

The Peacemakers Are Here'



Turkish-Pakistan Pact May Be Risky But Wise

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON
 AS IS well known to borrow a phrase from Mr. Vishniac, it is a mighty oak from Jittia scores grow. Consider, for example, the following little diplomatic score. A few days ago, the Turkish Foreign Office quietly informed the Pakistan Foreign Office and the American State Department that Turkey is ready to enter a military pact with Pakistan. Announcement of this pact—and of American armed support for it—is expected shortly.

This news seemed hardly worth a second glance. Yet now consider the mighty oak which will, or might, grow from this small acorn.

The whole power relationship of the Soviet empire will be transformed. The relations between the United States and India will take an immediate, violent turn for the worse. Bitter official protest, accompanied by widespread anti-American rioting, is expected. An open break is not ruled out.

If the intelligence experts are right, the Soviet Union is likely to sponsor a major drive to capture political control of Afghanistan or Kashmir or both, as a direct response to the pact. If Indian Prime Minister Nehru is right, the world will take a long step towards world war.

In short, the soon-to-be-announced Turkish-Pakistan agreement to form an American-supported military alliance is not quite the routine news it appears. It is a first bluish ink, one of the major developments of recent months. The history of this development traces back to Secretary of State Dulles' trip to the Middle East last spring. On this trip, Dulles decided that the then existing American policy — to build a Middle Eastern counter-part of NATO, to be called MEDO — was a pack of nonsense.

Simply would not work. Dulles decided, so long as the Arab states were more interested in their quarrels with Israel and Egypt than in defending themselves against Soviet attack, the sensible alternative, Dulles concluded, was a defense organization of the type which he called the "northern tier"—Turkey, Iran and Pakistan. This organization could

ultimately be expanded, Dulles reasoned, but this was the place to start. There is, to be sure, a break in the "northern tier"—the new regime in Iran, in response to some delicate maneuvers, fully refused to have anything to do with the pact, at least until after an oil settlement. But, Dulles reasoned, a Turkish-Pakistan pact is a firm base to build on, to strengthen the desperately weak southern border area of the Soviet Union in Iran, and perhaps ultimately the other Arab states can come in later, when the time is ripe.

There is, to be sure, a break in the risks involved in this plan are distinctly hair-raising. Nehru has made no secret of his bitter resentment of a move which will strengthen India's rival Pakistan, and at the same time crack the neutral Asian bloc of which Nehru considers himself the leader. When Nehru protests, he will be offered the same arms aid Pakistan is to receive — about twenty-five million as a starter. But he is almost certain to reject this offer forthwith. The rift between his country and India will then become almost unbridgeably wide—and whether you like it or not, the whole northern tier Communist country on the Asian land mass.

Nor is a rift with India the only danger. The government of Kashmir is already heavily infiltrated, and indeed partly controlled, by Communists and fellow-travelers. As a response to the armament of Pakistan, the Kremlin will give the Kashmir Communists the go-ahead to attempt the seizure of Kashmir, the gateway to the Indian sub-continent. Afghanistan, a sparsely populated, strategically vital country which has heretofore been a sort of no man's land in the cold war, is another obvious Soviet target. Dulles and his advisers are quite aware of these dangers. But they argue, neither fear of Soviet reaction nor desire to appease Nehru can be permitted to paralyze American policy, and all, Nehru or no Nehru, the whole northern tier of the vast Soviet empire cannot be allowed to remain forever a total power vacuum. Frightening as the risks are, it is hard to see a flaw in this argument.

Ships Are Nice Because They Cannot Be Hurried
 By ROBERT C. RUARK
 People are greatly concerned with hurry, these days, and for a man in a hurry a ship is no way to get from here to there. A man in his better-remembered business cannot live without the airplane, and I suspect I average about 100,000 miles a year on planes. But the plane is functional. The plane is wonderful. But it isn't romantic.

You get there too fast in planes. You leave a scrap of your soul behind you. They have narrowed the world to a tiny corner, the planes, and you are a man with limited time to go places and see things he could never have hoped to see before.

The skipper, Commandante Antonino Lauro, has been considerably more of a father to his flock on this trip than a formal picture of the stern sea captain. There were very few passengers in first class, but we had Christmas, New Year's, and a lot of birthdays, and I detected no homesickness.

There are nearly three hundred kids in the tourist class, of 18 different nationalities, all heading for the States. I have seen Claus making a dash for his way out to sea in 18 different languages. One of the most moving sights I have seen was Claus passing a sister ship, the Victoria, Europe-bound from Hong Kong, on a full sea, and I saw Claus passing close aboard and firing rocket salutes at each other. Both ships are now and sparkling white, with their Christmas decorations for a moment for present that the next day's news would contain the usual accounts of gloom and violence.

A Tax Benefit For One Group

UNTIL the House Ways & Means Committee completes the big task of rewriting the complex and unwieldy federal tax laws, it may not be wise to draw conclusions from the piecemeal changes so far approved.

Even so, the decision to exempt up to 15 per cent of the income from dividends raises serious questions that are not easily answered.

Proponents argue that since corporation profits are taxed before dividends are distributed, it amounts to double taxation when the stock owner pays personal income taxes on his dividends. If that double taxation is a bad principle, it is not made any better by compromising with it. It could be argued more logically that all income from dividends should be tax exempt.

Proponents also contend that the partial exemption will encourage more people to buy stocks, a proposition that may have some merit to it.

But it seems to us that it is wrong to single out just one kind of property for tax relief. Stock certificates are property, representing shares in a company bought with the purchaser's money.

Bonds are also property—as are savings, and income-producing real estate. Yet the American people who complied with the request of the government to buy war bonds saw their real value decrease because of inflation, whereas those who put their money in stocks rode the tide of inflation and watched the dollar value of their stocks soar.

If the stock owner is to be permitted a tax exemption on 15 per cent of his income from dividends, would it be fair to the bond holder to deny him the same benefit? And what about the man who puts his money into an apartment house? Should not he get some consideration?

Tax legislation that bestows favors on any one class is questionable. If tax reduction is to come, it would be better to lower the schedule of corporation taxes so as to leave more profit to be divided among stockholders, to cut excise taxes uniformly, and to increase the personal exemptions for individuals.

In that way, tax reduction would benefit the greatest number in the fairest manner.

Why The FCC Is No Place For Lee

A STORM of controversy rages around Robert E. Lee (not the illustrious general, whose ability is agreed upon, but a present day namesake of his), who has been nominated by the President to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Many of those who object to his confirmation stress these three points:

1. He is without background that would qualify him for making decisions in the vital communications field.
2. He is a friend of Sen. Joe McCarthy, and with him had a part in the unethical Maryland campaign in which Sen. Millard Tydings was defeated.
3. He has been associated with H. L. Hunt, the fabulously rich reactionary from Texas who sponsors "Facts Forum," a radio program which purports to be factual and unbiased but frequently leans toward the right-wing viewpoint. Lee moderated a few of the early "Facts Forum" programs.

It is perhaps inevitable these days but nevertheless unfortunate that so much has been made of these latter two points. They are not very important, and they are examples of the guilt by

association technique which the McCarthy crowd uses.

After all, the fact that this man Lee or any other man worked for a radio program which has since become controversial should not rule him out, if he is otherwise qualified.

Neither should a man's incidental participation in a dirty campaign be held against him. Lee was not responsible for or a party to the back street tactics that gave the Tydings campaign its notoriety.

This being said, we think Lee should not be confirmed, for the simple reason that he is not professionally qualified for the job. He has been an investigator, for the FBI and a congressional appropriations committee. He has not had the experience or training that would qualify him to exercise great power over radio and TV stations and deal with complicated, technical communications problems.

The President was not well-advised to propose this man for the job. The Senate can correct the error by refusing to confirm him.

Progress Along The St. Lawrence

CANALS and seaways have a hard time getting started. In Balboa's day there was talk of a waterway across the Isthmus of Panama. In 1825 Henry Clay spoke glowingly of the Erie Canal, and completion of the Panama Canal would inaugurate, Napoleon, during his Egyptian campaign, envisioned the Suez Canal. In both cases, decades of talk and wrangling preceded construction of the canals.

Viewed from the historical perspective, then, the St. Lawrence Seaway project is making rapid progress. The Seaway, or more properly that remaining 100 miles or so which needs development if Midwestern cities are to become seaports, will be built. It will be built and the tolls will be collected by Canada alone if the U. S. does not choose to go along with its northern neighbor. And the likelihood that the U. S. will join in the venture was increased substantially last week when the Senate voted, 81 to 33, for U. S. participation.

If the bill passes the House, where it is said to have a 50-50 chance, it will become law, for President Eisenhower, like other recent Presidents, wants to see the Seaway completed.

A combination of factors led to defeat

of the Seaway's opponents, principally railroad, port and coal interests and legislators anxious to please these groups.

In recent years iron ore resources have been discovered in the Quebec-Labrador area and steel companies, anxious to get closer to the U. S. cheaply, became proponents rather than opponents of the Seaway.

The current bill deletes certain provisions, found in previous bills, which tied power development along the St. Lawrence with the Seaway, and which private power companies found objectionable.

This administration has stressed the need for the Seaway as a defense requirement and some legislators apparently foresaw the havoc that could be created by the Seaway, and which Great Lakes industrial region were blasted, and no alternative water transportation were available.

Thus a logical and long overdue development of a natural resource moves one stage nearer reality. We hope the House concurs with the Senate, rather than trying to delay the inevitable and logical development which will give this country a string of seaports from Buffalo to Duluth.

People's Platform

Yalta Didn't Bind U. S.

Editors, The News:
 MANY members of the Bricker proposal to amend the Constitution frequently refer to the Yalta agreement as a prime example of how the treaty-making power of our government has been abused. I would like to point out that the Yalta agreement was neither a treaty nor an executive agreement, which would have been binding on the government of the United States.

The agreement begins with these words: "The Crimea Conference of the Heads of the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which took place from Feb. 4 to 11 came to the following conclusions:"

The important aspect of that opening statement is that it refers to the "heads of the governments" coming to "conclusions." There is not one word indicating that it was a binding commitment on the governments.

Many of the conclusions reached at Yalta related to matters which were not the subject matter of treaties. For instance they agreed to call for conference at St. Francisco which drew up the Charter of the United Nations. They also issued the "Declaration on Liberated Europe" pledging themselves to assist the peoples in that area of eastern Europe "to create democratic institutions of their own choice."

There were provisions in the Yalta agreement about the disarmament of Germany, the zones of occupation, reparations and so on.

The above-mentioned provisions, of course, have not been the focal center of the many attacks on the Yalta agreement. What did arouse widespread criticism were the provisions relating to the transfer of Far Eastern territory to the Soviet Union from the United States. The Big Three moving the pre-war eastern Polish border to the west. Unquestionably agreements of that sort should be submitted to a treaty subject to approval by our constitutional process. The point which is apparently missed by so many critics is that Roosevelt himself never considered either of the above-mentioned provisions to be binding on the government of the United States.

"We've been pretty critical of McCarthy," remarked a Midwestern editor, "doesn't want us to print too much about McCarthy. We have the application pending before the FCC."

Both newsmen had every reason to be cautious. They knew that McCarthy has ten men on the FCC—John C. Doerfer of Wisconsin and Robert E. Lee. They also knew that on the same day Lee took his seat, the FCC for

the first time reversed a ruling out had refused to reverse on three separate occasions regarding a "McCarthyism" network. They hope to see Lee take his seat, the FCC proceeded to reopen Milwaukee to McCarthy's friends.

The Denver Post, staunch Eisenhower backer, has pounded editorially on the worry that monopolization of public opinion is involved. Palmer Hoyt, Denver Post publisher and one of the most respected newsmen in America, has indirectly warned "McCarthyism" in Milwaukee. Johnson, what the nation faces if one senator begins to influence public opinion through the FCC.

Already the nation has seen how the senator from Wisconsin was able to secure \$300,000 of free radio and TV time to answer President Truman. At first his senatorial network, officials planned to refuse McCarthy radio-TV time since Truman referred not to the senator but to "McCarthyism." However, higher-up network officials—the men who have to deal with McCarthy's two men on the FCC—ruled otherwise.

Quote, Unquote
 A writer says home-grown things usually are the best. If he's talking about children, we agree—Matton (Ill.) Journal-Gazette.

A magazine reports that a recipe for a salad composed of diced raw rutabagas, chopped green pepper and salted peas is available in a leaflet issued by the Bureau of Home Economics in Washington. It's free. "Plea sounds like just about the right thing." — Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel.

Two things which must be kept free from suspicion are a woman's reputation and a low water supply. — Richmond Times-Dispatch.

The only person who listens to both sides of a family argument is the woman in the next apartment. — Wall Street Journal.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON
 CONFIRMATION debate over one of Eisenhower's most important appointments comes up in the Senate today. He is Robert E. Lee, the new federal communications commissioner.

Lee's nomination has allocated the greatest national wealth of the U. S. Government can still parcel out private citizens—radio and TV channels.

In the Hoover administration, the most important bureau from the viewpoint of national wealth was the Federal Power Commission, which allocated dam sites to electric power companies. Now most of these have been deeded.

Not only do TV and radio have

a tremendous impact on the public, but many TV and radio stations are owned by newspapers, which makes them a monopoly of the news, of cannot think, according to Sen. Mike Monroney of Oklahoma, is not to be taken lightly.

Subtle Slanting
 But what even Sen. Monroney, an ex-newspaperman, may not realize is the extent to which some newspapers may be tempted to slant their pages because of pending TV licenses.

"I suppose we'll have a tough time getting a TV license," observed one Wisconsin publisher of McCarthy.

"The boss," remarked a Midwestern editor, "doesn't want us to print too much about McCarthy. We have the application pending before the FCC."

Bricker Plan Isolates Move

Charlotte
 THE CHARLOTTE NEWS is to be commended for its recent excellent editorial on the Bricker Amendment. This attempt to put the executive in a strait-jacket in the conduct of the nation's foreign affairs is one of the greatest constitutional crises of the republic.

It is all too clear that the principal backers of the Bricker Amendment are a group of extremely narrow nationalists and isolationists. They hope by the adoption of this amendment to lay the ground work for the ultimate destruction of the United Nations and NATO, and to annul the progress of the world away from the law of the jungle in international relations.

Their method has been subtle. By a campaign of half-truths, they have conjured up an apparition of dangers to our liberties. These dangers do not exist under our present Constitution and form of government, as your editorials so well demonstrated.

—FRANK W. SNEPP

Some Senators Afraid To Oppose Lee

Hoyt's newspaper has pointed out that McCarthy's friend, Lee, whose confirmation is voted on today, has no qualifications to regulate TV or radio other than serving as moderator for three months on Facts Forum, the TV program financed by Texas millionaire H. L. Hunt, another McCarthy friend and backer.

Lee was also embroiled in the most scurrilous and dirtiest political campaign in recent history, the McCarthy operation in Maryland to defeat Sen. Tydings. An official Senate investigation of that campaign indicates violation of the Corrupt Practices Act.

No wonder, Lee will be confirmed. He will be confirmed partly because some senators are afraid of McCarthy, partly because the big networks have been pulling wires for him backstage. Sen. Tydings would come into Wisconsin of the Interstate Commerce Committee which has old Lee, confirmed to friends that he feared McCarthy would come into Wisconsin to campaign against him.

Sen. Magnuson of Washington, even on the committee, has a close political backer in Seattle

who is interested in a TV station. Meanwhile, Earl Gammans, vice president of Columbia Broadcasting, buttonholing Sen. Smathers of Florida, also on the committee which old Lee, Magnuson, and Sen. Tydings, Ed Murrow, who has done an outstanding job of combating McCarthyism, and generally has followed the lead of Sen. Tydings. However, the networks have asked the FCC for permission to operate a TV network. The present limit on Commission fees is reported to favor their petition. Sen. Smathers reserved judgment on the confirmation. But no one on the executive committee, with the exception of Oklahoma's Ed Donohoe, had the courage to vote against Lee.

"President Eisenhower made a pledge to the American people that he would appoint qualified men to public office," Magnuson told fellow senators. "A young man who has served three months as moderator for H. L. Hunt and who handled money for McCarthy in Maryland isn't exactly qualified to regulate the radio and TV airways of the nation."