil Money The reason Lyndon Johnson ducked the McCarthy issue at that time was attributed to the fact that Texas oilmen were heavily behind McCarthy. Lyndon feared they might vote a candidate in the race against him if he backed McCarthy. So, as the Louisville Courier-Journal points out, the "oil" of the Democratic Party in the Senate were shaped by the election ambitions of one man rather than the good of the nation.