

THOMAS L. ROBINSON.....Publisher
J. E. DOWD.....General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH.....Executive Editor
C. A. MCKNIGHT.....Editor

SATURDAY, MARCH 13, 1954

Open Door For Reds And Wetbacks

It was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area.

That would be, one supposes, a statement by one of the more imaginative spy-hunters. But no, that statement was made by the head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, points up the difficulty of administering these laws and reveals a gross exploitation of cheap foreign labor, at the expense of American workers.

About 200,000 Mexicans come into this country legally each year. They are under contracts, which provide that they get the prevailing wage in the community.

These non-contract workers know that some cotton, lettuce and melon growers will hire them, because they will work for less than the going wage. So they are smuggled across in the old days they swam, thus the term "wetbacks".

During the first eight months of 1953, almost 700,000 illegal immigrants from Mexico were apprehended—no one knows how many others entered the country unnoticed.

The ranchers who encourage the wetbacks argue that native workers won't do the "stoop labor" that their crops require. When properly qualified that statement is true. U. S. workers won't do that kind of work at the incredibly low wages the ranchers will pay.

A Weak Answer To SEN. JOE MCCARTHY'S answer to Ed Murrow's television program was old stuff to Tar Heels, who saw the same false allegation used against Dr. Frank P. Graham in the 1950 Smith-Graham primary battle.

In his appearance on the Fulton Lewis radio program, McCarthy quoted from an 18-year-old newspaper the charge that Murrow was on the national advisory council of the Institute of International Education which taught "the violent overthrow of the entire traditional social order."

What he said that the purpose of the session was "an effort to coordinate the youth to go to Russia and study communism under Russian teachers."

That was not the case at all. The May 5, 1934, issue of SCIENCE & SOCIETY made it clear that the school was "to provide American educators an opportunity to observe educational methods in Russia."

The magazine went on to say that the advisory committee was not forced to "sell" the summer session.

"To the end that the Soviet authorities may learn the American reaction to the new Russian educational system, an American national advisory

grave social problem, involving murder, prostitution, robbery and a gigantic illegal narcotic infiltration. The ease with which any Communist agent who wishes to can enter this country is illustrated by a look at the map. Guatemala is pro-Communist.

Certainly even a partial solution of this problem is difficult. But it would be eased if employers were required to hire native workers when they are available, at standard wages, and if the Immigration Service were given more funds to enforce the immigration laws and crack down on the contractors and farmers who connive to import the poor Mexicans illegally.

Unequivocal

HAVING finished the annual struggle with the internal revenue department and conscience at 2 a. m. this morning, we are in no mood to say a kind word for anything or anybody in any way connected with tax collection.

A good many taxpayers who can't qualify to use the federal short form can use the state short form. If your income derives from wages, commissions, salaries, dividends or interest you just put down the total, take your deduction, multiply, grip your teeth and reach for the checkbook.

One could quarrel about the fairness of this kind of form, but no one can say it isn't simple and clear. Because it is that way, it doesn't even give your conscience a workout.

A Weak Answer To SEN. JOE MCCARTHY'S answer to Ed Murrow's television program was old stuff to Tar Heels, who saw the same false allegation used against Dr. Frank P. Graham in the 1950 Smith-Graham primary battle.

In his appearance on the Fulton Lewis radio program, McCarthy quoted from an 18-year-old newspaper the charge that Murrow was on the national advisory council of the Institute of International Education which taught "the violent overthrow of the entire traditional social order."

What he said that the purpose of the session was "an effort to coordinate the youth to go to Russia and study communism under Russian teachers."

That was not the case at all. The May 5, 1934, issue of SCIENCE & SOCIETY made it clear that the school was "to provide American educators an opportunity to observe educational methods in Russia."

The magazine went on to say that the advisory committee was not forced to "sell" the summer session.

"To the end that the Soviet authorities may learn the American reaction to the new Russian educational system, an American national advisory

grave social problem, involving murder, prostitution, robbery and a gigantic illegal narcotic infiltration. The ease with which any Communist agent who wishes to can enter this country is illustrated by a look at the map. Guatemala is pro-Communist.

Certainly even a partial solution of this problem is difficult. But it would be eased if employers were required to hire native workers when they are available, at standard wages, and if the Immigration Service were given more funds to enforce the immigration laws and crack down on the contractors and farmers who connive to import the poor Mexicans illegally.

Certainly even a partial solution of this problem is difficult. But it would be eased if employers were required to hire native workers when they are available, at standard wages, and if the Immigration Service were given more funds to enforce the immigration laws and crack down on the contractors and farmers who connive to import the poor Mexicans illegally.

A scientist says the Colorado mountains will have disappeared five million years from now. Then what will the boys with the \$12-a-day motel do for a living? —LAUREL (MISS) LEADER-CALL.



"No, no, Eve, think of what you're doing. . . disease, war, A-bombs, H-bombs, taxes, television, Arthur Godfrey. . ."

Why Flanders Spoke Out

The Sensible Senator

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON THERE is something oddly reassuring about the talk of Sen. Ralph E. Flanders, Republican, of Vermont.

Flanders is a solid-appearance, elderly man with the real, deliberate speech of northern New England. He is above all an eminently sensible man—this is the characteristic which immediately strikes the visitor and it is reassuring to be reminded that a man of this kind is in the Senate.

Like other such men in Congress (and there are more of them than sometimes appears) Sen. Flanders has not attracted a great deal of attention in his eight years in Washington. But a few days ago the nation and the Republican party were rather sharply reminded of his existence when he arose on the Senate floor and delivered a quietly devastating little speech about Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin.

Flanders not only bluntly charged McCarthy with seeking to "shatter" the Republican party. He also made fun of McCarthy. He said that McCarthy had been successfully done before. His best passage may become a classic when Flanders' denials are painted. He goes into his war dance. He emits his war whoops. He goes forth to battle and presently returns with the scalp of a pink Army devil.

As by one of these reporters how he meant to make his speech, Flanders replied that it was "strictly my own idea." There were no origins from "the House or elsewhere. It was, Flanders realized, "a very serious thing to do—to get up on the floor of the Senate and say how I felt about this McCarthy matter."

It was indeed, McCarthy is personally without question the most nearly universally disliked man in the Senate. Yet his bullying tactics have been so successful that precious few Democrats, let alone Republicans in this Congress, have been able to breathe a word of criticism of him.

"For over a year now," Flanders says, "the Republican leadership has been trying to get rid of the McCarthy followers and all the Eisenhower followers into the same camp. Perhaps it might have been done—so one on our side wants to split the party. But

over and over again, McCarthy has served notice that it has to be McCarthy all the way or nothing.

MATTER OF PRINCIPLE "As this became clear it seemed to me that real matter of principle was involved. So I took an extra day in Vermont this last weekend just to sit and think. And in the end I made up my mind that I ought to speak out."

"I have a strong feeling," Flanders continued, "that it is a President himself has got to assert his leadership and authority more." He is, Flanders admits, his sensible way, not absolutely sure specifically what the President ought to do. It might have been better, for example, if the President himself, rather than Vice President Nixon, had answered Adlai Stevenson's charge that the administration had sold out to McCarthyism. But it still appears that the President is "under the influence of the political advice of those who think he can hold himself clear from McCarthy."

There is, Flanders says dryly, "no fooling ourselves." Even in Vermont there are "a surprising number of people who look on McCarthy as a gift from heaven." But it is important to remember that the vast majority of these people will never vote Democratic under any circumstances. It is true that some of them might stay home in November. Eisenhower makes his position on McCarthy unequivocally clear. And it is no use pretending that

"If Eisenhower goes it alone, this will make the Republican party safe in November. Nothing will do that. SPLIT WOULD HELP "But I think the balance," the Senator continues thoughtfully, "that a clear-cut split would help more than it would hurt. Of course I can speak only about Vermont, which is Republican anyway, and I may be wrong. But I know so very many people who will vote Democratic if it appears that the administration has indeed surrendered to McCarthy."

"There is remarkably little in a business life," Flanders says forgoing, obviously with the surrender of the unfortunate Secretary Stevens in mind, "which prepares a man for a life in politics." The senator speaks from experience. Again reassuringly, his raise from bonded apprentice at sixteen (the Phi Beta Kappa he wears on his elegant mole-skin waist) is an honor to wealthy capitalist in the great American tradition. He even followed tradition, Flanders remarks smilingly, by "marrying the boss' daughter."

"What taught me a lot about politics, after fifty years in business," he said, "was running for the Senate the first time and getting licked. I learned not to rise to every fly in the ointment, and I learned not to take too much advice. I learned that the best rule in politics is to be yourself." This is indeed a sensible rule—and one that President Eisenhower himself might well ponder.

CONGRESSIONAL QUIZ

By Congressional Quarterly Q—How does the government support farm prices? A—The government determines the price-support level for farm products; it guarantees that farmers will receive that price either on the "free market" or from the government. If market prices fall below the guaranteed price, the government loans the farmer the difference. When prices rise above the support level, the farmer repays the loan, reclaiming his crop, and sells it. If prices remain low, he forfeits his crop but keeps the loan money. When

the government takes over the crop as collateral, it keeps it off the "free market." By reducing the surplus supply in this way, the government helps strike a balance with demand, forcing market prices up. Q—What is parity? A—Parity—as applied to farm prices and income—is a formula to measure the purchasing power of the farmer's income from sale of his produce. Current prices and income are compared to levels in a base period. If a farmer gets 100 per cent of parity for a bushel of corn, the proceeds of sale are equal to the proceeds of a bushel of corn in the base period. Corn and some other farm products now are supported at 90 per cent of parity.

Merry-Go-Round Drew Pearson's

WASHINGTON IF you trace the attacks of Sen. McCarthy against the Communist Party, you will invariably detect an underlying motive of revenge—a motive reminiscent of totalitarian tactics in Europe before the war.

McCarthy attacked Sen. Tydings of Maryland and Benton of Connecticut because they had questioned his charge of 200 Communists in the State Department; the other introduced a resolution asking for a probe of McCarthy's charge.

McCarthy now seeks to defeat Sen. Margaret Chase Smith in Maine because she introduced the "declaratory act" resolution which reflected on him. And of course the running feud with Secretary of the Army Stevens came after Stevens refused to admit that Fort Monmouth was riddled with Communists.

But the most bizarre recent case of McCarthy vindictiveness was against the former assistant secretary of war, John J. McCloy, now head of the Chase Bank, which is not exactly a Communist institution.

The Story Behind Attack On McCloy

Wisconsin suddenly accused McCloy of destroying records of Communists in the State Department.

The charge was so untrue that McCarthy had to retract it publicly. But he still accused McCloy of "wasting time, Army order, which," McCarthy claimed, permitted Communists to be commissioned in the U. S. Army.

Reasons For Revenge But while the public has read of McCarthy's attack on McCloy, they don't know the motives behind that attack. It dates back to a famous speech made by President Eisenhower at Dartmouth last spring in which the President condemned book-burning. McCarthy bitterly resented that speech—obviously aimed at him.

And since that speech was extemporaneous, McCarthy was determined to find out who inspired it, even sent an investigator all the way to Hanover, N. H., to see who and what the speaker was. The inspiration, he found, was Mr. McCloy.

Actually, the inspiration was accidental. Here is what happened. McCloy, then, was receiving an honorary degree from Dartmouth, and before the ceremonies, was talking to N. Y. attorney Joseph Proskauer about the books that

had been burned at U. S. information libraries abroad at the demand of Sen. McCarthy.

Catching only a fragment of the conversation, President Eisenhower leaned forward and asked: "What's this, what's this?" "I was talking about the burning of State Department books abroad," McCloy replied. "Oh, they're not burning books," like interposed.

"I'm afraid they are, Mr. President," McCloy replied. "I have the evidence." He then went on to tell the President how he, as an American official in Germany, was the first to see the tremendous achievement of State Department libraries.

McCarthyism Has Its Effect On Developments In Germany

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WHAT LIES beneath the surface of this busy, hard-working Germany is anyone's guess. Dignified intent on the job at hand, moving as though with a reflex conditioning them to keep aloof in field and workshop, the German people seem bent on wiping out the past.

Yet, even passing through on the one sort of survey men can find beneath the surface old attitudes, old fears and suspicions evoked by the memories of past grandeur and past defeat.

The old demons that set the German spirit on the path of flame and blood can be discerned again. A most significant touchstone in Germany is Sen. McCarthy, who has become for all of Europe the chief apparition on the Western horizon. This reporter talked to a number of Germans, as well as to many foreign observers, in an effort to find out the reaction to reports of McCarthyism.

TWO REACTIONS Two strikingly different reactions come to light at once. First, those genuinely concerned with seeing Germany become part of a unified Europe realize that America must share in this undertaking and at least help to underwrite it. They are fearful that McCarthy will so divide America as to bring about a reversion to the old isolationism.

This attitude is found particularly among young people, many of whom are working actively to further international cooperation. They are fearful, too, that the ideal of democracy will be so degraded by demagogic tactics as to encourage the forces within our own country looking once again to an authoritarian way. The neo-Nazis, however, are believed to be comparatively small in number and confined, thus far, to the extremist fringe.

The second reaction is that of Germans who are rather happy to see the United States suffering from the embarrassment of one who flouts the rules of law and order in a constant stream of emotional headlines. This attitude grows partly out of a thinly concealed resentment of the occupation and its restrictions, which it has imposed on a defeated people.

Some Germans have not forgotten the way in which McCarthy's name is first known here. That was when, using the same tactics as later applied to the Communist issue, he investigated a Senate investigation into the treatment of German prisoners of war, shooting down disgraced American soldiers at the time of the Battle of the Bulge.

Injecting himself into the inquiry, McCarthy did everything he could to make it seem that the German prisoners were mistreated and even tortured German prisoners. Former Sen. Raymond Baldwin, Republican of Connecticut, tried to bring out the facts of the new refuting this charge. Yet McCarthy's sensational accusations found a ready public in Germany, where they supported a kind of self-pitying view that all the world had turned against the German people.

It is this latter attitude that concerns serious-minded Germans fearful of a revival of the rampant spirit of revenge. After 1919 and the Versailles Treaty, the stab-in-the-back thesis was a staple of the German army had not lost the war, the German soldier had been betrayed by traitors behind the lines. The generalisimo followed this line, and it was taken up by Hitler and the Nazis and used with great effect to discredit struggling democracy known as the Weimar Republic.

Careful observers who have followed the fortunes of the new Bonn Republic for several years believe that something like the stab-in-the-back thesis to explain away defeat can take hold again.

Stokes Vs. Ivy League felt was sweeping post-war America. Today, nine years later, a formal agreement between these eight colleges outlines a sporting code whose spirit contradicts Stokes' proposal of a "character-building" value, he saw sports as a major part of his entertainment. University athletic departments and academic officials across the nation were agitating over whether college athletics were education or slow business.

Harold W. Stokes, dean of the Graduate School at the University of Washington, was the surveyor, and his analysis is contained in an article entitled "College Athletes: Education or Show Business," which appears in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

Stokes has assumed that big-time athletic ailments can be cured by admitting openly that intercollegiate sports are "entertainment" and not an educational responsibility.

EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION To fulfill this obligation Stokes proposes a minor educational revolution which would change the traditional relationship between student and athlete. In effect he would acknowledge that the two are incompatible, and establish separate admission requirements for the athlete and for the student. Sports scholarships would be freely handed out to all recruited athletes, and once at college they would live solely as athletes.

In essence, Stokes' analysis of the American university sporting scene is based on the acknowledgment that sports should be public entertainment, completely divorced from the athletic from the academic.

Nine years ago this relationship was discussed by a very different vein. At that time eight presidents of the so-called Ivy League also surveyed the underground sports scene and were as distressed as Stokes by what they saw. Professionalism, commercialism, and over-emphasis were terms used to describe the surge of "big-time" athletics they

felt was sweeping post-war America. Today, nine years later, a formal agreement between these eight colleges outlines a sporting code whose spirit contradicts Stokes' proposal of a "character-building" value, he saw sports as a major part of his entertainment. University athletic departments and academic officials across the nation were agitating over whether college athletics were education or slow business.

Harold W. Stokes, dean of the Graduate School at the University of Washington, was the surveyor, and his analysis is contained in an article entitled "College Athletes: Education or Show Business," which appears in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

to see the United States suffering from the embarrassment of one who flouts the rules of law and order in a constant stream of emotional headlines. This attitude grows partly out of a thinly concealed resentment of the occupation and its restrictions, which it has imposed on a defeated people.

Some Germans have not forgotten the way in which McCarthy's name is first known here. That was when, using the same tactics as later applied to the Communist issue, he investigated a Senate investigation into the treatment of German prisoners of war, shooting down disgraced American soldiers at the time of the Battle of the Bulge.

Injecting himself into the inquiry, McCarthy did everything he could to make it seem that the German prisoners were mistreated and even tortured German prisoners. Former Sen. Raymond Baldwin, Republican of Connecticut, tried to bring out the facts of the new refuting this charge. Yet McCarthy's sensational accusations found a ready public in Germany, where they supported a kind of self-pitying view that all the world had turned against the German people.

It is this latter attitude that concerns serious-minded Germans fearful of a revival of the rampant spirit of revenge. After 1919 and the Versailles Treaty, the stab-in-the-back thesis was a staple of the German army had not lost the war, the German soldier had been betrayed by traitors behind the lines. The generalisimo followed this line, and it was taken up by Hitler and the Nazis and used with great effect to discredit struggling democracy known as the Weimar Republic.

Careful observers who have followed the fortunes of the new Bonn Republic for several years believe that something like the stab-in-the-back thesis to explain away defeat can take hold again.

Stokes Vs. Ivy League felt was sweeping post-war America. Today, nine years later, a formal agreement between these eight colleges outlines a sporting code whose spirit contradicts Stokes' proposal of a "character-building" value, he saw sports as a major part of his entertainment. University athletic departments and academic officials across the nation were agitating over whether college athletics were education or slow business.

Harold W. Stokes, dean of the Graduate School at the University of Washington, was the surveyor, and his analysis is contained in an article entitled "College Athletes: Education or Show Business," which appears in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

Stokes has assumed that big-time athletic ailments can be cured by admitting openly that intercollegiate sports are "entertainment" and not an educational responsibility.

EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION To fulfill this obligation Stokes proposes a minor educational revolution which would change the traditional relationship between student and athlete. In effect he would acknowledge that the two are incompatible, and establish separate admission requirements for the athlete and for the student. Sports scholarships would be freely handed out to all recruited athletes, and once at college they would live solely as athletes.

In essence, Stokes' analysis of the American university sporting scene is based on the acknowledgment that sports should be public entertainment, completely divorced from the athletic from the academic.

Nine years ago this relationship was discussed by a very different vein. At that time eight presidents of the so-called Ivy League also surveyed the underground sports scene and were as distressed as Stokes by what they saw. Professionalism, commercialism, and over-emphasis were terms used to describe the surge of "big-time" athletics they

felt was sweeping post-war America. Today, nine years later, a formal agreement between these eight colleges outlines a sporting code whose spirit contradicts Stokes' proposal of a "character-building" value, he saw sports as a major part of his entertainment. University athletic departments and academic officials across the nation were agitating over whether college athletics were education or slow business.

Harold W. Stokes, dean of the Graduate School at the University of Washington, was the surveyor, and his analysis is contained in an article entitled "College Athletes: Education or Show Business," which appears in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

Stokes has assumed that big-time athletic ailments can be cured by admitting openly that intercollegiate sports are "entertainment" and not an educational responsibility.

EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION To fulfill this obligation Stokes proposes a minor educational revolution which would change the traditional relationship between student and athlete. In effect he would acknowledge that the two are incompatible, and establish separate admission requirements for the athlete and for the student. Sports scholarships would be freely handed out to all recruited athletes, and once at college they would live solely as athletes.

In essence, Stokes' analysis of the American university sporting scene is based on the acknowledgment that sports should be public entertainment, completely divorced from the athletic from the academic.

Nine years ago this relationship was discussed by a very different vein. At that time eight presidents of the so-called Ivy League also surveyed the underground sports scene and were as distressed as Stokes by what they saw. Professionalism, commercialism, and over-emphasis were terms used to describe the surge of "big-time" athletics they

felt was sweeping post-war America. Today, nine years later, a formal agreement between these eight colleges outlines a sporting code whose spirit contradicts Stokes' proposal of a "character-building" value, he saw sports as a major part of his entertainment. University athletic departments and academic officials across the nation were agitating over whether college athletics were education or slow business.

Harold W. Stokes, dean of the Graduate School at the University of Washington, was the surveyor, and his analysis is contained in an article entitled "College Athletes: Education or Show Business," which appears in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly.