

The Star-Telegram is an independent Democratic newspaper, supporting what it believes to be right and opposing what it believes to be wrong, regardless of party politics, publishing the news fairly and impartially at all times.

## Lyndon Johnson and the Red Menace

Senatorial Candidate Coke Stevenson attempted in his Houston speech Monday night to show that his opponent, Lyndon Johnson, has not been as aggressive as he might have been in his support of measures designed to control communism.

The implication of Mr. Stevenson's speech is that Lyndon Johnson is not alert to the danger of communism. Those who are thoroughly familiar with Representative Johnson's voting record in Congress realize that such a thesis is utterly without foundation in fact.

Ignoring the scores of votes Lyndon Johnson has cast demonstrating his awareness of the Communist threat and his desire to expose their activities in the full glare of publicity, Mr. Stevenson singled out three votes for criticism. His case falls flat when the votes in question are analyzed and the reasons for them are examined.

On April 30, 1947, Mr. Stevenson is quoted as having said that "Johnson voted against a bill providing no foreign relief would go to any country dominated by Russia unless the relief was wholly supervised by Americans."

There are some pertinent facts regarding this vote which Mr. Stevenson did not mention. Their omission, whether intentional or not, places Lyndon Johnson in a false light.

On April 30, 1947, the House was considering a \$350,000,000 foreign relief bill. Purpose of the bill was taken up where UNRRA had left off the task of caring for starving people in the war-devastated areas of Europe and Asia. The bill had been formulated by the House committee on foreign affairs on a bipartisan basis.

The committee had written into the bill several safeguards against abuses alleged to have occurred in UNRRA operations. Provision also was made that no relief was to be supplied the people of any country until their government had given the United States certain guarantees, and if such guarantees were not fulfilled, the relief program in that country was to be terminated.

During floor debate on the bill an amendment was proposed to prohibit use of any of the funds in countries with governments dominated by Russia. It was the vote on this amendment to which Mr. Stevenson apparently was referring in his Houston speech.

Lyndon Johnson voted against the amendment after it was brought out in the debate that the people in some of the countries which would be affected by it (notably Poland) were resentful of their domination by Russia, and to refuse them food, medicine and clothing would be to strengthen the hand of Soviet propagandists. That was a logical view, and the one which finally prevailed.

Although the amendment was approved by the House, it was rejected by the Senate and omitted from the conference report which subsequently was accepted by the House.

In this connection it is interesting to recall that Mr. Stevenson, after his recent hurried trip to Washington, announced his approval of the Marshall Plan. He seems to have forgotten that the Marshall Plan contemplated economic aid to Russia and to all the Russian satellite states which would co-operate in the European Recovery Program. The only reason these countries are not now participating in the program is the fact that they themselves refused to play ball.

Mr. Stevenson states that on April 18, 1946, Lyndon Johnson voted against a

resolution for the House judiciary committee to investigate "certain charges in connection with theft and possession of important secret documents."

Mr. Stevenson, whether intentionally or not, misstated the purpose of the resolution. When its true purpose is understood, Lyndon Johnson's vote against it is above reproach.

Some secret documents which had been stolen from State Department files had been found by FBI agents in the offices of a pro-Communist magazine in New York. Charges were filed against six persons. A federal grand jury which investigated the theft returned indictments against three of those charged. Two were convicted and fined. The third indictment was dismissed for lack of evidence.

The resolution which Lyndon Johnson voted against would have directed the House judiciary committee to "conduct an investigation of the disposition of the case against certain individuals charged by the FBI with espionage and possession of confidential government documents."

The purpose of the resolution was not, as Mr. Stevenson inferred, to investigate Communist spy activities in the State Department, but to investigate the handling of the case by the FBI, the Department of Justice, the grand jury and the federal court in which the cases were tried. The resolution was introduced by a Michigan Republican. That it was a partisan effort to embarrass the Democratic administration is evidenced by the fact that only one Republican voted against it, while Democrats voted two to one against it. Of the 14 Texas congressmen who voted, 11, including Lyndon Johnson, were against it and only 3 were for it.

Mr. Stevenson is critical of Lyndon Johnson for having voted against this resolution. One may only wonder how Mr. Stevenson would have voted on it had he been a member of Congress at the time.

The third vote cast by Lyndon Johnson which Mr. Stevenson criticizes was on May 17, 1946. Mr. Stevenson said that on that date "Johnson voted against an appropriation to enable the un-American activities committee to continue its work."

Again Mr. Stevenson, whether intentionally or not, beclouds the issue by misstating the purpose of the measure which Lyndon Johnson voted against. It was not a resolution appropriating money "to enable the un-American activities committee to continue its work," but to allow it \$75,000 additional for which no need had been shown.

At the time this measure came up the un-American activities committee was dominated by Congressman Rankin of Mississippi, and it was charged on the floor of the House that the money was to be expended by the committee in such manner that it would aid Mr. Rankin in the campaign he was then facing for reelection.

The record also shows that the committee had on hand at that time a substantial unexpended balance from previous appropriations; and that the request for the appropriation was made by the committee on accounts without a formal vote of the un-American activities committee. Furthermore, the record also shows the committee on accounts approved the appropriation at a meeting attended by less than a quorum.

It evidently was because of the irregular manner in which this appropriation measure reached the floor of the House, together with the obvious lack of need for the money by the un-American activities committee that Lyndon Johnson voted against it. One may only wonder how Mr. Stevenson would have voted on the measure had he been a member of Congress at the time.

Mr. Stevenson gave his listeners a distorted view of Lyndon Johnson's record in regard to the un-American activities committee by citing this one vote. The truth of the matter is that Lyndon Johnson has been consistent in his support of the committee, voting each year for its continuance, and to supply it with all the funds needed to carry on its work.

Thus another attack on Lyndon Johnson's record in Congress comes to naught. That record, including the isolated votes cited by Mr. Stevenson, shows Johnson a man of vision, discernment and sound judgment and the best qualified man in the race.

## TRIBUTE TO A WORTHY UNIT

by Marquis Childs

McCALL, Idaho. — William James, America's great philosopher, wrote about the need of mankind to find a moral equivalent for war. He was speaking of the need to find, in time of peace, some great unifying force that would release all of man's energies for creative good that they are released in war for destruction.

Something approaching that is the United States Forest Service. If ever I have seen men dedicated to a cause, and faithful and efficient in that dedication, it is in the guardianship of the mountain heartlands of the West which under law rests on this service.

It is a service as decentralized as any government organization could be. Forest supervisors and rangers have a lot of independence and authority. They make the decisions on which the well-being of forest and river and valley depend.

Since it is part of a large bureaucracy, the Department of Agriculture, it has some of the blights of bureaucracy. The red tape, manifested in innumerable records, often seems excessive. Lumbermen and stock growers frequently accuse the service of arbitrary and dictatorial decisions.

But seeing the vast devastation that has been worked by fire and erosion and the narrow margin of security, I think I would incline to side with the service in any such argument. Without the water from the watersheds which are protected by the Forest Service, the livelihood of thousands upon thousands of families in the West would disappear. And that would be only the beginning of a chain of consequences fatal to the empire of the West.

From the high protected watersheds, the mountain streams run down into the rivers. The flood water from melting snows in the spring is stored in reservoirs built by the Bureau of Reclamation. Then during the growing season this water is released to farmers in the valleys through an elaborate irrigation system.

It works a magical transformation. Land that supported only sagebrush and sparse grass blooms with rich crops. While the hills are brown and desert-like, the valleys are green and fruitful.

This fruitfulness begins in the smallest rivulet high in the wilderness of the national forests. The precious water must be guarded and guided from the stream bed at eight thousand feet to the irrigation canal in the floor of the valley.

Fire is the most menacing enemy. The Forest Service is geared to fight it with modern weapons. Fire jumpers—the paratroopers of peace—are rigorously trained in the technique of parachuting out of planes to put out fires before they can spread.

By radio and telephone from a network of lookouts comes the warning of the first small blaze. It is plotted on the map, a dispatcher sends out a plane and soon the Forest Service paratroopers are dropping on the fire with equipment to fight it.

Supervisor John T. Mathews of the Payette National Forest, with headquarters in McCall, has a force of 60 smoke jumpers. For these 60 summer jobs he had 483 applications from young men prepared to undergo the stern training and then to drop from a swiftly moving plane in a remote part of the forest.

An almost equally menacing enemy is the destruction of soil caused when too many sheep and cattle graze in the mountain meadows. At this point politics of an explosive variety enters in.

Here in Idaho the Forest Service has had considerable co-operation from ranchers and stockmen. They did not join with livestock associations in Wyoming and Nevada in a move that seemed to have as its ultimate goal the removal of public forests from federal guardianship. The scarcely concealed objective was to turn these lands over to the states and thence, in all probability, to private ownership and exploitation.

But that move backfired. Farmers, spokesmen and conservationists were quick to see that it threatened everything they valued including the base of permanent development in the whole region. Frightened politicians, who had fallen in with the move, hastily tried to run to cover.

The men of the Forest Service—the full-time personnel is only about 2,500—are dedicated to the concept of a permanent growth of the forest or what remains of it. They are at war with the cut-and-get-out logger who leaves nothing behind; closes down his mill; throws men out of work; and leaves whole counties without tax revenue.



—Hal Coffman's Cartoons Appear Exclusively in the Star-Telegram.

## Disloyalty Case

by Joseph and Stewart Alsop

WASHINGTON. — Mrs. Ann Smith, a former clerk-stenographer for the U. S. Navy in the Canal Zone, is not an important political figure. But what has happened to her, and the way in which it happened, is important—deeply important—in these times.

Mrs. Smith (which is not her real name) is a personable young woman in her late 20s, a Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Southern California, mildly liberal, mildly intellectual, mildly interested in the problem of race relations. After an unhappy marriage in California which ended in divorce, she took a job in 1945 in the Panama Canal Zone as a Navy clerk.

Her interest in the race question was partly responsible for her also taking on a part-time job teaching English after working hours at the University of Panama. She had received permission to do so. But the classes she taught were largely Negro, and racial feeling in the Canal Zone runs high. There were certainly those in authority who frowned on Mrs. Smith's after-hours work and on her tolerant racial views.

Whether this had something to do with her subsequent experiences, no one knows. At any rate, in 1947, she met Petty Officer Robert Brown, and they decided to marry. Brown applied for permission to marry from his commanding officer, Adm. J. F. Shaforth. Then the blow fell. Permission was refused, on the grounds that the intended bride was suspected of disloyalty to the United States.

This was in August 1947. In September, Brown's locker was searched in his presence, his personal papers were read, and a copy of "Generation of Vipers," a rather dull but by no means Marxist book by Philip Wylie, was confiscated.

Nothing more happened until January. Despite repeated requests for a decision, permission for Brown to marry Mrs. Smith was still withheld. Then, on Jan. 30 of this year, Mrs. Smith was presented with an "interrogatory," consisting of some 21 questions.

Some of these questions are routine, others are peculiarly interesting. Mrs. Smith was asked whether she read, among other publications, "The New Republic"; whether she was acquainted with "persons you know to be connected with labor activities and labor leadership in the Canal Zone"; whether she had "exchanged views on political, governmental, or international subjects with persons connected with the University of Panama"; and whether she had in her possession "books or literature concerning the government of the U.S.S.R."

chilling prospect. At any rate, Mrs. Smith admitted only that she had once subscribed to "In Fact" some years previously, and that she had occasionally leafed through a copy of "The New Republic." On every score, she protested her innocence.

A second category of questions concerned Mrs. Smith's acquaintanceship with four individuals. One was a Negro minister in California. Mrs. Smith had, she said, never heard of him, although it is difficult to see how it would have mattered if she had, since the minister is an anti-Wallace Democrat and was a delegate to the recent Democratic convention. The second individual was a woman who had been active in radical student movements in California, in the thirties, while Mrs. Smith was going to college. Mrs. Smith asserted flatly that she had never heard of this woman either.

She had known the third individual, though only briefly. On a vacation in Guatemala, she had been assigned to share a hotel table with him and his wife for three meals. More than a year before the date of the "interrogatory" he had sent her some newspaper clippings and a copy of "P.M." As for the fourth individual, a woman who lived in the Canal Zone, she and Mrs. Smith had both attended a luncheon given in Balboa by the Unitarian Church, which Mrs. Smith attended regularly. But Mrs. Smith had not, to the best of her knowledge, been introduced to this woman and she did not know her.

Having answered the "interrogatory" frankly and fully, Mrs. Smith felt certain that the whole troublesome business would at last be cleared up, and that Brown would be allowed to marry her. Then, on March 17, she received a memorandum from Capt. W. F. Weidner, U. S. N. The memorandum, citing no evidence to that effect, bluntly charged her with having lied consistently in her answers to the "interrogatory," and with disloyalty to the United States.

The case of Mrs. Smith would not, perhaps, be worth reporting if these were different times, or if hers were an isolated case. But these are times in which traditional American liberties are closely threatened. And, as will be shown later, what happened to Mrs. Smith in the Canal Zone has happened to too many others elsewhere. In the year 1948, it is the plain and necessary duty of the American government to protect itself from attack from within. But a great deal, a very great deal, depends on the way in which this is done.

The handling of the so-called filibuster against the anti-poll tax bill in the Senate proved that the two major parties are capable of bipartisan co-operation outside the realm of foreign policy.—Memphis Commercial Appeal.

## CRACKS AT THE CROWD

by Claude Callan

When Uncle Bill was left a widower at the age of 78 his first thought was of another wife, so he recalled an old sweetheart, and since she was a widow he decided to slip away to the old home town and see if she was still the beauty she used to be. As luck would have it, the widow was poor and he was rich, so she cooked a wonderful dinner for him and took on over him a lot. Every day he went to her home and in spite of the fact he was wealthy, her whole family thought lots of him. Well, in a short time there was a happy wedding in the old home town. A widower courts rapidly, and in a few weeks Uncle Bill marched to the altar and married his old sweetheart's pretty granddaughter.

We can't live the past in every way, but occasionally we buy some of the good, cheap candy that comes in buckets. It is much better than this boxed candy that sells at jewelry prices.

Son doesn't like a girl mother picks out for him. Mother is wonderful in many ways, but when it comes to picking a girl or a pocketknife father can beat her badly.

When Cousin Pelfry breaks a promise he gives you another to take its place. He has given away thousands of promises and never a good one.

## OFF THE RECORD

by Ed Reed



## FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM

Trademark Registered U. S. Patent Office  
MORNING-EVENING-DAILY

Combining the Fort Worth Star, established February 1, 1906; Fort Worth Telegram, purchased January 1, 1908; the Fort Worth Record, purchased November 1, 1925. Entered as second-class matter at the Postoffice at Fort Worth, Texas, January 1, 1909, under Act of March 3, 1879.

Amos G. Carter, President and Publisher.  
Bert N. Hones, Vice Pres. and Gen. Mgr.  
Harold V. Hough, Vice Pres., Circulation Dir.  
Amos Carter Jr., Treasurer.

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

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC  
Any erroneous reflection upon the character, standing or reputation of any person, firm or corporation which may appear in the columns of this paper will be gladly corrected upon the notice of same being given to the editor personally at the office, Seventh and Taylor Streets, Fort Worth, Texas.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By carrier: One week, Evening only, 20c; Evening with Sunday, 30c; Morning, Evening and Sunday, 13 copies, 45c; Single Copies, Evening 6c, Morning 5c, Sunday 10c. By mail in Texas and Oklahoma, Daily and Sunday, per month, \$1.25; per year, \$15. States outside Texas and Oklahoma, per month, \$1.50, per year \$18.