151620

ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES CANADA

The New York Times

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

"All the News That's Fit to Print."

ADOLPH S. OCHS, Publisher 1896-1935.

Published Every Day in the Year by THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY.

ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER, President and Publisher.

JULIUS OCHS ADLER, Vice President and General Manager.

GODFREY N. NELSON, Secretary.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1946.

OFFICES OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

New York City Telephone Lackawanna 4-1000
Main Office.... Times Building, 229 W. 43d St. (18)
Times Tower, Times Sq. (18) | Downtown, 280 Bway (7)

MINEOLA...Tel. Garden City 8900. 1527 Franklin Ave.
NEWARK.....Tel. Market 3-3900. 744 Broad St. (2)
WHITE PLAINS..Tel. White Plains 3300. 175 Main St.
BOSTON.....News, Herald-Traveler Building
PHILADELPHIA.....News, Record Building
WASHINGTON..News, Albee Bldg. BALTIMORE Sun Bldg.
CHICAGO..News, 435 N. Michigan; Bus., 230 N. Michigan
DETROIT..News, Free Press Bldg.: Bus., Gen. Motors Bldg.
SAN FRANCISCO.News, Chronicle Bldg.: Bus., Russ Bldg.
LOS ANGELES..News, Times Bldg.: Bus., 645 S. Flower St.
LONDON..News, 85 Fleet Street, E. C. 4.
Business, 162A Queen Victoria Street, E. C. 4
OTTAWA..22 Goulburn Ave. MEXICO CITY..Apartado 346
PARIS..37 Rue Caumartin. ROME..Via Della Mercede 54
DUBLIN.....14 Blackheath Pk., Clontarf
BUENOS AIRES.....San Martin 344
RIO DE JANEIRO.....Avenida Rio Branco 257
HAVANA.....Manzana deGomez, 212
CANAL ZONE.....Balboa Heights

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: UNITED STATES, POSSESSIONS AND TERRITORIES

Edition.	1 Yr.	6 Mos.	3 Mos.	1 Mo.
*Daily and Sunday	$17.00	$8.50	$4.25	$1.50
†Weekdays	12.00	6.00	3.00	1.00
Sunday	6.00	3.00	1.50	.75

*One week, 30c. †One week, 40c.

Canada, Central and South America

Edition.	1 Yr.	6 Mos.	3 Mos.	1 Mo.
Daily and Sunday	$22.00	$11.00	$5.50	$2.50
Weekdays	15.00	7.50	3.75	1.50
Sunday	8.00	4.00	2.50	1.25

For Rates to Other Foreign Countries Apply Circulation Department

MICROFILM EDITION, by the year..... $175.00
BOUND VOLUMES {Rag Paper..... 260.00
{Newsprint..... 80.00

THE NEW YORK TIMES BOOK REVIEW (weekly), a year, $2; Canada, $3; foreign, $3.50

THE NEW YORK TIMES INDEX

	U. S. A.	Canada	Foreign
12 monthly volumes	$20.00	$25.00	$30.00
Annual Cumulative Volume	26.00	26.60	27.00
Monthly & Annual Volumes	35.00	36.00	36.00

The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and local news of spontaneous origin published herein. Rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

TIME FOR PLAIN SPEAKING

There are two men, we believe, who have a particular responsibility for speaking plainly at this moment about the whole series of events touched off by Mr. Wallace's attack on the foreign policy of Secretary Byrnes. One is President Truman. The other is Herbert Lehman.

The President's responsibility arises because it is an evident fact that the three statements already made at the White House on the subject of the Wallace speech have failed thoroughly, both at home and abroad, to clear away the confusion regarding American foreign policy. What has Mr. Truman said thus far? He has said (1) that he did not intend originally to indicate that he "approved the [Wallace] speech as constituting a statement of the foreign policy of this country," and (2) that "there will be no significant change" in present policy without discussion and conference with Secretary Byrnes and the leaders of Congress. But he has not said that there will be no change in present policy. He has not said that no change is under consideration. And the continued presence of Mr. Wallace in the Cabinet, under only the briefest kind of restraint before he resumes an open attack upon the foreign policy of the Government of which he is a member, merely prolongs and intensifies the confusion which has previously existed.

Thus our correspondent at the Paris conference reports that it may be said with confidence that to our hard-pressed delegates the latest turn of events—Mr. Wallace's momentary moratorium—is "far from satisfactory." "The effect [of the whole series of events] upon the small and friendly nations has been particularly disastrous, as is obvious to the United States delegation, which has been flooded with inquiries." "The effect on the Russian representatives and on Moscow * * * has been to make Mr. Byrnes' long struggle more difficult, since the Russians say, and possibly believe, that the United States is split on foreign policy and hence is not fully behind Mr. Byrnes."

Mr. Truman cannot let this confusion continue without jeopardizing the work of Mr. Byrnes in the very middle of a difficult negotiation, on the successful outcome of which hangs much of our hope for peace and progress. It is time for him to do something more than say what he does *not* approve. It is time for him to say what he *does* approve. It is time for a positive and ringing statement of support for Mr. Byrnes, and the time when even such a statement will do much good is growing shorter. If Mr. Truman hesitates some more, if he equivocates some more, if he does not make it crystal clear that he stands and will continue to stand firmly behind Mr. Byrnes, he will find himself, and the country will find itself, facing far harder choices and far greater risks than those which are now present.

Mr. Lehman's responsibility for speaking plainly is different, but no less real. It is a responsibility owed directly to the voters of New York State, who will elect, a little more than six weeks from now, a member of a new Senate which will be confronted with many important questions of foreign policy. The voters of the State are entitled to know which foreign policy each candidate favors.

We address the question to Mr. Lehman because it may be taken for granted that his Republican opponent, Mr. Ives—having no Labor party problem on his hands—will support the foreign policy of Mr. Byrnes, which Senator Vandenberg is actively supporting at Paris.

Mr. Lehman's position, from a political point of view, is more difficult than that of Mr. Ives. For Mr. Lehman is not only the candidate of the Democratic party; he is also the candidate of the Labor party, which can be counted upon to favor a pro-Wallace-and-leave-Eastern-Europe-and-the-Near-East-to-Russia position; and he is, in addition, the candidate of the Liberal party, whose State Chairman has just expressed "profound disagreement with the dominant theme of Mr. Wallace's proposal, namely, division of the world into spheres of influence."

In these circumstances efforts will be made, and in fact already are being made, to gloss over the differences between the Wallace foreign policy and the Byrnes foreign policy, and to pretend that they are, after all, essentially the same thing.

We are certain that Mr. Lehman is too intelligent and experienced an observer of foreign affairs to believe that the difference between the two policies is not real and fundamental, and we are sure that he knows that the independent voters of New York will expect from him a forthright statement of his own position.

DOING BUSINESS WITH RUSSIA

In international affairs it is not necessarily true that the customer is always right. Nevertheless, it is easier to keep on friendly terms with nations to which we sell goods and from which we buy goods than with nations with which we have no such relationships. For this reason we welcome the Commerce Department's announcement that two of its representatives, in a six-week visit to Moscow, have "laid the foundation for development of closer economic contacts" between Russia and the United States in "the near future."

If Messrs. Lewis Lorwin and E. C. Ropes have achieved this much they have undone some of the harm their chief, Secretary Wallace, did in his Madison Square Garden speech, and they have done this by working out the sound part of his policy. For no wise man will disagree with Mr. Wallace's advocacy of better relations with Russia nor with his recommendation, made in his letter of July 23 to President Truman, for a trade mission to Moscow. Indeed, Secretary Wallace urging "collaboration with Russia in the industrial and economic development of areas in which we have joint interests" partially answers the Secretary Wallace who contends that we have no "business in the political affairs of eastern Europe." Political peace must precede economic collaboration.

We see no reason why free-enterprise America should not buy goods it needs from Communist Russia nor why it should not sell goods to Communist Russia. The individual Russian and the individual American can gain by such exchanges. If we sell on credit we would want to know that we would be repaid, just as a Detroit manufacturer does when he sells on credit in Wyoming or Pennsylvania. With this exception, we are willing to risk strengthening communism by selling our products to the Soviets if they, in turn, are not afraid of strengthening free enterprise by supplying some of what we lack here. We ought to try to meet the Russians half-way at every point where they are willing to come half-way. We can do this and still be firm when they will not come more than one-tenth of the way.

SUPER-DEADLY POISON

The report from Schenectady of a new poison which is so deadly that, if thoroughly dispersed, an ounce of it could kill every person in the United States and Canada, may be based on some dark hints thrown out in the Merck committee's report on bacteriological warfare—a report which is far less explicit than that on the atomic bomb. Perhaps a poison, gas, solid or liquid, has been developed which is far more lethal than anything hitherto discovered. But questions arise. If the poison has 1 per cent of the potency with which it is credited, how does it happen that the chemists who evolved it lived to tell the tale? How is such a compound to be handled with impunity by ordinary factory workers? If a single ounce can wipe out the entire populations of this country and Canada, it follows that two or three molecules must be fatal, which seems incredible. Even chemists have been known to make errors. The insidiousness of hydrogen arsenide once so alarmed them that a legend still persists of a man who was killed by a single bubble of it.

Lastly, there remains the matter of dispersing this new, presumably volatile compound. It might be dropped from airplanes, but a vast fleet would be needed to blanket the North American continent. Something worse than anything known may have been developed at a cost of $50,000,000, but how much worse no high Army or Navy official has yet stated.

STEWART EDWARD WHITE

Stewart Edward White was a brisk young man of 29 when his "Blazed Trail" was published. A whole generation of boys and grown-ups sat up late to read this story of high adventure in the deep woods. Some of us may remember losing ourselves in "The Magic Forest" and "The Silent Places" when they first came out. Mr. White made the canoe and the back-pack, saddle soreness and rainy camps enchanting. The woods, mountains and deserts came alive, the sound of water running, the burning sun, the strange night noises as the fire died down. If the population of our cities continued to increase after Mr. White's early books appeared, it must have been because a lot of people didn't read them. But a lot did read them and were ever afterward grateful to the author. He found his vein at the very beginning of his career. No really new note came in, except when late in life he became interested in survival after death and wrote about it.

He never faked. Even if he had been capable of doing so, which he wasn't, he never needed to. He got his material at first hand. He was an experienced camper before he was out of his teens; he knew the North Woods, the Black Hills, the Sierras, British Columbia and some wild parts of Africa because he had been there; he was a sporting hunter who late in life killed lions with the bow and arrow. He lived and wrote in the outdoor tradition, keeping alive the spirit of the pioneers. Now he is dead in San Francisco, a city that he probably loved as much as he could love any city. One would like to think of him as putting out the campfire on some grassy shore, loading the dunnage into the canoe and pushing off into the unknown, with the fish jumping, game moving in the underbrush and other camps ahead to come to after a hard day's paddling.

WHEN DO WE START?

At last the city seems to be embarked on a program of taking down the boards on closed tenement houses, remodeling them and renting them to people without homes. This idea has been in the talking stage, in one form or another, for months. It has the merit of tremendous logic as a partial solution of the shortage of housing for veterans, because the buildings already exist and utilities such as streets, sewer, water, gas and electric lines are already installed or near by. Now with the cooperation of the State on half of the program, the city will use $6,000,000 in rehabilitating closed buildings, after seizing them in condemnation proceedings for tax arrears. Some of these will house families evicted from sites being cleared for permanent housing projects, thus serving a double purpose.

Mayor O'Dwyer says that "no time will be lost in carrying out the program," but much will depend on the city's success in getting high priority on needed materials, such as plumbing. It should have as high a priority as any phase of the housing program, because it offers the opportunity for early occupancy and at the same time has the great advantage of needing only a small fraction of the amount of building material that would be used if a new building were being put up. The speed with which this program goes ahead will be a fresh test of Federal Government machinery.

There has been a natural reluctance to make use of these tenement buildings, on the ground that to rehabilitate them might mean perpetuation of slums. But present conditions rob this argument of its validity; we must furnish such housing as we quickly can, make it as livable as possible, and worry about the slum problem when we can afford that luxury. It was on Dec. 16, 1945, that Mayor-elect O'Dwyer's Emergency Committee on Housing, headed by Commissioner Moses, proposed "quick rehabilitation" of old-law tenements under private auspices—an idea that bogged down under a barrage of objection and amendment. Now, nearly a year later, we may actually begin to unboard some of these houses. Let us get on with it.

VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has informed the International Monetary Fund that we do not intend to change the current gold value of the dollar. This statement, combined with the assurance of the British that the pound sterling will be tied to the dollar at the current rate, means that a new wave of currency depreciation on a world-wide scale will be averted for the time being.

Almost three-fourths of the world's trade is conducted in dollars or pound sterling, and this action should prove beneficial, since currency stability is an important prerequisite for world trade. However, stable currencies depend upon more than assurances of Governments. Basically they can only be continued in the proper economic environment. Thus the ability of the British to maintain the present value of the pound sterling will depend upon the success of their export drive, the effects of efforts to nationalize industries and how they offset the loss of income from investments liquidated during the war and the reduced importance of income from shipping and other services.

Our own ability to maintain the present international value of the dollar will depend upon how soon we bring our fiscal affairs in order and our ability to increase production by attaining more orderly relations on the labor front. As for most other countries, it is impossible now to determine at what level their currencies ultimately will be stabilized. Internal conditions in most European countries are so chaotic that there is no sound basis for currency stability at this time.

The International Monetary Fund, therefore, does not embark upon its task of maintaining stable currencies under the most favorable circumstances. Success will attend its efforts to the degree that economic conditions within each country become more stable. The balancing of national budgets, the re-establishment of favorable cost-price relationships, the leveling of barriers to trade with other countries, the re-establishment of production and transportation facilities, the repair of war damages—these are the fundamental prerequisites for international currency stabilization.

ODD CRITTER, THE PLATYPUS

Nature was in a mood of comic genius when she put together the duck-bill, or platypus. Only once has this connecting link between mammal and bird ever been exhibited anywhere in the world except in its native Australia. That was in 1922 at the Bronx Zoo, when one survivor of five shipped from Sydney lived forty days and forty nights and then died after thousands had come to marvel that there should be such creative caprice. Now the New York Zoological Society has not one, not two, but three of these platypuses undergoing conditioning for the long ocean voyage from Australia.

It looks like a muskrat, is semi-aquatic, has broadly webbed feet, is a fast swimmer, eats worms. It has a hardened snout, like a bird's beak, and pouches in its cheeks to store food awaiting a hungry moment. When the sex is right it lays eggs, and is the only mammal that does so. Our reporter who covered the momentous arrival in 1922 was apparently so skeptical that he refused to stake his professional reputation on some features of this queer beast. The female is "said" to lay eggs, he announced cautiously, take it or leave it. This has since been authenticated beyond doubt (it is said). David Fleay, an Australian curator and the world's greatest authority on the platypus, is coming to New York to lecture on its odd life, and it is about time.

Whether a displaced platypus will like New York is, of course, another question. They are reported to be subject to attacks of nerves, to start at the slightest noise. They are, however, ideally adapted for the atomic age, for they make a practice of digging deep burrows, with entrances safely under water. The voice is like the growl of a displeased puppy, but the disposition is gentle. The platypus is said to enjoy being scratched behind the ears, but, on the other hand, some authorities say it has no ears. The male, far from being weak in the manner of Achilles, has a poisonous spur on the heel. Or so some say, while others deny it. Frankly, we are a little embarrassed about the facts, and this can only be considered an interim report on the platypus. We await, somewhat breathlessly, the arrival of Mr. Fleay and his Australian whatisits so we can really get things straight.

Topics of The Times

Another Forcible Entry

Secretary Wallace may have got the idea from the British housing squatters, though, actually, as a thoughtful discussion in another column on this page reminded us, the squatter problem presents itself after every war and economic upheaval. In any event, it has been suggested by one light-hearted correspondent that our foreign policy was thrown into sad confusion when the Secretary of Commerce decided to give up his own commodious quarters and to go squatting in the State Department, from where he has served notice he will exert every effort to resist ejection.

How to Bewilder Opponents

This in itself would be a sufficiently frivolous note to strike on a very serious topic. Our correspondent follows this up with the startling contention that a confused foreign policy is not always as bad as it sounds. One advantage of not knowing your own mind is that it keeps your opponents, if there be such, guessing. When your own course is clearly and resolutely laid down your adversary can work out his own counted program; but when you change from day to day your opponent is himself thrown off his stride. Mark Twain said about dueling that the best swordsman in the country is not afraid of the second best swordsman. But the champion doesn't like to go up against a novice who is likely to grab the rapier half way down the blade and wade right in.

Victor of Alamein

If posterity works no faster making up its mind about "Monty" of Alamein than posterity has been arriving at a final verdict on the fall of the Roman Empire, it is obvious that a good many controversial books are still to be written about Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery. Faced with a hotly debated problem or a personality, we are always saying, as a journalistic neighbor said the other day about the victor of Alamein, "his final position in the military history of the world's greatest war must be left to posterity."

But what makes one so sure that posterity is certain to arrive at a true and final verdict on "Monty"? It is almost two thousand years since the Roman Empire began to "decline" and more than fifteen hundred years since the tragedy was consummated, but the historians are still debating why Rome fell.

Why Rome Fell

Did Rome fall because of soil exhaustion in Italy, landlordism, malaria, the infiltration of alien races, the crushing imperial taxation, not to mention Mr. Gibbon's main emphasis on the challenge of Christianity?

Posterity, to judge by the new books that are written, has still to say the final word about Christopher Columbus, Napoleon, Hamilton and Jefferson, Andrew Jackson. History and biography are not only being constantly rewritten but there is a very articulate school of thought which insists that this is as it should be. Every generation is encouraged to rewrite the epochs and the heroes of the past in its own image, so to speak.

The Longer View

Posterity is even more frequently called perspective. When men are far enough away in time from Bryan and McKinley in 1896 their passions are supposed to have cooled off, their fears and hopes softened down; they have attained perspective. And certainly that should be the case when the perspective stretches back to the Federalists and anti-Federalists of 1796. After all, it is inconceivable that Americans in 1946 should hate Alexander Hamilton or Thomas Jefferson as these two men and their followers hated each other.

But the thing so often overlooked is that Americans in 1846 and 1896 and 1946 have their own fierce loyalties and partisanships, and in fighting their own contemporary battles they will reach back into the past for all the ammunition they can lay hands on. They will conscript Hamilton, Jefferson, Jackson for partisan duty in 1846, 1896, 1946.

Today Alters Past

That is why we have the rise and fall of historical reputations in the course of the years, and now Hamilton will be in the fashion and now Jefferson will oust him from popular esteem. Posterity never really pronounces a final verdict because posterity is a long, long time and the fashions and the moods fluctuate. This is the real secret why new biographies are written about famous people, and not the discovery of new "evidence," as commonly alleged. There will always be new evidence to support a popular case.

In The Nation

Some Casualties Before the Truce Came

By ARTHUR KROCK

WASHINGTON, Sept. 19—The ship of State is wallowing hull down today in its effort to carry a wild cargo which it cannot confine and the skipper is afraid to jettison. Mutiny in the crew has not been quelled but merely taken under consideration, with leave granted by the captain to the chief of the mutineers to fight it out later. No one aboard or elsewhere knows whether the course has been changed, and if so in what direction, or how many helmsmen are to fight for the wheel with the skipper's full permission.

This extraordinary condition is the result of the captain's tactics in dealing with an assault by one of his officers on another while the ship of State was being steered through the most perilous rocks it has ever encountered. The President merely ordered the vessel hove to.

In adopting this method of postponing a decision that must be made, Mr. Truman took the advice of professional politicians, principally National Chairman Hannegan, over that of almost every other counselor. Secretary Wallace has agreed for the time being to cease his assaults on Secretary Byrnes, and incidentally on the foreign policy pursued by Mr. Byrnes, which the President has again endorsed. But he "stands absolutely" on the Madison Square Garden speech he made as a member of the administration. And he remains a member of the administration.

Silence, the poet said, like a poultice comes to heal the blows of sound. But the blows already struck in this battle over foreign policy cannot be healed by silence, especially of a temporary nature. All concerned except Mr. Wallace have suffered loss of that prestige without which officials cannot carry out their responsibilities, the President most of all. Mr. Byrnes, in addition, has been weakened by the blow in the back from his own corner which Mr. Truman has condoned on the mere pledge that it will not be followed by another until Mr. Byrnes can regain his strength and get the opportunity to put up his guard.

A List of Damages

The damages inflicted are numerous and lasting. Among them are these:

The President, for what was obviously the belief that he requires the political support of Mr. Wallace and his radical followers on almost any terms, compromised what cannot be compromised at home or abroad and tolerated disunity in his administration. Since the effectiveness of foreign policy depends on government unity as well as on economic and military power, the injury here is plain.

Mr. Wallace, in the speech on which he still stands "absolutely," having attacked the Republican party and its leaders, imperiled the cooperation in foreign policy these have been giving, and the President's refusal to oust him from the Cabinet imperils it still more. If the Republicans decline to join in promoting a policy which may be changing, for all they know, and going under new direction which they could not conceivably support, the consequence could be national and world disaster.

The parallel thinking and similar objectives of the British in the quest with the United States for lasting peace have constituted the only restraint on Soviet Russia. Mr. Wallace assailed British policy as "imperialism" with which we must not be associated and explained all Soviet moves as necessary "retaliation." Since he has not been disavowed as a Cabinet officer by the President, the British have reason to doubt our eventual course in world affairs and to feel they cannot be sure who speaks for the administration.

Eye to Eye With Moscow

The plan for control of atomic energy which Mr. Baruch and his aides presented to the commission of the United Nations was vigorously criticized by Mr. Wallace, although his summary of it was surprisingly inaccurate. The Russians have criticized it also, and now it is disclosed that their counter-proposal of a treaty as substitute, without an effective international inspection system, is virtually Mr. Wallace's proposal, too. The President's procedure with the Secretary of Commerce, although he repeats his approval of the Baruch-Hancock plan, will stiffen Russian resistance on this issue, already encouraged by the open record that Mr. Wallace agrees with their counter-proposal. Anything that defers solution of this problem increases the menace to the world.

The Soviet spokesmen have often voiced their suspicion that an influential group of military commanders in the United States advocates immediate war against Russia and that this group is piling up atom bombs with this precise purpose in mind. In his letter of July 23 to the President, Mr. Wallace attributed to certain "military thinking" this very concept, once more agreeing in substance with the Russians. The disavowal by Secretaries Forrestal and Patterson that any "responsible officer" of the Navy or Army has urged such a program will not remove the Soviet suspicion, the less so because they can quote another Cabinet authority—still in office and Presidential favor—to the contrary.

These are some of the casualties of the episode thus far. When Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Baruch and some others whose long and devoted labors have been seriously undermined by Mr. Wallace think the situation through there may be more. And the nation as a whole has seen a momentous decision made on the basis that seats in Congress are the highest stakes of all.

Letters to The Times

Communism in China

It Is Believed to Intensify Economic Decay and Block Reforms

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

J. Spencer Kennard's letter in your Sept. 11 issue contains many inaccuracies.

For instance, he writes that Gen. Ho Ying-chin in 1935 "handed over to Japan jurisdiction of large areas of north China." The Ho-Umetsu agreement, to which Mr. Kennard refers, was an attempt by the Central Government to keep some control over the northern provinces which Japan was seeking to detach by force and intimidation exerted against the local authorities.

To imply, as Mr. Kennard does, that China could and should have fought Japan before "the limits of endurance" were reached in 1937 is unfair. China had only the beginnings of a modern army and no armament factories; and she knew she would have to fight alone, with the United States, Britain and Russia standing by with folded arms. When war came the United States and Britain not only did not help China, but continued for years supplying Japan with all the war materials she needed to use against China.

Comparison With America

If to "oppose war with Japan" prior to 1937 makes Ho Ying-chin "an exponent of feudalism," how would Mr. Kennard describe President Roosevelt and the whole American people until Pearl Harbor?

As regards the charge that Ho Ying-chin "organized civil war," how does Mr. Kennard explain that between V-J Day and December, 1945, the Chinese Communists had acquired possession of huge territories. Who was attacking whom?

I hold no brief for General Ho Ying-chin, and I agree as to the necessity of land reform in China and the desirability of democratic reforms. Nor do I think that China's agrarian problem could or should be solved by mass expropriations and killings.

Mr. Kennard repeats what someone at Yenching told him about Yenan and its "highest pattern of democracy."

I was in Yenan myself last February, and while I do not deny that agrarian reforms have been carried out there, I found no trace of democracy. There is only one newspaper, one radio and one party and they all speak with one voice. Nor did I ever meet anyone there who criticized the Communist administration—this in itself proves the absence of democracy. In National China, on the other hand, the Communists and every other opposition group are allowed to publish newspapers and criticize or abuse the Government to their hearts' content.

In Yenan, which has become Communist China's snowplace, all dissident elements were liquidated long ago. In the more recently acquired Communist territories there is pillage, forced grain levies, expropriation and murder, and forced levying of recruits for the Communist armies. Hence the thousands of refugees from north Kiangsu whom THE NEW YORK TIMES correspondent recently saw in the Government-held capital of that province.

Reforms Hampered by War

The fact which critics of the Chinese Government leave out of account in damning it for not yet having instituted the reforms which are so necessary is that it has been preoccupied with war almost ever since it came to power. From 1931 onward it had to cope with Japan. Now there is Russia's aggression, which is masked as civil war.

The vicious circle of economic difficulties creating communism, and communism intensifying economic decay and preventing reconstruction and reform, cannot be broken without our help. In China, as in Europe, Russia profits from chaos and misery. America stands to gain only through helping China to recover from the war and its aftermath and to set her house in order.

Naturally the Communists want the United States to "withdraw its armed forces" and withhold supplies from China. If we do so China must, in despair, let herself become part of Russia's "new order." FREDA UTLEY.

Washington, Sept. 14, 1946.

Traffic Accident Figures

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I am amazed at the amount of conflicting reports and statistics which are being published concerning the various factors involved in traffic accidents. Let me illustrate by citing three examples from your own fine newspaper:

On July 28 you carried an article under the by-line of Bert Pierce, in which he quotes the editor of The Weekly Underwriter as authority for the statement that "90 per cent of all car accidents result from overindulgence in liquor." In THE NEW YORK TIMES Magazine of Aug. 11 you published an article by Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, who was general chairman of the President's Highway Safety Conference. In this article General Fleming lists the outstanding causes of accidents as:

1. Failure to obey traffic laws.
2. Substandard traffic laws.
3. Differences in regulations and traffic-control devices in various States.

In regard to the subject of drinking, General Fleming refers to an analysis of what he terms "the most accurate figures available" and makes the statement that "one out of nine drivers in fatal accidents had been drinking."

And again, on Aug. 12, THE TIMES carried an article on a traffic accident survey made by the New York Police Department and the Greater New York Safety Council, and you quote the Greater New York Safety Council to the effect that two of every three serious accidents involving automobiles were the result of faulty brakes or other mechanical defects.

It is most important that the cause of accidents be known before curative or preventive measures can be applied. But isn't it rather confusing to the layman to read one day that 90 per cent of the accidents are caused by one factor, and another day to see that two-thirds of the accidents are caused by something else, and another day to find that there are three entirely different major causes, in the opinion of someone else?

The National Safety Council has for many years made careful study and classification of accident causes, getting their facts from police records and official sources throughout the country and compiling them most accurately. So why not let's take their figures as standard and authoritative, and go on from there and do something real about correcting the situation?

JOHN W. DARR.

New York, Sept. 15, 1946.

Status of Baltic States

Non-Recognition Policy in Regard to Russian Annexation Is Pointed Out

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the editorial "Mr. Wallace and Russia" it was omitted that President Roosevelt also did not yield to Soviet Russia the Baltic states. On the contrary, he continued the non-recognition policy of the illegal annexation of the Baltic states effectuated, as it is stated in the United States Government declaration of July 23, 1940, by devious processes, which culminated in the deliberate annihilation of the political independence and territorial integrity of the three Baltic states: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

Further, the declaration states:

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak. These principles constitute the very foundation upon which the existing relationship between the twenty-one sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

May I add that the non-recognition policy of the annexation of the Baltic states has been pursued also by the present Government. It is a fact that the United States does not recognize the incorporation of the Baltic states into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The representatives of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania accredited to the United States Government continue to be recognized, as could be easily verified by a glance into the diplomatic list issued monthly by the Department of State. DR. ALFRED BILMANIS,

Latvian Minister.

Washington, Sept. 17, 1946.

A Campaign Against Rats

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The acting director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Clarence Cottam, writes us:

"It is estimated that 7,312,500 tons of the 1944 grain crop (wheat, oats, barley, rye, rice, corn, beans, peas and soy beans) was removed from human consumption by rats. This is between 3 and 4 per cent of the total grain production for that year. The estimated value of the amount lost through rats was conservatively placed at $200,000,000."

He informs us that less than $140,000 has been appropriated to exterminate rats which cause this waste.

We have asked the President, in view of the fact humans need this grain and rats don't, to allocate $250,000 more from funds at his disposal for an effective campaign against rats.

Your readers can render a real service by writing the President, urging him to do this.

BENJAMIN C. MARSH,
Executive Secretary, People's Lobby.

Washington, Sept. 16, 1946.

Return to Ethiopia Asked

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Now that the peace treaty with Italy is about to be concluded, I crave the hospitality of your columns to express the ardent desire of my compatriots in ex-Italian Eritrea and Somalia, Ethiopia's lost provinces, to return to their motherland. We have cherished this desire most earnestly during the sixty years under which we were oppressed by Italian rule.

We appeal to you, the free people of the United States living under a democracy, to understand how we suffer under such disabilities. We desire self-government in our motherland; we desire to rejoin our own people and to work together with them in developing our country, in providing schools for our children, hospitals for our sick.

GABRE-MASKAL HABTEMARIAM,
President, Ethiopico-Eritrean Unity Association.

Addis-Ababa, Ethiopia, Aug. 26, 1946.

TRIOLET BY THE SEA

Who listens to a hollow shell
Will hear slow surf upon the sand
And water ringing like a bell.
Who listens to a hollow shell
Will hear his echoed heart-beat swell
In music like a saraband.
Who listens to a hollow shell
Will hear slow surf upon the sand.

DOROTHY ULRICH TROUBETZKOY