

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

'Under God'

"I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the country for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

That is the Pledge of Allegiance as it stands now. The words "under God" were inserted there by the Senate and House of Representatives, and on Monday, Flag Day, President Eisenhower put his signature on the bill.

The sponsors of the bill adding "under God" to the Pledge were Representative Louis C. Rabaut, Democrat, Michigan, and Sen. Homer Ferguson, Republican, Michigan.

The Pledge of Allegiance is nobly worded, simply stated, and unequivocal. Those who long have favored recognition of Divinity in it contend that the framers of the Declaration of Independence recognized God in their immortal document, and that the American people always have been basically a religious people.

So it is seemly and altogether fitting and proper that now, in the Pledge, we formally recognize that this nation exists "under God."

Our chief enemy is not only godless, but scorns all religion, all churches. Until recent years the Communists openly shouted that their purpose was to "tear God from the sky and religion from the heart of man." They have played down their anti-God propaganda in recent years, but remain intensely atheistic, so that no person may be admitted to the Communist party unless he abjures all religion and becomes a militant atheist.

Washington praying at Valley Forge is a cherished American concept. Lincoln took his many problems to the Lord in prayer, and Eisenhower's inauguration prayer is a moving expression of reliance upon the Higher Power.

"Under God" belongs in the Pledge.

Unbelievable

The average decent person finds it impossible to believe that any father would furnish his 11-year-old son with plenty of whiskey, and permit, all but encourage him, to smoke a pack of cigarettes a day. That is exactly what Lewis Gregory of Chicago, did.

The boy who was encouraged to drink whiskey and to smoke a pack of cigarettes is a "comic book" addict, as well. He read one bizarre horror-story that was called "The Human Torch." Then he set fire to a tenement house, and in the ensuing blaze seven persons perished and nine were badly injured.

The child has been taken from the custody of his father and placed in a children's home, pending disposition of him by the courts.

In the light of such a tragedy, most average persons will be so bewildered and upset that they have no opinion as to what should be done to prevent similar cases from arising in the future. What punishment is sufficient for the unnatural father who would buy whiskey and cigarettes for this small boy?

Neglecting a child is one thing, and very bad indeed it is. But this case goes far beyond neglect. Here we have a father who seems deliberately to have done almost everything possible to make sure that his son would become a criminal. The father told police: "I found out the kid was drinking whiskey and there was nothin' I could do about it, so I bought the best 100-proof for him."

There was nothing a father could do to prevent an 11-year-old boy from drinking

whiskey and smoking cigarettes? We recall one custom prevalent a long time ago, which had a tendency to discourage tough kids. It had to do with a trip to the woodshed, a razor strop, a certain portion of the lad's anatomy, and father's strong right arm. It was crude, perhaps, but it was effective in most cases.

The Widow Yells

Hasn't a widow as much right to disturb a neighborhood by yelling "Shut up" through a megaphone as a dog has to bark so often and so loudly that she says, "I have to holler or I'd go mad?"

Between the dog and the widow those who live near both in Greenville, S. C., really are having a hard time. L. D. Cole, a railroad engineer, owns the dog, Tippy. "I'm away lots of nights, and the dog's bark is the only protection my wife and kids have," Cole explains. It doesn't satisfy Mrs. Mina Govaerts, and for a year now almost every time the dog barks, Mrs. Govaerts yells "Shut up" through a big megaphone rigged in one of her windows. Strange as it may seem, the neighbors have petitioned the city fathers to silence Mrs. Govaerts, but haven't complained about the dog.

We don't know too much about decibels, but we don't see that there is much to choose between a doggy "bow-wow" and a woman's "shut-up."

Summer Colds

It's no fun to have a cold, no matter what time of year the thing comes on. But to contract a cold during June, July or August gives the victim a sense of grave injustice. "Where the heck did I ever get a cold this time of year?" the victim will ask. We have never heard the answer yet.

It's had enough to cough, gag, sneeze, blow one's nose endlessly, have a headache and that feeling of all-out complete misery when snow and ice are with us. But to be cheated out of the enjoyment of a week or more of summer by the common cold, which should be uncommon this time of year, really is too much.

The 'Silent Man'

Francis P. Carr, whose silence has puzzled many who have followed the Army-McCarthy thing in TV, was asked how it is he doesn't have much to say.

The Newport non-talker grinned. "Generally speaking," he said, quietly, "it's hard to get a word in."

Suppose you were in the midst of such silence-breakers as McCarthy, Cohn, Jenkins, and a flock of Senators, assorted politicians, and eager-beaver generals. Pretty easy to get a reputation for silence, surrounded by such a crew, eh wot?

Not Coffee!

Two highway department trucks gathered 1,495 empty beer cans and bottles and 36 whiskey bottles along eight miles of highway in the St. Cloud, Minn., area. The can and bottle harvest was made at the suggestion of the St. Cloud Daily Times as an indication of the amount of drinking done in motor vehicles.

That an enormous amount of drinking is done in motor vehicles is proved, too, by the erratic driving of some motorists, and by the highway deaths and maimings.

That "one for the road" isn't coffee in too many cases, more's the pity.

What Knight Is This?



Today In Europe

Drive To Discredit A E C Laid To 'Left Wingers'

By DAVID LAWRENCE

WASHINGTON — A determined effort seems to have been made by "left wingers" hereabouts to discredit the Atomic Energy Commission and particularly its chairman, Lewis S. Strauss, whose heroic defense of the security of the United States deserves instead the highest plaudits of his countrymen.

His chief sin in the eyes of the "left wingers" is that he has lined up against Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

The official release of the entire transcript in the proceedings which led to the judgment that Dr. Oppenheimer is a security risk and should not be employed by governmental agencies; hereafter is a sensational revelation. But this document and the report of the special board headed by Gordon Gray do not tell the whole story.

For the fact is that Dr. Oppenheimer strayed outside the field of science and, for example, urged that in the event of war the strategic air command of the U.S. Air Force should not be used if the other side would agree also to refrain from using theirs, which was relatively small. This was first disclosed in an article appearing in "Fortune" magazine in May 1953 which was written by Charles J. V. Murphy, who had just finished a tour of reserve duty as a colonel in the Air Force and as aide to the late General Hoyt S. Vandenberg.

Why should a scientist—and an influential one who could bring to bear the influence of many of his colleagues—try insistently to give advice during top-level secret conferences on what the American military position should be? The Gray board's report had in this guarded language:

"In evaluating advice from a specialist which departs from the area of his specialty, government officials charged with the military posture of our country must also be certain that underlying any advice is a genuine conviction that this country cannot in the interest of security have less than the

strongest possible offensive capabilities in a time of national danger . . .

"We must make it clear that we do not question Dr. Oppenheimer's right to the opinions he held with respect to the development of this weapon (the H-bomb). They were shared by other competent and devoted individuals, both in and out of government. We are willing to assume that they were motivated by deep moral conviction."

"We are concerned, however, that he may have departed his role as scientific adviser to exercise highly persuasive influence in matters in which his convictions were not necessarily a reflection of his judgment, and also not necessarily related to the protection of the strongest offensive military interests of the country."

"In the course of the proceedings, there developed other facts which raised questions of such serious import as to give us concern about whether the retention of Dr. Oppenheimer's services would be clearly consistent with the security interests of the United States."

Most significant also is a letter from William L. Borden just now made public in the official proceedings of the hearings of the Gray board. Mr. Borden was executive director of the staff of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy from January 1949 until June 1953. He served under the late Sen. McMahon, Democrat, who was chairman of the committee. Before entering on these duties, he had been a pilot in the Army Air Force for three years and served overseas. He is a graduate of Yale law school. On Nov. 7, 1953, after he left the committee, he wrote to J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, outlining his suspicion about Dr. Oppenheimer based on a careful study of all classified data to which he had access, and this included almost everything related to atomic-energy matters in the

government. Mr. Borden wrote in part:

"The purpose of this letter is to state my own exhaustively considered opinion, based upon years of study, of the available classified evidence, that more probably than not J. Robert Oppenheimer is an agent of the Soviet Union."

"This opinion considers the following factors among others: he was contributing substantial monthly sums to the Communist party; his ties with Communism had survived the Nazi-Soviet pact and the Soviet attack upon Finland; his wife and younger brother were Communists; he had no close friends except Communists; he had at least one Communist mistress; he belonged only to Communist organizations, apart from professional affiliations; the people whom he recruited into the early wartime Berkeley atomic project were exclusively Communists; he had been instrumental in securing recruits for the Communist party; and he was in frequent contact with Soviet agents."

In addition, Mr. Borden charged that Dr. Oppenheimer was a vigorous supporter of the H-bomb program until World War II ended and that he then urged each senior individual in his field to desist and was "remarkably instrumental in influencing the military establishment and the Atomic Energy Commission essentially to suspend H-bomb development from mid-1946 through Jan. 31, 1950."

Mr. Borden asserts that Oppenheimer "more probably than not, has since (mid-1942) acted under a Soviet directive influencing United States military, atomic energy, intelligence, and diplomatic policy," and points out that "it is to be noted that these conclusions correlate with information furnished by Klaus Fuchs, indicating that the Soviets had acquired an agent in Berkeley who informed them about electro-magnetic separation research during 1942 and earlier."

What is particularly damaging, however, are several of Oppenheimer's own admissions which are revealed in the official testimony, such as his confession that he lied to a security officer of the United States Army about a contact with him attempted by a Soviet agent and that he did not reveal the true facts until some months later. Obviously the furor about the Oppenheimer case isn't just a matter of views or opinions but concerns specific acts that resulted in the decision to refuse to give him security clearance for the future.

Hal Boyle

European Abraham Lincoln?

BONN, Germany (U)—Here where Beethoven was born and wrote some of the world's mightiest music a 78-year-old German statesman is trying to bring true a mighty dream—the dream of European unity.

And time is running out for the old man.

As of the first of this year Chancellor Konrad Adenauer was the strongest and most influential political figure between London and Moscow.

By the end of this year Adenauer will probably either go down in history as a kind of European Abraham Lincoln—or merely another old titan with a faded dream, cultivating his rose garden in quiet bitterness as his countrymen forget him.

The issue is simple. His coalition German Federal Government so far has gone along with him in his program for European defensive cooperation. But the coalition is wavering. How long can he hold it together in the face of France's refusal to vote for a six-nation European army in which French and German troops would serve together?

Just last week the sturdy elderly Chancellor told a group of visiting American former vice-presidents about his dream of European freedom. Lean and erect, he has the dark impressive facial immobility of an Indian chieftain.

But although he has lived eight years beyond man's Biblical age, his voice was firm and strong, his eyes bright and intense, as he talked for more than an hour on the present plight of Europe.

Many German leaders now like to play down the question of Germany's guilt in the last war. But Dr. Adenauer makes no concessions to his people's desire to for-

get the past. He despised Adolf Hitler's aggression in the latter's lifetime and has no wish to minimize now the disaster that Nazi policies brought to the world.

Then turning to communism, he remarked:

"But a terrible dictatorship has gained control of half of Europe. This dictatorship is even worse and stronger and more cruel than that of Hitler."

The Chancellor remarked he thought it a delusion for leaders in his own or other individual countries to believe they could deal separately with Soviet Russia. He said nothing impressed Russia's Communist rulers but power equal to their own, and the only power they now feared was the United States.

Then he went on to add that if the six-nation European army did become a reality the Russians would find that within four years it would no longer even serve their purposes to continue the cold war—real peace might be won.

"We can no longer think in national terms only," he said. "The development of Germany since 1945 holds no danger to the free world. In a unified Europe no country could be a threat to another country. We have overcome the selfish egotism of European nationalities."

The strong old man sat there a moment, his firm face framed against the white-walled reception room in the Palace Schaumburg, then he rose and quickly walked out.

Seeing him leave, some of us couldn't help wondering who, if Dr. Adenauer falls, would have the strength of will or purpose to hold a free and united Europe. He seems the tallest tower in a dubious landscape still darkened by ancient fears and old distrust.

Arms And Men

The Knock-Out Blow

By WALTER MILLIS

The nation-wide air defense test on Monday seems to have been quite successful both in the extent of public understanding and participation and in the functioning of the Civil Defense communications and control systems. But there is a great deal more than that to be said about it.

The first thing to be said is, I believe, that with this test it should become a primary and basic aim of United States policy, diplomacy and strategic planning to insure — so far as our own actions can do so — that nothing like this imagined catastrophe of Monday ever take place.

The exercise assumed a sudden, massed and simultaneous nuclear attack on 54 American cities by a force of 425 enemy bombers. It was assumed that no more than a third of them were destroyed by the active defenses and that the rest took as their targets, neither the American strategic bomber bases nor the basic industrial installations and military production facilities of the country, but population centers. It was assumed, in short, that this was a raid aimed to produce a single "knock-out blow," to win a war in a space of twenty minutes by rolling up an enormous total of dead and injured and so disrupting all agencies of communications and command as to paralyze the United States for further military action.

This problem was, like all man-made problems, artificial. It was set up under these assumptions, not because the Air Force necessarily thinks that anything like this will ever actually happen, but in order to provide maximum training and test opportunities. It is obvious that you cannot test and train the Brooklyn D.D. organization, for example, if you assume an attack upon the logistics far more important Bayway oil complex across the harbor in New Jersey. But if the atomic bombs ever start flying, Bayway would be a considerably more likely target than the "city of homes," under any strategic calculation save one. That one calculation which could make Brooklyn a preferred target over Bayway would be the calculation that with a single effort of mass slaughter one could "knock out" the opposing country and so end the war.

Because the problem was set up in this way does not, as has been said, imply that the Air Force thinks this a probable situation. It does imply nevertheless, that it is considered a possible one, that the Soviet Union might or may soon have the capabilities for making such an attack, and that an attack of this kind is seriously accepted as an element of modern strategy. To me it seems improbable in the extreme that any group of men in the Kremlin would ever stake the future of the world, of the Soviet

Defensive measures, which, even if they could not save millions of American lives, might still hold together the national fabric and prevent the assault from achieving the knock-out objective, are most important. But it is probably more important still not to fall victim ourselves to the "knock-out" strategic concept. We know a lot now about in arreance but in fear that the light destruction which atomic and hydrogen bombs will spread around themselves; we still know next to nothing about the application of such weapons to produce desired political results. If the Russians cannot knock us out in a blow there is not much reason to believe that we could knock out the Russians with any such facility; but it is this idea of a possible knock-out which is the greatest single incitation to these horrors, about in arreance but in fear that the other side will attempt them. There is no greater task before national strategy today than to insure that this does not happen.

From The Daily News

10, 20, 40 Years Ago

Ten Years Ago, 1944

Police Chief Edward C. Sullivan issued warnings against damage to victory gardens.

William M. Thompson of Newport was ordained at a service in the Congregational Church in Edgartown, Mass.

Twenty Years Ago, 1934

The congregation of the First Baptist John Clarke Memorial Church voted to sell the parsonage at Spring and Sherman Streets.

Forty Years Ago, 1914

The Naval Station here was without a ship for the first time since its establishment when the historic frigate Constellation sailed for Norfolk, Va., in tow of tug Incas for repairs.

How to Torture Your Wife

A WINTER CLASSIC



The World Today

The Character Of The Characters

By JAMES MARLOW

WASHINGTON (U)—If the Army-McCarthy hearings accomplish nothing else, at least they've enabled the public to examine for an unparalleled 36 days not only the main characters but the character of the characters.

Like him or not, Sen. McCarthy dominated the hearings, due to end today.

The hearings would have been routine without him although much of the time he played the same record over and over: speeches about his patriotism, his zeal against communism, his desire to give the public the truth.

It was his unpredictable weapons that caused uproars and kept interest alive: his sudden attack on an individual; a new charge;

the introduction of a picture or document.

He acted like a man who felt he was persecuted, repeatedly finding or imagining new individuals in new conspiracies against him. He attacked, belittled or challenged anyone who crossed him.

No matter where the camera was it always came back to McCarthy.

And through it all he demonstrated to the Eisenhower administration that if it ever tries again to cut him down from trying size in something like this, it had better be sure it throws in a man as tough as he is.

McCarthy showed one weakness: he reacts to needling and ridicule. Those two weapons in the hands of an iron-hard opponent who used them relentlessly might have driven McCarthy into costly explosions.

But the Army's counsel, Joseph N. Welch, was not the man. Welch, a 63-year-old Boston lawyer with 35 years' trial experience, was no match for McCarthy in vitality, aggressiveness or even in flexibility.

McCarthy worked on Welch, attacking him, diverting him, once driving him to tears in a good demonstration that emotionalism or softness won't work in dealing with McCarthy.

Welch has wit and mockery of his own. McCarthy seemed to detect in the very beginning he might be embarrassed unless he could throw Welch into a tailspin. He took Welch's measure fast.

In the early days of the hearings, when McCarthy briefly took

the stand, Welch had a look in his eye which seemed to say he'd enjoy having fun with the senator. McCarthy squelched him.

In an obvious and theatrical effort to discredit Welch, McCarthy turned his back and answered him contemptuously. The flabbergasted Welch never seemed to recover. Thereafter Welch's wit melted away.

There has been some speculation that the contrast between the gentle Welch and the aggressive McCarthy did the latter damage in the public mind. That's doubtful.

Those who admire McCarthy probably found in these hearings new reasons for their admiration. Those who disliked him before probably dislike him more.

Any resemblance between these hearings and a courtroom, where McCarthy would have had to operate within strict rules, is purely coincidental. No judge would let him get away for a minute with the tactics he used in the hearings: long speeches instead of answers, personal attacks and accusations, and diversions.

But in the hearings he was playing in his own ball park. He had helped make the rules. He jumped over them when it suited him. Except for three Democratic senators, sitting with four Republican senators as judges, this was a Republican show.

McCarthy was in frequent wrangles with the Democrats. McClellan of Arkansas, Symington of Missouri and Jackson of Washington — but less with McClellan than the others. But he had few tangles with his fellow Republicans.

Robert C. Ruark

Time For A Change

Over a long, misspent life I have had the usual assortment of concussions, contusions, aches, pains and aches, and am a very lucky fellow. All the doctors I ever had any professions' truck with were dedicated croakers in the best Arrowsmith tradition, and if they made any mistakes they were honest mistakes.

But doctors are only men, and they are subject to the mistakes men make.

Even though you know that medicine can be a racket, and that fee-splitting and undue expenses are not uncommon, the doctor generally has enjoyed an immunity from the penalties that beset other men. You can seldom sue him for a mistake, unless he sues you up and leaves the alarm clock inside. He can kill you through flagrant carelessness and you haven't got a prayer of retribution, not even to take care of the orphans.

A careful doctor can conduct an abortion practice or a narcotics mill and get away with it. If he's taking his fees in cash he can steal the government blind taxwise, and get away with it.

The medico ways have been a sort of self-admitted god from the machine, and his ace in the hole has been an inalienable fraternal relationship with his associates that surpasses love of man for woman, or even money. It's a closed corporation, with the AMA sitting up on top of it. No matter how horribly a doctor butchers a case, from bum diagnosis to a sloppy surgery to outright ne-

glect, you can rarely force a fellow medico to testify against a member of the group.

It isn't cricket. It isn't done. It isn't ethical.

A judge in Trenton not long ago tore the pants off the medical profession, mentioning, in a quiet shock such things as "a shocking unethical reluctance to accept its obligations to society . . . when a doctor is accused of malpractice," and a lot of other bitter words.

The judge, Alred C. Clapp of the Appellate Division of the Superior Court, was referring to a suit for malpractice which had been postponed 11 times since 1950. And when the expert medical witness for the plaintiffs finally decided, "on second thought," not to testify against a brother practitioner, the suit was dismissed again until Judge Clapp repealed the dismissal.

Time's about come when we recognize that doctors are just as liable to mistakes as writers who make libelous statements, architects who build faulty bridges, and grocers who sell ptomaine poison in lieu of food.

The docs—and I love mine—are in a business like any body else, since they charge money for what they do or don't do in your behalf. Within reason, it's time they became a little more liable for their actions, up to and including honest testimony in a court of law when one of the brotherhood gets nabbed off base.

Newport Daily News

Established 1846

Published daily except Sundays and certain holidays by the Edward A. Sherman Publishing Company, 140 Thomas Street, Newport, R. I. Telephone connecting all departments 2340

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By carrier—one year, \$15; three months, \$5. By mail, payable in advance, Newport County—one year, \$12.50; three months, \$4.75. Outside Newport County—one year, \$16.00; three months, \$5.50. One month, \$1.50.

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

Average daily net paid circulation for May 1954 was 11,414