

Wilmington Morning Star

North Carolina's Oldest Daily Newspaper
Published Daily Except Sunday
R. E. Page, Publisher
Telephone All Departments 2-3311

Entered as Second Class Matter at Wilmington, N. C. Post Office Under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

SUBSCRIPTION RATES BY CARRIER IN NEW HANOVER COUNTY
Payable Weekly or in Advance

Time	Star	News	Combination
1 week	\$.30	\$.25	\$.50
1 Month	1.30	1.10	2.15
3 Months	3.90	3.25	6.50
6 Months	7.80	6.50	13.00
1 Year	15.60	13.00	26.00

(Above rates entitle subscriber to Sunday issue of Star-News)

SINGLE COPY
Wilmington News 5c
Morning Star 5c
Sunday Star-News 10c

By Mail: Payable Strictly in Advance
1 Month \$ 2.50 \$ 2.00 \$ 3.85
3 Months 6.00 4.00 7.70
6 Months 10.00 8.00 15.40
1 Year 20.00 16.00 30.80

(Above rates entitle subscriber to Sunday issue of Star-News)

WILMINGTON STAR
(Daily Without Sunday)
3 Months—\$1.85 6 Months—\$3.70 1 Year—\$7.40

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper, as well as all AP news dispatches.

MONDAY, AUGUST 17, 1947

Star Program

State ports with Wilmington favored in proportion with its resources, to include public terminals, tobacco storage warehouses, ship repair facilities, nearby sites for heavy industry and 35-foot Cape Fear river channel.

City auditorium large enough to meet needs for years to come.

Development of Southeastern North Carolina agricultural and industrial resources through better markets and food processing, pulp wood production and factories.

Emphasis on the region's recreation advantages and improvement of resort accommodations.

Improvement of Southeastern North Carolina's farm-to-market and primary roads, with a paved highway from Topsail inlet to Bald Head Island.

Continued effort through the City's Industrial Agency to attract more industries.

Proper utilization of Blumenthal airport for expanding air service.

Development of Southeastern North Carolina health facilities, especially in counties lacking hospitals, and including a Negro Health center.

Encouragement of the growth of commercial fishing.

Consolidation of City and County governments.

GOOD MORNING

The man who rules his spirit, saith the voice that cannot err, is greater than the one who takes a city. If each would have dominion of himself, would govern wisely, and thus show a true courage, knowledge, power, benevolence, all the princely soul of private virtues, then each would be a prince — a hero — a man in likeness of his maker. — Mrs. S. J. Hale.

High School Band Is Tops

The people of Wilmington, who have long been proud of the High school band, have additional reason now to take special pride in the organization. Competing before thirty thousand spectators at the North Carolina Tobacco exposition in Wilson with high school bands from Raleigh, Wilson, Kinston and Washington, the Wilmington players took first place and brought home a coveted trophy to add to their growing list.

The grading was on neatness, musical and marching ability. Lieutenant Lacock, the conductor, and his assistant, Mr. Richard Dobson, deserve great credit for this victory, but so do the boys and girls in the band.

It is not yet determined whether the group will attend the Harvest festival in Selma on September 3, but it is to be hoped that it does, and places first there too. At any rate every preparation must be made to send the band to the State Music festival in Greensboro next spring.

The Communist Strategy

The New York Liberal party, which broke with the American Labor party in the Empire state when the Labor party submitted to communist domination, has as its chairman Mr. Adolf A. Berle, Jr.

Mr. Berle has repored in a variety of political beds in the past. He was among the chosen few who foisted Fiorello H. LaGuardia on New York City as mayor. He supported Thomas E. Dewey when he first ran for district attorney. He was a member of the original Roosevelt new deal, and was rewarded with an assistant secretaryship in the State Department under Secretary Hull. Now he heads a political group which he declares is neither pink or black or any other pastel shade.

Whether his frequent change of allegiance entitles him to consideration either as a leader or a prophet is a moot question. But he gave voice to an utterance in New York a few days ago which at least deserves a hearing. The communist strategy in the United States, he declares, is to defeat President Truman next year and elect an isolationist President and Congress. He added the communists will unite

with "backward" members of the Republican party in this program.

"This should not seem so surprising," Mr. Berle said. "The most reactionary elements in our country co-operated with the Hitler regime for business purposes. They sold scrap iron and aviation gasoline to Japan. They are now intent on doing business with Russia."

"Their program calls for undermining the present State Department policy whenever it is possible."

Mr. Berle's declaration is not surprising. How he came to omit "backward" democrats from the alleged coalition, however, is. Assuming he meant to define "backward" as radical, we know the Democratic party has as many such members as the Republican party. The communists are baiting their hooks for everybody of this ilk, whatever their former political affiliation may have been.

We cannot easily believe that the rank and file of the major political parties in the United States will permit any group, whether in the liberal or the communist camp, to elect an isolationist president in 1948. The day for isolationism is past.

Whether the next president of the United States was the candidate of the republicans or the democrats, we are confident he will not have been misled by the Kremlin's ideology or try to count his nation out in international affairs, as the communists would like.

As Pegler Sees It

By WESTBROOK PEGLER
(Copyright, 1947, by King Features Syndicate, Inc.)

NEW YORK, Aug. 17. — It is useless to look to most of our Washington journalism for passably honest analysis of any issue involving the name of Roosevelt and the corruption that he bequeathed to a morally immature people who babble that it is wrong to expose the wickedness of his regime because, therefore, we create sympathy for the master rogue himself and defeat our ends politically. Damn it, most of these sodden hangers-on think only in terms of political and material loss or gain. Don't expose the graft and hypocrisy, the treachery and the continuing impositions of this breed of parasites because, in the first place, the boss was a great man by the same measure that made Hitler and Stalin great. Don't speak ill of him because he is dead and can't talk back as though he didn't have a hundred thousand vengeful thugs to write his defense if there were one in Christian morals. And Hitler and Mussolini, too, are dead, but, by some special clause in the rule, enjoy no such immunity.

This queer, depressing reaction to the exposures of the conduct of Elliott Roosevelt and Howard Hughes has been expressed in most of the privileged newspaper comment on the sorry show presented by the Senate's subcommittee. Granted that Senators Brewster and Ferguson did mishandle their job and yield the initiative to these two audacious adventurers, is that something for American journalists to gloat about who profess to have any concern for decency in government? Is that any excuse to applaud these two and their success in getting away with a defiance that should be the sorrow of all good citizens?

As the game has been scored to date by this corrupted journalism so long exposed to the cynicism of the greedy opportunists of the Roosevelt revolution, it would seem that the Senators had been caught in some flagrant misconduct and had convicted themselves under the clearer prosecution by Elliott and a man who frankly resorted to the hiring of pretty young women for ulterior motives.

Senator Brewster was accused of offering to call off this inquiry if Hughes would agree to the provisions of a bill to combine the best elements of the big cut-throat American overseas Airlines for patriotic reasons. The object was to concentrate their diffused strength and enable them to compete in union under the American flag against subsidized Overseas Airlines of other nations. These subsidies, incidentally, are paid by the American taxpayer, who thus plainly is subsidizing competition against the American lines. The object of Brewster's bill was to stop the hacking and slashing between the Americans, and save their strength for the competition with other nations. It may be an unwise proposal, but to suggest that it was a crooked scheme to put Howard Hughes out of business for the benefit of Pan-American is merely to accept Hughes' own motivated, reckless, utterly irresponsible pleading in his own interest. His pleading was whooped up, incidentally, as a counter-blast to the disgusting disclosures that his company had resorted to the practice of backslapping and pouring drinks for Army officers, and apparently for others, and providing women for them, at company expense and expending nickel-by-nickel accounts of the expenses.

What kind of hospitality is that, anyway? What kind of man would do that dirty trick to his guests and preserve the records so that they could later be used to influence sensitive or vulnerable members of these happy little Companies? Does a decent man thrust his guests unknowingly into the society of professional young women about town and then file away in a memorandum that this girl got \$75 and that one \$100 and that one under a \$20 bill and \$175 worth of nylons because she was "charming"? Certainly no man or woman of the world will overlook the scandalous possibilities here. This Hughes is no boy. He has been around Hollywood and the Waldorf for years, and most of the hot New York and Las Vegas night clubs, and he knows plenty. He knows enough to duck when the photographers try to take his picture with women who might get predators' ideas.

Brewster, the poor old, let Hughes muddy him up with insinuations that Brewster was earning some pay from Sam Pryor and Juan Trippe of Pan-American in offering this bill to combine the Overseas Airlines. Brewster bounced himself over his own ostrich-egg skull with his own saucy red circus bladder and didn't care for the presence of mind to explain that Pan-American also objected to his bill just as angrily as Trans-World did. The Senator seems to have forgotten to point out that almost two years ago Pan-American filed official documents petitioning the courts to redress an injustice done them and a great favor granted Hughes in the allotment or routes abroad to American Transoceanic Lines.

General H. H. Arnold, who finally authorized the contract given Hughes for 100 fast reconnaissance planes, urgently and aggressively recommended by Elliott Roosevelt in the grotesque role of flying general, admitted pointedly that he did this by a "verbal" order. Is that the way they were doing business in the air force in items of \$22,000,000? They certainly had plenty of typewriters and WAC's to run them by that order was "verbal," one Johnny Meyer admitted that he squandered enormously of Hughes' money on drinks, luxuries and other entertainment for Elliott Roosevelt, the son of the President, and spent, specifically, \$1,400 on Elliott's third wedding alone. And he admitted moreover that this money was spent on this young rounder solely because Elliott recommended that Hughes' company get this job.

Yet this vulgar extravagance in time of war was kissed off as a normal and customary sort of thing in American business, and Elliott had the gall to criticize General O. P. Echols, of the material command, in a manner of nasty insinuation, because Echols, after the war, went to work for a group of aviation interests as a civilian. This virtuous rebuke came, mind you, from a fellow who had trimmed suckers for a fortune on the strength of his father's name and had served as president of a thing called the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce when he knew no more about flying than any juvenile hedgehogger in a June-Bug, but — mind this — but when his father was President of the United States.

Cost Of Government

In an analysis of an article dealing with the cost of government and the people's food bill, which was written by its Washington correspondent, Mr. Harry Wohl, the St. Louis Star-Times notes that figures can become so huge "they cease to have meaning the human mind can comprehend." The figures in Mr. Wohl's article "cannot be understood even after hours of explanation."

To make them comprehensible, the Star-Times editor, obviously after hours of study, reduces them to terms we can grasp by the process of comparison. "In the year 1929," he writes, "the people spent 19.6 billion dollars for food and only 3.7 billion for government. In other words, government's cost was 18.9 per cent of that for food." These are figures we can understand, as are those that follow:

"By 1945 the food cost had almost doubled, being 36 billions. But the cost of government had been multiplied by 25, rising to 90.5 billions.

"By 1946 the food cost had more than doubled since 1929, being 42.9 billions. But while the cost of government had declined slightly, it was still more than 12 times that in 1929, or 44.9 billion dollars."

Why has this happened? The Star-Times believes the cost of World War II "wouldn't have been anywhere close to its tremendous peak had it not been for the short-sighted government policy that inflated everything to encourage war production. Prices were inflated. Wages were inflated. Hence the staggering increase of 2,400 per cent in the cost of government from 1929 to 1945."

This is the national picture. Being thorough and painstaking in his task, the Star-Times editor carries his comparison to its logical conclusion. "Let's look at the same figures reduced to terms of each individual inhabitant of the United States. In 1929 the American man or woman said: 'This year I am going to spend exactly \$162 for food, and I am going to buy \$31 worth of government.' In other words he spent less than one-fifth as much for his government as he spent for his food. But what has happened? By 1944 this same individual had to say, 'This year I shall spend \$229 for my food and God help me, whether I like it or not, I shall have to spend \$699 for my government.' In other words, his food cost in 1944 was 41 per cent greater than in 1929, but his government cost was 2,154 per cent greater."

What this all boils down to, we are told, and cannot believe differently, is that the people en masse are on a road that will lead straight to national bankruptcy. "Unless the pressure of public opinion forces the Congress to cut government spending by billions of dollars and restore the integrity of the United States Treasury, there will be no getting off that road."

Every last mother's son of us has been feeling the pressure of federal extravagance and waste since the inflationary spiral started with the outbreak of World War II. But we have had only a vague idea of what it was doing to the national and the individual economic situation. Here it is told in plain and simple terms.

The Star-Times has performed a

Quotations

We must find a way to bridge the torrent of doubt and suspicion between the eastern and western powers or the eventual result would be conflict. — Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Producers, Inc.

Production and only production which creates a balance of supply and demand is the only sure cure for the increasing wage and price spiral. — George M. Humphrey, Pittsburgh coal and steel executive.

The toughest thing about success is that you've got to keep going a success. Talent is a starting point in business. You've got to keep working that talent. — Irving Berlin, song writer.

We keep the Iron curtain down on how much we don't know, which is practically everything. — Charles F. Kettering, General Motors executive.

Comments

ONE WAY TO STOP IT

Another North Carolina town has disclosed its sensitiveness to literary criticism. Some Rocky Mount citizens resent Martha Gellhorn's reference to the train tracks which bisect its main business district and her remarks approving the unkempt condition of its streets.

Well, there are more ways than one to respond or react to criticism. One is to grow hot under the collar about it—a process which gives an individual or town a princely publicity but tends to focus more attention upon the defects criticized, if real. Another is to ignore the criticism, which usually has the effect of causing it to pass without more than passing public notice. But where the criticism is justified, the best response is to do something definitely remedial about the situation or conditions that have been spotlighted for attack.—Twin City Sentinel (Winston-Salem).

WHO SHALL HAVE THE RUHR

Holding out for socialization of the mines and factories of the Ruhr, Ernest Bevin wants to know who is going to have these industries if the people do not. Given a choice in the matter, the people would probably be willing for somebody to take them over who can make them produce. — Greenville (S. C.) News.

THE SCIENCE BILL

An Editorial From The Wall Street Journal

When it was proposed that the federal government make a major research contribution to scientific research, there immediately arose the fear that government would soon dominate the field; that such a lever for state control of the economy would be just too tempting.

The totalitarian rulers had so employed science. There was and is—happily not as much as there was—enough of the spirit in Washington to justify the fear that it could happen here.

So when Congress set up a National Science Foundation, it provided government money to be spent at the discretion of a group of citizens almost free from supervision. President Truman vetoed the bill and many scientists seem surprised and disgruntled.

It is a commentary on the scientists' understanding of politics that a group of them ever thought that such an arrangement would or could be set up or long continued if set up. Had President Truman consented to this bill, it would have been a comparatively short time before some committee of Congress would be looking into the expenditure of the government funds. The committee undoubtedly would be able to show that they had been spent in some cases unaccountably and without results. They would be some very red faced scientists and the imposition of the political control they dread.

There are some facts of life that our scientists—probably the most unselfish and practically idealistic group in the world—must learn. Messing with politics invites political domination. Years ago the

valuable public service in telling the story of our frustration in a way we can all at last comprehend. Unless we are extraordinarily indifferent to our fate we will see that the second session of the 80th. Congress does some constructive work on domestic relief legislation.

As Pegler Sees It

By WESTBROOK PEGLER
(Copyright, 1947, by King Features Syndicate, Inc.)

NEW YORK, Aug. 17. — It is useless to look to most of our Washington journalism for passably honest analysis of any issue involving the name of Roosevelt and the corruption that he bequeathed to a morally immature people who babble that it is wrong to expose the wickedness of his regime because, therefore, we create sympathy for the master rogue himself and defeat our ends politically. Damn it, most of these sodden hangers-on think only in terms of political and material loss or gain. Don't expose the graft and hypocrisy, the treachery and the continuing impositions of this breed of parasites because, in the first place, the boss was a great man by the same measure that made Hitler and Stalin great. Don't speak ill of him because he is dead and can't talk back as though he didn't have a hundred thousand vengeful thugs to write his defense if there were one in Christian morals. And Hitler and Mussolini, too, are dead, but, by some special clause in the rule, enjoy no such immunity.

This queer, depressing reaction to the exposures of the conduct of Elliott Roosevelt and Howard Hughes has been expressed in most of the privileged newspaper comment on the sorry show presented by the Senate's subcommittee. Granted that Senators Brewster and Ferguson did mishandle their job and yield the initiative to these two audacious adventurers, is that something for American journalists to gloat about who profess to have any concern for decency in government? Is that any excuse to applaud these two and their success in getting away with a defiance that should be the sorrow of all good citizens?

As the game has been scored to date by this corrupted journalism so long exposed to the cynicism of the greedy opportunists of the Roosevelt revolution, it would seem that the Senators had been caught in some flagrant misconduct and had convicted themselves under the clearer prosecution by Elliott and a man who frankly resorted to the hiring of pretty young women for ulterior motives.

Senator Brewster was accused of offering to call off this inquiry if Hughes would agree to the provisions of a bill to combine the best elements of the big cut-throat American overseas Airlines for patriotic reasons. The object was to concentrate their diffused strength and enable them to compete in union under the American flag against subsidized Overseas Airlines of other nations. These subsidies, incidentally, are paid by the American taxpayer, who thus plainly is subsidizing competition against the American lines. The object of Brewster's bill was to stop the hacking and slashing between the Americans, and save their strength for the competition with other nations. It may be an unwise proposal, but to suggest that it was a crooked scheme to put Howard Hughes out of business for the benefit of Pan-American is merely to accept Hughes' own motivated, reckless, utterly irresponsible pleading in his own interest. His pleading was whooped up, incidentally, as a counter-blast to the disgusting disclosures that his company had resorted to the practice of backslapping and pouring drinks for Army officers, and apparently for others, and providing women for them, at company expense and expending nickel-by-nickel accounts of the expenses.

What kind of hospitality is that, anyway? What kind of man would do that dirty trick to his guests and preserve the records so that they could later be used to influence sensitive or vulnerable members of these happy little Companies? Does a decent man thrust his guests unknowingly into the society of professional young women about town and then file away in a memorandum that this girl got \$75 and that one \$100 and that one under a \$20 bill and \$175 worth of nylons because she was "charming"? Certainly no man or woman of the world will overlook the scandalous possibilities here. This Hughes is no boy. He has been around Hollywood and the Waldorf for years, and most of the hot New York and Las Vegas night clubs, and he knows plenty. He knows enough to duck when the photographers try to take his picture with women who might get predators' ideas.

Brewster, the poor old, let Hughes muddy him up with insinuations that Brewster was earning some pay from Sam Pryor and Juan Trippe of Pan-American in offering this bill to combine the Overseas Airlines. Brewster bounced himself over his own ostrich-egg skull with his own saucy red circus bladder and didn't care for the presence of mind to explain that Pan-American also objected to his bill just as angrily as Trans-World did. The Senator seems to have forgotten to point out that almost two years ago Pan-American filed official documents petitioning the courts to redress an injustice done them and a great favor granted Hughes in the allotment or routes abroad to American Transoceanic Lines.

General H. H. Arnold, who finally authorized the contract given Hughes for 100 fast reconnaissance planes, urgently and aggressively recommended by Elliott Roosevelt in the grotesque role of flying general, admitted pointedly that he did this by a "verbal" order. Is that the way they were doing business in the air force in items of \$22,000,000? They certainly had plenty of typewriters and WAC's to run them by that order was "verbal," one Johnny Meyer admitted that he squandered enormously of Hughes' money on drinks, luxuries and other entertainment for Elliott Roosevelt, the son of the President, and spent, specifically, \$1,400 on Elliott's third wedding alone. And he admitted moreover that this money was spent on this young rounder solely because Elliott recommended that Hughes' company get this job.

Yet this vulgar extravagance in time of war was kissed off as a normal and customary sort of thing in American business, and Elliott had the gall to criticize General O. P. Echols, of the material command, in a manner of nasty insinuation, because Echols, after the war, went to work for a group of aviation interests as a civilian. This virtuous rebuke came, mind you, from a fellow who had trimmed suckers for a fortune on the strength of his father's name and had served as president of a thing called the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce when he knew no more about flying than any juvenile hedgehogger in a June-Bug, but — mind this — but when his father was President of the United States.

Politics And Sugar

By PETER EDSON

WASHINGTON — Biggest political enigma of the last session of Congress was the Sugar Act of 1938. A Democratic White House administration supported the act, proposed to cartelize allowed the U. S. mainland and off-shore sugar producers to dictate a bill which sets up a virtual sugar trust. A Republican Congress supposed to be dedicated to free enterprise passed a bill which is full of controls.

It was smart politics, all right, to get the bill passed this year. That avoids seven months of wrangling in 1948.

When the industry-written bill hit the House floor a little over a month ago, however, it immediately drew fire. Rep. John W. Flannagan of Virginia, former chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, in which the New Deal's original sugar quota control legislation had been written, called the new act "the most vicious piece of price-fixing ever proposed in Congress. I am in the role of the lone wolf," said Flannagan. "I am the only one who will oppose this bill."

Flannagan wanted to know what the State Department's 202-e amendment to collect claims from sugar-producing countries in default to U. S. citizens really meant. Who would produce the sugar that would be cut from the quotas of these defaulting countries? Hastily the bill was amended to give such quotas to U. S. producers.

One of the changes which Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson had proposed was to strike out several provisions carried over from the old Sugar Act of 1937. The required U. S. sugar growers to pay their labor a fair wage and to observe child labor standards.

On Flannagan's insistence, plus pressure from CIO sugar workers' union and the Florida and Louisiana cane growers, these provisions went back in. That was the only fight, however, made against the bill in the House.

In the Senate, the bill had a much narrower squeak. With only five days of the session remaining, Sen. Dennis Chavez of New



Economist Discusses Socialism

By ROGER W. BABSON

BRIDGEPORT, Conn. I wanted to visit some typical New England city to learn how its people are feeling. As Bridgeport perhaps suffered most through the depression of the thirties and then—according to Newton's Law of action and Reaction — prospered most later during World War II, I am writing from here.

Bridgeport is a city of about 150,000 people. These people have had a reputation as being radical and for many years have elected a socialist mayor. He, however, has been hard to be fair and has had the vote of many conservative people. At one time Bridgeport was the only city in New England with a socialistic government.

During the recent war these people prospered greatly. Not only is this a large center for small machinery and tools of all kinds, but it makes guns and ammunition even in peace times. Hence, it was and is a war city. The conversion to peace time products was difficult and much unemployment was created for 1946 and 1947, but this has not come about. Bridgeport continues to be prosperous. Certainly if this applies to Bridgeport it should apply to most manufacturing centers in New England and elsewhere.

The truth is that the entire United States — as President Truman has recently pointed out — is at an all-time high. We have more employment and greater sales today than ever before in our history. The only disappointed people seem to be those of some summer resorts who had planned on a record year which has not occurred. Too, many people seem to be economizing during vacations. They take only a twenty dollar bill and one suit of clothes and change neither during the trip. This however is not a bad sign. These people are saving money for something which will last longer and perhaps give them a little vacation each day of the year.

When the stock market was at its ebb — some months ago — many readers criticized me for being optimistic during the early months of 1947. They felt that my forecasts for a "good 1947" would be wrong. Each month, however, has confirmed my optimism. Investors who cashed in half of their profits did a safe thing; but the "smart ones" who sold everything are now disappointed bears.

A Bridgeport socialist, who knew that the United States money in circulation had tripled from \$8,000,000,000 in 1940 to over \$24,000,000,000 today asked a local banker: "Why am I not three times as rich now as I was seven years ago?" This interested the banker enough to take a Gallup Poll of the next 100 women leaving his savings bank. He asked each woman how much money she usually carried in her pocket-book before World War II? These women usually replied: "About four or five dollars." He then asked them to count how much they now had as they left the bank after making their weekly deposit. He found that all the women of Bridgeport were averaging twelve to fifteen dollars in their pockets, — or three times what they formerly carried.

But why do these people vote the socialistic ticket? The answer is because Bridgeport has an honest Mayor Jasper McLevey, who leads the Socialist Party but who truly loves the people. He looks after every boy and girl as if it were his own boy or girl. He has a heart, generous with the poor, enforcing the laws and especially protecting youth. He is more than

Comments

ONE WAY TO STOP IT

Another North Carolina town has disclosed its sensitiveness to literary criticism. Some Rocky Mount citizens resent Martha Gellhorn's reference to the train tracks which bisect its main business district and her remarks approving the unkempt condition of its streets.

Well, there are more ways than one to respond or react to criticism. One is to grow hot under the collar about it—a process which gives an individual or town a princely publicity but tends to focus more attention upon the defects criticized, if real. Another is to ignore the criticism, which usually has the effect of causing it to pass without more than passing public notice. But where the criticism is justified, the best response is to do something definitely remedial about the situation or conditions that have been spotlighted for attack.—Twin City Sentinel (Winston-Salem).

WHO SHALL HAVE THE RUHR

Holding out for socialization of the mines and factories of the Ruhr, Ernest Bevin wants to know who is going to have these industries if the people do not. Given a choice in the matter, the people would probably be willing for somebody to take them over who can make them produce. — Greenville (S. C.) News.

THE SCIENCE BILL

An Editorial From The Wall Street Journal

When it was proposed that the federal government make a major research contribution to scientific research, there immediately arose the fear that government would soon dominate the field; that such a lever for state control of the economy would be just too tempting.

The totalitarian rulers had so employed science. There was and is—happily not as much as there was—enough of the spirit in Washington to justify the fear that it could happen here.

So when Congress set up a National Science Foundation, it provided government money to be spent at the discretion of a group of citizens almost free from supervision. President Truman vetoed the bill and many scientists seem surprised and disgruntled.

It is a commentary on the scientists' understanding of politics that a group of them ever thought that such an arrangement would or could be set up or long continued if set up. Had President Truman consented to this bill, it would have been a comparatively short time before some committee of Congress would be looking into the expenditure of the government funds. The committee undoubtedly would be able to show that they had been spent in some cases unaccountably and without results. They would be some very red faced scientists and the imposition of the political control they dread.

There are some facts of life that our scientists—probably the most unselfish and practically idealistic group in the world—must learn. Messing with politics invites political domination. Years ago the

THE SCIENCE BILL

An Editorial From The Wall Street Journal

When it was proposed that the federal government make a major research contribution to scientific research, there immediately arose the fear that government would soon dominate the field; that such a lever for state control of the economy would be just too tempting.

The totalitarian rulers had so employed science. There was and is—happily not as much as there was—enough of the spirit in Washington to justify the fear that it could happen here.

So when Congress set up a National Science Foundation, it provided government money to be spent at the discretion of a group of citizens almost free from supervision. President Truman vetoed the bill and many scientists seem surprised and disgruntled.

It is a commentary on the scientists' understanding of politics that a group of them ever thought that such an arrangement would or could be set up or long continued if set up. Had President Truman consented to this bill, it would have been a comparatively short time before some committee of Congress would be looking into the expenditure of the government funds. The committee undoubtedly would be able to show that they had been spent in some cases unaccountably and without results. They would be some very red faced scientists and the imposition of the political control they dread.

There are some facts of life that our scientists—probably the most unselfish and practically idealistic group in the world—must learn. Messing with politics invites political domination. Years ago the

THE SCIENCE BILL

An Editorial From The Wall Street Journal

When it was proposed that the federal government make a major research contribution to scientific research, there immediately arose the fear that government would soon dominate the field; that such a lever for state control of the economy would be just too tempting.

The totalitarian rulers had so employed science. There was and is—happily not as much as there was—enough of the spirit in Washington to justify the fear that it could happen here.

So when Congress set up a National Science Foundation, it provided government money to be spent at the discretion of a group of citizens almost free from supervision. President Truman vetoed the bill and many scientists seem surprised and disgruntled.

It is a commentary on the scientists' understanding of politics that a group of them ever thought that such an arrangement would or could be set up or long continued if set up. Had President Truman consented to this bill, it would have been a comparatively short time before some committee of Congress would be looking into the expenditure of the government funds. The committee undoubtedly would be able to show that they had been spent in some cases unaccountably and without results. They would be some very red faced scientists and the imposition of the political control they dread.

There are some facts of life that our scientists—probably the most unselfish and practically idealistic group in the world—must learn. Messing with politics invites political domination. Years ago the

Drug Brings Hive Relief

BY WILLIAM A. O'BRIEN, M. D.

Benadryl brings immediate relief to most patients with attacks of hives. These chronic hives tend to relapse as soon as the drug is stopped. Hives are pockets of fluid in the skin with the difficulty caused by the collection of histamine in the tissues. Benadryl neutralizes the chemical.

The number of hives present one time runs from one to several hundred, and the size from the head to as large as the flat of the hand. Fluid accumulations vary from those which are superficial to large, deep, disfiguring swellings. In all forms of hives, itching and swelling are the chief complaints.

Any part of the body may be affected by hives, but particular apt to be affected. In persons who are subject to hives, there is a tendency for the condition to come back in the same spots. Some two-thirds of all people have had one or more attacks of hives at their lifetime.

Hives have an unpredictable course. The majority of swellings flare up last a few days to a week, and then disappear. The condition can become chronic. At this time, this type has been noted for its stubborn resistance to most forms of treatment. Large swellings in vital structures such as the throat, may interfere with breathing, and intense itching, insomnia and discomfort interfere with the victim's sleeping powers.

Paul A. O'Leary, M. D., of the Clinic, reports that he has seen many hives, benadryl relieved the majority of patients within a few hours to days. Benadryl should not be used except under a physician's direction, because it may cause drowsiness, dizziness, weakness and loss of consciousness. These difficulties develop early, and disappear as the drug is discontinued.

Food such as shellfish, strawberries, eggs, and chocolate are drugs such as quinine, barbiturates, iodine and headache remedies are the commonest causes of hives. Hives also may be caused by light, heat and cold. When cause in known it is advisable to avoid the food or drug even though treatment is effective in many cases.

QUESTION: Some time ago I mentioned that vitamins were gray hair to its original color. ANSWER: Wrong. There is scientific proof that gray hair has been restored to its original color by the use of vitamins.

Just In Fun

HIDDEN MOTIVE

Rufus, a Negro with a white face, courted the Widow White while she bent industriously over her wash-tub. His remarks were more and more romantic in length, he offered a proposal of marriage.

"Are you sure you love me?" sighed the buxom widow, as she gazed in her wringing. "Sho' Mandy, sho'!" Rufus assured her. "I loves you."

Mandy picked up another garment and meditatively rubbed over the washing-board. In her mind, hope seemed to be coming with doubt. Suddenly she raised her head, and fixing a wary eye on her waiting Romeo, demanded:

"Look here, Rufus, you ain't no 'yo' job, is you?" — Wall Street Journal.

RHETORICAL QUESTION

Meeting a casual acquaintance on Fifth Avenue one day, Levant so far forgot himself as to inquire politely: "How are you today, Williams?"

Williams proceeded to give Levant an unsparring account of most lamentable condition, stating not a single ache or pain.

After five minutes of the recital, Levant shrieked: "But dear fellow, I didn't mean to say 'yo' job'!" — Wall Street Journal.

GAS FLOWING

Detroit reports a natural gas well flowing at the rate of 400 cubic feet a day, but is unable to give the gentleman's name who told what office he seeks. — Michigan Commercial Appeal.

The Science Bill

An Editorial From The Wall Street Journal

When it was proposed that the federal government make a major research contribution to scientific research, there immediately arose the fear that government would soon dominate the field; that such a lever for state control of the economy would be just too tempting.

The totalitarian rulers had so employed science. There was and is—happily not as much as there was—enough of the spirit in Washington to justify the fear that it could happen here.

So when Congress set up a National Science Foundation, it provided government money to be spent at the discretion of a group of citizens almost free from supervision. President Truman vetoed the bill and many scientists seem surprised and disgruntled.

It is a commentary on the scientists' understanding of politics that a group of them ever thought that such an arrangement would or could be set up or long continued if set up. Had President Truman consented to this bill, it would have been a comparatively short time before some committee of Congress would be looking into the expenditure of the government funds. The committee undoubtedly would be able to show that they had been spent in some cases unaccountably and without results. They would be some very red faced scientists and the imposition of the political control they dread.

There are some facts of life that our scientists—probably the most unselfish and practically idealistic group in the world—must learn. Messing with politics invites political domination. Years ago the

The Science Bill

An Editorial From The Wall Street Journal

When it was proposed that the federal government make a major research contribution to scientific research, there immediately arose the fear that government would soon dominate the field; that such a lever for state control of the economy would be just too tempting.

The totalitarian rulers had so employed science. There was and is—happily not as much as there was—enough of the spirit in Washington to justify the fear that it could happen here.

So when Congress set up a National Science Foundation, it provided government money to be spent at the discretion of a group of citizens almost free from supervision. President Truman vetoed the bill and many scientists seem surprised and disgruntled.

It is a commentary on the scientists' understanding of politics that a group of them ever thought that such an arrangement would or could be set up or long continued if set up. Had President Truman consented to this bill, it would have been a comparatively short time before some committee of Congress would be looking into the expenditure of the government funds. The committee undoubtedly would be able to show that they had been spent in some cases unaccountably and without results. They would be some very red faced scientists and the imposition of the political control they dread.

There are some facts of life that our scientists—probably the most unselfish and practically idealistic group in the world—must learn. Messing with politics invites political domination. Years ago the

The Science Bill

An Editorial From The Wall Street Journal

When it was proposed that the federal government make a major research contribution to scientific research, there immediately arose the fear that government would soon dominate the field; that such a lever for state control of the economy would be just too tempting.

The totalitarian rulers had so employed science. There was and is—happily not as much as there was—enough of the spirit in Washington to justify the fear that it could happen here.

So when Congress set up a National Science Foundation, it provided government money to be spent at the discretion of a group of citizens almost free from supervision. President Truman vetoed the bill and many scientists seem surprised and disgruntled.

It is a commentary on the scientists' understanding of politics that a group of them ever thought that such an arrangement would or could be set up or long continued if set up. Had President Truman consented to this bill, it would have been a comparatively short time before some committee of Congress would be looking into the expenditure of the government funds. The committee undoubtedly would be able to show that they had been spent in some cases unaccountably and without results. They would be some very red faced scientists and the imposition of the political control they dread.

There are some facts of life that our scientists—probably the most unselfish and practically idealistic group in the world—must learn. Messing with politics invites political domination. Years ago the

The Science Bill

An Editorial From The Wall Street Journal

When it was proposed that the federal government make a major research contribution to scientific research, there immediately arose the fear that government would soon dominate the field; that such a lever for state control of the economy would be just too tempting.

The totalitarian rulers had so employed science. There was and is—happily not as much as there was—enough of the spirit in Washington to justify the fear that it could happen here.

So when Congress set up a National Science Foundation, it provided government money to be spent at the discretion of a group of citizens almost free from supervision. President Truman vetoed the bill and many scientists seem surprised and disgruntled.

It is a commentary on the scientists' understanding of politics that a group of them ever thought that such an arrangement would or could be set up or long continued if set up. Had President Truman consented to this bill, it would have been a comparatively short time before some committee of Congress would be looking into the expenditure of the government funds. The committee undoubtedly would be able to show that they had been spent in some cases unaccountably and without results. They would be some very red faced scientists and the imposition of the political control they dread.

There are some facts of life that our scientists—probably the most unselfish and practically idealistic group in the world—must learn. Messing with politics invites political domination. Years ago the

The Science Bill

An Editorial From The Wall Street Journal

When it was proposed that the federal government make a major research contribution to scientific research, there immediately arose the fear that government would soon dominate the field; that such a lever for state control of the economy would be just too tempting.

The totalitarian rulers had so employed science. There was and is—happily not as much as there was—enough of the spirit in Washington to justify the fear that it could happen here.

So when Congress set up a National Science Foundation, it provided government money to be spent at the discretion of a group of citizens almost free from supervision. President Truman vetoed the bill and many scientists seem surprised and disgruntled.

It is a commentary on the scientists' understanding of politics that a group of them ever thought that such an arrangement would or could be set up or long continued if set up. Had President Truman consented to this bill, it would have been a comparatively short time before some committee of Congress would be looking into the expenditure of the