

Two Tough Tasks In Caracas

"DOLLAR DIPLOMACY"... big stick U. S. Marines... this did Foreign Minister Guillermo Toriello of Guatemala go on in his address to the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela. Then in conclusion, in the manner of a southern politician who invokes the name of Thomas Jefferson, the shrewd diplomat of this hemisphere's pink regime ended his trade against pangloss imperialism of another day by appealing to the memory of Simon Bolivar, the Caracas-born South American liberator, and stepped from the rostrum amid sustained applause to shake the outstretched hands of other Latin American representatives.

The Guatemalan's speech was well-received, not because his government is pro-Communist, but for other reasons which are important to an understanding of Pan-American relations and the problems the U. S. faces now that it is finally refocusing attention to this hemisphere.

South Americans still get emotionally upset when the old tales about U. S. exploitation and intervention are recalled. They know that the U. S. long ago abandoned these tactics. But they also know that relations between the U. S. and its southern neighbors have deteriorated during the past few years, specifically, since the latter part of the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Secretary of State Dulles.

The U. S. hopes to re-establish good Pan-American relations at the conference and to threaten the threat of Guatemala's Reds to the Panama Canal and the rest of the hemisphere. Both of these tasks will be difficult.

The first will be difficult because the administration is getting off to such a late start in establishing Latin American policy. Secretary of State Dulles' modernized Monroe Doctrine—a request

for a collective "hands off" warning to Russia against Red infiltration of this hemisphere, plus U. S. economic aid for the Latin—this is the first definitive statement of policy by a high official of this administration. No doubt the secretary's assurances of more technical assistance and private investment, continuance of Export-Import Bank loans and postponement of the wool tariff increase make good listening in Caracas, but the Latin's there presumably will hold their hosannas and wait to see what the wool and economy bills in Congress do with these proposals.

It is impossible effectively to negate the Communist threat in Guatemala, for reasons that apply with particular force in Latin American relations. The doctrine of non-intervention is paramount in this area, because the U. S. so long refused to adhere to it. When the doctrine was established, at the Buenos Aires Conference in 1936, it was categorically phrased that "no state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another" and it was stated in even stronger language in the Charter of Bogota in 1948. A U. S. attempt to infringe upon this doctrine would be proclaimed from the houseposts as a return to the old imperialism.

Thus the long-awaited U. S. resolution on communism, being debated this week, is fairly mild. It does not name Guatemala, nor does it call for any kind of an international investigation. It mildly requests that Red domination or control of any country in this hemisphere would justify "appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties." And these existing treaties provide for an immediate meeting of the States parties to agree on measures to be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of peace and security.

The U. S. action then, although it may at first glance seem to be pusillanimous pussyfooting, proceeds from recognition of the fact that the States parties to the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, after all, if they become convinced during this conference of this country's renewed interest in them, their attitude will be vastly more useful in promoting Pan-Americanism and diminishing the Red threat than would be.

Lennon's Solution For McCarthy Problem

WITHIN a few hours after Candidate W. Kerr Scott had fired his blast at abuses of congressional investigating committees, Candidate Alton A. Lennon reiterated his formula for ending "one-man rule" of such investigations and the "headline parade" growing out of them. Sen. Lennon's solution has four basic points:

1. Committee rules should be changed to prohibit the holding of one-man investigating committee sessions.
2. The accused should have the right to have counsel of his own choice present to cross-examine the accusers.
3. The rules should be changed to require at least two members of the majority party and at least one of the minority party members of the committee present before a hearing could be held.
4. Creation of a joint Senate-House committee responsible for eliminating abuses versus rather than the present system of several committees.

Points 1, 2, and 4 have much merit and there is no valid reason, other than the traditional reluctance of senators to hamstring one another, why they should not be adopted.

Point 3 raises a question. With such a rule, it would be easy for a minority party to block any investigation that might prove embarrassing to it simply by

asking its minority representatives to boycott the hearings. Although we agree that the minority party should always be represented, we are not ready to give it a ready-made veto of committee investigations.

Sen. Lennon's proposal points up the basic fault in the treatment of those who would have President Eisenhower grapple with Joe McCarthy in the mire and muck of McCarthy's gutter politics. Although a strong President can bring a good deal of indirect pressure to bear on a recalcitrant senator, he cannot directly discipline him. The Congress is an autonomous branch of the government, and it is just as important to keep the Congress free of dictation by the executive as it is to keep the executive branch free of dictation by Congress.

The Senate is the judge of the actions of its members. Sen. Lennon's proposal, then, is directed to the right authority. It doesn't lessen our enthusiasm for his basic approach to note, somewhat cynically, that the Senate so far has shown precious little concern for its reputation as the greatest deliberative body in the world, and the repository of political greatness. In sum, we doubt that Sen. Lennon's proposal has any chance of being adopted.

over both schemes, but isn't it more than possible, if principle is going to be the yardstick, that there should be no tax reduction?

President Eisenhower has predicted a budget deficit of 2.9 billion dollars. Sen. Harry Byrd thinks that figure is optimistic—that the deficit may be double or even triple that, without any tax cuts save those that went into effect early in 1954. Any tax cut will increase the deficit.

For most of the past 20 years, the Republican Party has been highly critical of deficit financing in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Since 1938, the most influential Southern Democrats have stood beside the Republicans in their fight for a balanced budget.

A balanced budget is a sound principle of government at all times except during a critical national emergency. Yet it is beginning to appear that both Republicans and Southern Democrats are at the point of abandoning that principle in order to double attractive tax cuts before U. S. voters.

The Abandonment Of A Principle

ACCORDING to the Alsop brothers, a President Eisenhower will stand firm in his opposition to Sen. George's proposal for an increase in personal income tax exemptions—though it is reported in Business Week's current issue that he will agree to some reductions in excise taxes.

The Alsops say that Mr. Eisenhower believes his stand is a matter of principle, that it would be "wrong and irresponsible" to hand out large tax cuts this year and thus increase the national deficit.

The Democrats who are behind Sen. George appear to be standing on principle, also. They argue that the best way to get the national economy humming once again is to grant individuals some tax relief, thus increasing their purchasing power. It is the contention of the Democrats that deficit financing is better than a major economic recession.

In the political arena, principles are often rather flexible. The President, for example, thinks it would be all right to give U. S. business firms 1.5 billion dollars of tax relief, even though that would increase the deficit by an equivalent amount. Beyond that, tax reduction runs counter to his principles.

We don't want to toss a wet blanket



Republicans Vs. Democrats

Big Tax Battle Shapes Up

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

THE bitterest legislative battle of this session of Congress is shaping up around the tax issue. The Democrats are united as never before in their opposition to the Republican proposal to increase exemptions for all taxpayers and their dependents. Largely on the advice of Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, President Eisenhower has decided to throw his personal prestige and the power of his administration into the scales, in an attempt to beat the George proposal.

The President's decision by Thursday to 60 key Republican representatives from close Congressional districts, by Vice President Richard Nixon. At a meeting in the Congressional Hotel, Nixon told the assembled representatives that the George proposal had to be beaten at whatever cost.

The President intended, Nixon said, to appeal directly to the country on this issue. He would broadcast his radio and television address. He would explain why it would be wrong and irresponsible to increase exemptions, and to increase the prospective deficit by billions of dollars. And, Nixon warned, if it came up to the House, the Republicans in the House to back up the President.

JOB FOR THE HOUSE
The fight was already as good as lost in the Senate, Nixon frankly admitted—at least three Republican senators were certain to defect. The President could hardly veto the whole tax bill, throwing the entire legislative program into total confusion. Therefore it was up to the House.

He knew, Nixon said, how tough it was to stand up to the Democrats on such an issue in an election year. But it was often good politics to fight on the seemingly unpopular side of an issue, especially if the voters sensed in their hearts that it was the right side. He would be the first to ever cast their ballots on the basis of a candidate's stand on any one issue.

These votes reflected, instead, the general impression of the candidate. The real key to this general impression fell, Nixon said, to whether a Republican candidate had worked with President Eisenhower and for his program. The President's popu-

larity was far and away the Republican's greatest political asset. Those who heard Nixon were much impressed. And it will take more than one talk by the vice-president to line up the paper-thin Republican majority. For one thing, more than 20 Republican tossed into the hopper their own bills increasing the tax exemption. Even so, Speaker Joseph Martin and the other House leaders are confident that they can whip their party into line.

The Democrats claim to be equally confident—and the Democrats must be given credit for a brilliant, if perhaps slightly cynical, political strategy. When Sen. George was persuaded, reportedly by Senate Minority Leader Lyndon Johnson and House Minority Leader Sam Rayburn, to sponsor increased exemptions, the proposal was lent an aura of impeccable conservatism and responsibility.

The increased exemptions would particularly benefit people with large families in the low-income groups. The administration-backed measure for a 10 percent tax credit on dividends would particularly benefit people with large unearned incomes. As soon as the administration tax bill is introduced into the House, the Democrats plan to tie the two issues together by introducing a motion to strike out the dividend credit, and to increase exemptions from \$600 to \$700.

"Boy," one Democrat said jubilantly, "I can hear it already. The Republican party—the party that won't give a poor man with four kids a break, and hands over \$600 to the millionaire—a-year man."

Yet there are very cogent reasons for the firm stand Secretary Humphrey has persuaded the President to adopt. A \$100 increase in exemption would cost the Treasury \$2.3 billion dollars, or \$100 million more in revenue. Even the smaller increase would mean a deficit on the order of 7 billion dollars. Secretary Humphrey is adamant that the first Republican administration in twenty years cannot resort to deficit financing on a huge scale, and President Eisenhower agrees with him.

The proposed increases would also exempt from four and seven million people from any personal responsibility for the cost of government, which Eisenhower and Humphrey oppose on principle. Finally, it is certainly true that very heavy taxation, first on corporation profits and then on income derived from these profits, has tended to dry up the sources of risk capital. All in all, there are excellent reasons for the course the President has chosen, but the political price paid for it is high.

All in all, there are excellent reasons for the course the President has chosen, but the political price paid for it is high. Perhaps the outcome will provide a test of the Nixon theory—the theory that the good politician will not give the voters what they want if the voters know in their hearts they shouldn't have it.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

THE headlines and hullabaloo over McCarthy vs. Eisenhower have obscured a lot of other things happening in Washington. One of the most important to the free world as the battle over McCarthyism.

Another reason for axing Cohn is that the Army has kept a record of what conversations on behalf of his friend Gerard David Schine in which he sought favors for the young ex-McCarthy investigator.

Significantly, McCarthy is trying to find a lawyer of the Jewish faith to replace Cohn. He considers this important in order to offset the charge that he is anti-Semitic.

Cohn, however, did not exactly help McCarthy to refute this charge. Meeting McCarthy and Cohn at the Carroll Arms Hotel in Washington one day, Arnold Forster, secretary of the Anti-Defamation League, was greeted with this salutation from Cohn:

"You are all the — Jews in New York?"

Indochinese Training Plan Rejected

THE Senate staff has vacated when young prosecuting attorney now holding down the job, is slated for the ax.

Chief reason is that McCarthy needs a scapegoat. The heat from the White House has been too great; also from other members of the McCarthy subcommittee.

Another reason for axing Cohn is that the Army has kept a record of what conversations on behalf of his friend Gerard David Schine in which he sought favors for the young ex-McCarthy investigator.

Significantly, McCarthy is trying to find a lawyer of the Jewish faith to replace Cohn. He considers this important in order to offset the charge that he is anti-Semitic.

Cohn, however, did not exactly help McCarthy to refute this charge. Meeting McCarthy and Cohn at the Carroll Arms Hotel in Washington one day, Arnold Forster, secretary of the Anti-Defamation League, was greeted with this salutation from Cohn:

Johnson Calls Caucus

IT has now been two months since Congress convened, and at long last Sen. Johnson of Texas, the so-called Democratic leader, has called a Democratic caucus.

Ordinarily a party caucus is held at the political start of a session, but Sen. Johnson carefully avoided calling one until this week.

Reason for ducking usual procedure was the fear that Democratic senators opposing him would stage a rump revolt.

Coffee—Then And Now

By MISS BEATRICE COBB

(In The Morganton News-Herald)

THESE days the high price of coffee comes in for much discussion—in Congress, over radio and television, in homes, and grocery stores throughout the land, in fact just about everywhere that people meet and talk. Evidently the end of price increases is not in sight. An article I read the other day predicted that likely before many weeks have passed the best grades of coffee will go to at least \$1.25 per pound. In hundreds of homes there has been a switch to tea, and undoubtedly tea sales have been greatly boosted.

During the War between the States (at long last I've learned not to call it "the Civil War") both coffee and tea, except the improvised varieties of the latter, were practically non-existent in the South, not available at any price. Because both were so hard to come by, I imagine they were also scarce and very high priced even in the North. I've heard my mother say that for years during and even after the war, she had to make the only hot drink they had with their meals. My mother said she had tried sassafras tea, made from the dried roots of the sassafras shrub, and could not understand how anybody could ever learn to drink the "insipid stuff" at all. Besides, since sugar was also scarce and high priced, "long sweetening" or home-made molasses, was the only means of sweetening.

EARLY HANDSHIPS
So when we begin fuming and fretting about present-day coffee prices, it might be a good thing for us to recall some of the deprivations and hardships suffered by our ancestors less than a hundred years ago. In the 1860's many a Southern family existed on a near-starvation diet, and the lack and price of coffee and tea were probably the least of their worries.

In an old school history book I have been reading (written by John W. Moore, published 1882, and used in the schools of that post-war period) there are listed some prices which make \$125 a pound coffee seem so insignificant to quarrel much about now. "The price of Confederate money in the ranks was \$13 and \$17 per month, in 'Confederate money'." It was recorded. And to quote further, "during the latter days of the war flour was sold for \$300 per barrel; meat \$3 per pound; chickens \$15 each; shoes (brogans) \$300

per pair; coffee \$50 per pound; tallow candles \$15 per pound, etc. The cry of distress from famishing women and children was distressing."

The knowledge of the extreme suffering of their families weakened the morale of young Confederate army and caused hundreds of desertions. "Many a hero," Moore relates, "turned his back on scenes of his glory, incurred personal ignominy and sometimes the punishment of death, for desertion."

One case that of Edward Cooper, was cited. He was tried by court martial for desertion. Declining the aid of a lawyer, his only defense was the following letter from his wife, which he handed to the trial judge:

"My dear Edward: I have always been proud of you, and since your commission with the Confederate army, I have been prouder of you than ever before. I would not have you do anything wrong for the world, but before God, Edward, unless you come home, we must die. Last night I was aroused by little Eddie's crying. I called and said, 'What is the matter, Eddie?' And he said, 'O mamma, I am so hungry.' And Lucy, Edward, your darling Lucy, she never complains, but she is growing thinner and thinner every day. And before God, Edward, unless you come home, we must die. Your Mary."

COFFEE CRISIS
The military court, every member of which, the report says, was melted to tears, had no other course than to find the prisoner guilty, and to sentence him to death. A recommendation for mercy went along to Gen. Lee for a review of the case, and the unhappy artilleryman was pardoned. Afterwards, the story concludes, he was killed in battle, his face to the enemy.

If Congress finds that there is any fraud or shenanigans going on to run up the present price of coffee, drastic action should be taken, looking toward controls. Personally, as much as I enjoy two cups of coffee at breakfast, I can learn to do without coffee altogether. If the cost goes too high. The old general law of supply and demand would no doubt be as effective as governmental regulations. If the American people as a whole would cut down on coffee drinking, for even a few months, we would likely see an immediate effect on prices.

Of Men And Prejudice

By H. CLAY FERREE

(In The Winston-Salem Journal-Sentinel)

A 12-YEAR-OLD BOY, we're told, was asked by his mother to define "prejudice." He surprised her by answering, "It's when I hate somebody before I know him." Nobody could have given a better definition. For prejudice is an opinion formed without "due knowledge," a judgment made before the facts—re in it is a matter of prejudging individuals or groups on the basis of some sweeping generalization, such as "The Jews are crafty," "The Scotch are stingy," or "Negroes are inferior."

We too often come to judge individuals by such group tags which are usually untrue, irrational, fictitious. Then again sometimes a whole group is stigmatized through the notoriety of some real or fictitious individual, such as Fagin in "Oliver Twist," or some well-known loan shark of a certain race in one's community, or Shylock in "The Merchant of Venice." Simon Legree in "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

Prejudice, like fear, is not innocent but acquired. Psychology has proved that very young babies have no fear of such things as hot stoves or snakes. They must be taught to fear and avoid these things. This is largely true of prejudice. Youth is both democratic and trusting. It learns to hate through older persons.

The teaching is seldom done deliberately. But all of us live within our own cultural groups

and our attitudes are colored by the thinking, the customs and mores of those groups. Our world is divided between our group and the group outside it. The outsider is usually alien and suspect in our eyes. Often when one of us comes to know some member of the other group well he is pleasantly surprised to find that he doesn't wear horns or breathe fire and brimstone.

But as W. J. Cash wrote in his "Mind of the South," mere contact does not always overcome tolerance. It is so only when he has been educated to tolerance. "The simple man," said Cash, "... is apt to see whatever differs from himself as an enemy. Many of us are trained to suspicion and distrust of difference. What is like us is good, what differs from us is bad, mold or pattern is evil. Yet contacts always help. It is for fairness and amenable to the spirit of friendship and good neighborliness."

In the present period of national hysteria and social tension it is of course important to remember that Americans in every group and walk of life make an earnest effort to understand and appreciate the ideals and aims of those in groups different from their own. For Americans may not make for tolerance in every instance, certainly there are times when outcasts and can work together better when they know each other better.

Recession Advice

IT may be denied, but the President's chief economic adviser, Dr. Arthur Burns, apparently privately to lie that the Democrats are about to frighten the country into a depression.

Burns pointed out that the economic symptoms are plain to see in the country, and the average businessman recognizes that they are going through a slight recession. By denying any slump, Burns warned, GOP speakers were giving the impression that they are trying to cover up. This, he told his chief, is more than the fear that Democratic speakers are causing gloom-and-doom speeches.