

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS



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

MONDAY, JULY 5, 1954

Justice Dept. Maintains 'Stable' Of Pro Informers

WASHINGTON
 NO LESS than three of the Justice Department's paid informers and witnesses are now being investigated for possible perjury — and by the same Justice Department that employs them.

In the circumstances, that is a very high figure. Since July 1, 1952, approximately 50 persons have received payment for serving as political informers or witnesses. But of this total, only 12 have received payments in excess of \$100. Only these 12 qualify as fairly regular and professional practitioners of this highly peculiar and novel line of government work.

All three under investigation are in this select professional category. Thus a quarter of the political informers and witnesses the Justice Department has used most regularly are now being investigated as possible perjurers. And two of the three are the top earners.

Number one is Paul Crouch. He is being investigated because of sharp conflicts in his own sworn testimony in government trials. In the last two years, Crouch has received \$8,675 from the Justice Department, or an average of just under \$420 a month. In one of his last jobs before taking up his new trade,

Crouch was earning 85 cents an hour from an airline in Texas. **TESTIFIED AGAINST BUNCHE**
 Number two is Manning Johnson. Johnson is being investigated because of his testimony in the loyalty case of Dr. Ralph Bunche, the eminent Negro leader and American officer of the United Nations. In the last two years, the Justice Department has paid Johnson \$9,098, or an average of just under \$400 a month. The Department does not know any other naturalization was doing until two weeks ago, when he got a job as an insurance salesman.

The third man being investigated, Leonard Patterson, is another of Dr. Bunche's accusers. He stands about in the middle of the top 12 professionals, having received \$3,775, or an average of about \$180 a month, during the last two years. When not informing or witnessing, Patterson drives a hack in New York.

These men and the others like them are kept in a special stable by the Justice Department, under the guise of "consultants to the Immigration and Naturalization Service." Some persons having this classification — notably Dr. Louis Budenz — accept no payment for their services. Those who take money are paid \$25 per diem, plus certain additional per-

diem in lieu of subsistence, plus cost of transportation to the informing or witnessing point.

Payments are almost always made from the funds of the immigration service, even when the payee is appearing in court, for instance, for the Justice Department criminal division. Although the payments are not large, it can be seen from the three cases noted above that they are often quite large enough to be meaningful to the recipients.

The practice of putting political informers on the government payroll, which has been regularly denounced as pernicious and dangerous since the time of the Roman historian Tacitus, is a part of the "Truman mess" inherited by the Eisenhower administration. It is one part of the mess that has quite markedly not been cleaned up as yet. It raises certain obvious questions of great long range importance in any free society.

First, those of the informers and witnesses who mainly live by this new trade, or importantly supplement their incomes by it, have a clear financial interest in being used as much as possible. As ex-Communists, their actions are clearly suspect. Those who take money are paid \$25 per diem, plus certain additional per-

diem in the second Bridges trial in 1948. If Crouch's first testimony was truthful, where did he get all the facts—and they probably were facts—that he poured out in his second testimony? In short, just what is the Justice Department relationship to these people?

Finally, Attorney General Herbert Brownell's right hand is now, in effect, investigating what his left hand has been doing. Great department interests are now fighting on the side of the left hand. Is this sound practice?

City Needs New Filter Plant Now

THE man who builds a house big enough for his own family's needs and who adds at least one bedroom for occasional guests is being reasonably prudent. He may be overwhelmed by a visitation of relatives around Christmas time, but it would be foolish to anticipate such a misfortune to the extent of adding the two or three extra bedrooms they would need, rooms that would lie idle for the rest of the year. He would expect the relatives either to put up with some overcrowding and inconvenience, or else stop off at a hotel or motor court.

A city must follow roughly the same policy in planning a water supply if it is to be prudent with the taxpayers' money. More specifically, it would be wasteful for the city of Charlotte to plan a water supply with a capacity great enough to handle the abnormal demand at the past few days, capacity that would not be used for another twelve months.

BECAUSE of a combination of hot, dry weather, which has prompted homeowners to water their lawns and gardens almost daily, and the pumping of millions of gallons of water onto that Old Faithful, the Tremont Ave. rock quarry, water pressure has been low in several sections of Charlotte, and virtually nonexistent in others for hours at a stretch. Residents are understandably inconvenienced and provoked, and it has been necessary for the city to ask that consumers cut down on their use of water.

From the standpoint of feeder lines, which carry water from the filter plant to the various geographical areas of the city for further distribution to the individual consumer, this is a temporary condition. Contracts have been let and work started for a new feeder line to serve the North Charlotte-Plaza area. And plans are currently being drawn for another line that will boost capacity to the north in the Wilkinson Blvd. Shuman Ave., Remont Road, S. Tryon St. and

South Blvd. area. Residents of Sedgewick, hardest hit by the current shortage, will benefit from this latter line. But a water system is no stronger than its weakest link. Within another year, the weak link will be the filter plant, already operating at 30 per cent over its rated capacity. So far in 1954, total pumpage for the entire city has averaged around 17 million gallons daily. In the last few days, pumpage has skyrocketed to 25 to 26 million gallons daily.

Looked at another way, even if all of the feeder lines now needed were in existence today, the present filter plant could not safely handle any greater volume than it is handling today.

HENCE it is essential that the City Council elect no longer in calling an election for new water bonds in an amount large enough to complete the new feeder system and build the first units of expanded filter plant facilities, a site for which has already been purchased.

Water bonds are revenue producing, and they do not count against the city's statutory debt limit. They are, however, considered by bond attorneys in fixing a city's credit rating. For this reason the Council has been reluctant to call an election on a new water bond issue until the total debt limit could be lowered. Faced with the alternatives of a chronic water shortage and a lower credit rating, however, the city cannot but choose the latter.

Meanwhile, the city owes it to the taxpayers of Charlotte to extend no new service to the fringe area than is absolutely necessary for public health and safety. Currently, there are some 4,000 connections to the city water system beyond the city limits, serving an estimated 15,000 persons. Fringe area consumers pay premium rates, to be sure, but that is not enough water to go around, the city's first obligation is to those who pay city taxes.

Legislation Requires Leadership

THE administration can get substantially the kind of laws it wants, if it will work hard for their passage. Conversely, Congress won't legislate part of the Eisenhower program if White House leadership and pressure are lacking. Those facts were accentuated by developments in Washington last week.

The Senate passed, 69-9, a bill encompassing the most sweeping reforms in tax law of the century. The bill now goes to conference committee—most of the differences to be ironed out between Senate and House bills are technical. The Senate bill is pretty much what the President asked for. It includes extension of the 52 per cent rate of corporation income tax, an increase in the amount of medical expenses deductible from individuals' income tax and a provision for working mothers to deduct some of their child care expenses.

Meanwhile the House passed a farm bill acceptable to the administration. By a vote of 228-170 the House adopted a key provision empowering the Agriculture Department to adjust the price of wheat on a scale extending from 82-12 to 90 per cent of parity. The administration originally wanted flexibility extending from 75 to 90 per cent. But the com-

promise version was a sharp break from the existing, rigid 90 per cent pattern. The administration victory took by surprise the advocates of high and rigid supports in the Senate, where the bill now goes for a showdown fight.

The administration had put up a hard fight for both its farm and tax program, against determined opposition. The administration's opponents in these battles were certainly not well-organized and as numerous as were the opponents of the administration tax program. But in this latter instance Eisenhower forces beat a retreat when the high-tariff advocates charged. Thus last week the President signed into law an extension of the reciprocal trade act which is considerably weaker than the one he asked for.

When the Eisenhower administration took office it purposely refrained from throwing its weight around on Capitol Hill, in the belief that Congress would take responsibility for writing the President's program into law, and that this process would give Congress a proper sense of responsibility. That strategy, commendable as it was, has been proved unsound. Events last week underscored this fact, and pointed up the necessity of administration leadership in legislative affairs.

Here We Go Again With Flying Saucers

BATTEN DOWN the hatches and hang onto your hats.

The flying saucer season is back, says the Air Force.

Strangely enough, this "season" coincides with the July-August meteor showers—which probably explains at least some of the mysterious goings-on in the atmosphere.

Saucer time came a little later this year. In 1953, the celestial comedy of errors began in May when the planet Venus and some unusual atmospheric conditions were responsible for UFO-like phenomena near the horizon. Two-thirds of the saucers reported by pilots in Japan and Korea last year turned out to be Venus.

Now here we are just getting the pitted windshield epidemic safety behind us and we have to endure saucers again. We even have a friendly Englishman named Desmond Leslie around to help us watch. Mr. Leslie has a theory that interplanetary travel has already begun, with visitors shyly saucerizing in our other worlds almost every day. California presents an

ideal environment for seeing the things, he says, and that's where he plans to make his headquarters.

Saucer sighting is unfortunately, is mostly the result of atom age hysteria and partly the result of birds, weather balloons, light reflections and refractions and aircraft phenomena. It's also a natural for the poor soul, the lonely, nondescript plodder who has never drawn a second look from anyone in his whole uneventful life. He's discovered that saucer sighting is a sure-fire way to become the cynosure of all eyes. He merely walks into a favorite neighborhood pub and announces: "I have just seen a large, white, disc-shaped object piloted by some mysterious creature from outer space." It works every time.

But the saucer sighter deserves more than to ensure. His moment of greatness is brief. Soon the limelight melts away, the "mysterious objects" become wayward stars, airliners and itinerant condors and life settles back into the measured cadence of extreme boredom. It is a very sad story.

'Can We Have Peaceful Co-Existence in Washington?'



Man, You Can't Beat Sass'fras!

FROM THE ENKA VOICE
 CORN pone and sass'fras tea, a warm open fireplace, and old Jeff curled at your feet.

Sounds odd, maybe. If it does, that's because it old. The most important thing being the American sass'fras — known hilariously as sass'fras varifolium, in the North it grows to bush size, but down here in the South it often grows as tall as 50 feet.

Some folks claim that if you drink it in February you won't have to worry the rest of that year about taking typhoid fever. And the argument seems to be at least partially validated by the generally accepted belief that sass'fras thinns the blood.

IT'S MEDICAL
 The bark of the tree occasionally has been used in medicine as a diuretic, and that oil of sass'fras, a rapidly evaporating liquid, also comes from this bark of the roots. It is widely used in perfumes. Other extracts from the bark make bitters and flavoring for beverages.

But the people who drink it never think about all these things. They just drink it 'cause they like it. And once you get a yearning for it, it's hard to give it up. Mind you, if you think you'd like to go out and start brewing a pot, you oughta be watchful some of the things wearing tea drinkers can tell you.

Believe it or not, though, sass'fras tea is used as medicinal beverage, a stimulant, as well as a pleasure drink.

The sass'fras tree is native to the northern temperature zone. There are just a few varieties of it — the most important being the American sass'fras — known hilariously as sass'fras varifolium, in the North it grows to bush size, but down here in the South it often grows as tall as 50 feet.

Some folks claim that if you drink it in February you won't have to worry the rest of that year about taking typhoid fever. And the argument seems to be at least partially validated by the generally accepted belief that sass'fras thinns the blood.

EASY TO MAKE
 It's easy to make this sass'fras tea. And it's good and warming to the soul when sweetened with about two teaspoonful of sugar.

Many of the old folks say it's best when hot, and not 'tiffin' it drink 'kiss'wise.

Government officials reading their column inferred that one or both of the writers had seen the document. An investigation has been going forward to determine whether there was a violation of the provision of the Espionage Act that forbids the publication of secret information. The Alsops say they did not see the document, adding that the information it contained

tant—don't use the white sass'fras roots. Use only the red ones. You can't always tell the difference just by looking at the tree. You've got to get your life that white-rooted variety will never grow as tall as the red, but still you've just about got to dig up the roots before you know for sure. You see, the stuff put-ground looks just about the same—white or red.

Now, you might like to have this word of advice, too. If the first brew from your prepared roots is "sappy," you can throw it right out, turn around and boil those same roots again, and you'll find your tea is not at all sappy.

After you've boiled them once, they're sort of pinkish all over. And the tea is downright red. About the only explanation you can find is that it's just one of those tricks Mother Nature plays. Now go out, dig some roots—or you can buy them at the corner grocery—and get set to brew a real drink of satisfaction—the forgotten tea of sass'fras.

Here's to your health!

Editors, The News: I READ with great interest an editorial "Arms Alone Won't Do the Job," June 11, 1954. This editorial was of particular interest to me since I am completing my doctoral dissertation on the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. This agency has, since 1942, carried out cooperative programs in the fields of health and sanitation, agriculture and education in Latin America.

The passage of Point IV legislation through the institution made responsible for such work in Latin America. This has been a fascinating study of what can be accomplished through cooperation. It has made the resolutions of the various Inter-American conferences live.

The increased emphasis on our part of government seems wholly out of line with our best interests in Latin America and with the best interest

Administration Resents The Increasing Press Criticism

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON
 THE increasingly critical tone of the press toward the Eisenhower administration in recent months has produced a strong reaction within the administration. The feeling is growing that with a press which is so full of irresponsible and overly critical of the conduct of both foreign and domestic policy—particularly the former—becomes all the more difficult in a time of grave crisis.

In speaking of the record to the National War College during the term that ended in mid-June, four members of Cabinet rank in the administration took the line that the press was putting the administration under a heavy handicap. This attitude is strongly reminiscent of the resentment toward the press felt by former President Truman and his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, during the last year and a half or two years of Truman's tenure in office when his administration was confronted with a sea of criticism at home and abroad.

SHARP CONTRAST
 One reason for the strong reaction today may lie in the contrast with two years ago and even a year ago. Seldom has a presidential candidate had such an adulatory press as did candidate Dwight Eisenhower. Likewise, in the second phase of the Presidency the great majority of newspapers treated Mr. Eisenhower with extraordinary kindness both in the news and editorial columns.

The change has been abrupt, and it may explain the intensity of the feeling that the press imposes an added burden on those who are trying to make policy. The feeling is especially acute in the area of conflict over the need for secrecy, as seen by top policy-makers, and the insistence of newspaper reporters on knowing out news even though it means trying behind or ignoring a "secret" label.

Some time ago Columnists Joseph and Stewart Alsop published information which they said was based on a National Security Council document dealing with the relative military strength of the United States and the United Kingdom. The article in the States. They gave the official number of this "top secret" document.

Government officials reading their column inferred that one or both of the writers had seen the document. An investigation has been going forward to determine whether there was a violation of the provision of the Espionage Act that forbids the publication of secret information. The Alsops say they did not see the document, adding that the information it contained

was more or less common knowledge in the Pentagon and the State Department.

Secretary of State Acheson, from the viewpoint of the relationship between press and government, is the attitude of Eisenhower administration. They say that for a reporter or columnist to advertise he is a member of the press is equivalent to the attitude of Sen. McCarthy in appealing to government employees to give him secret information. These officials say that in both attitudes the individual presumes to put himself above the law in determining what is good for the country.

HARD TO GET THROUGH
 Secrecy restrictions have long been resented by newsmen here. One of the persistent complaints against the Truman administration was that the secret label was put on when it was desired to hold back unpleasant facts. The Eisenhower administration announced last week under a new policy the right to apply the classification of secret and top secret being withdrawn from many government departments. But reporters complain that this order is merely a gesture, since top officials maintain a barrier of silence increasingly hard to get through.

The feeling among some policy-makers is strong that the press should uphold American negotiations when in trying to arrive at critical decisions they are in conflict with other powers. Thus, there was deep resentment over the interpretation of many commentators that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles suffered a major diplomatic defeat at the Geneva conference. The blame, it is felt, should have been put on the British for refusing to go along with Dulles' proposal for presenting the Communists with a strong front for "united action" in Indochina.

President Truman several times wanted to prosecute reporters whom he believed guilty of violating secrecy laws. He was kept from doing this by advisers who told him that such action would inevitably lead to an open feud with the press.

The present attitude in Washington may be merely a phase of adjustment to the harsh realities of government in a period of crisis and revolutionary upheaval. The Eisenhower administration and its press, however, may have got accustomed to the slings and arrows of misfortune which in their view, the press goes out and digs up. But the present feeling is undeniably sharp and bitter.

Some of the writers had seen the document. An investigation has been going forward to determine whether there was a violation of the provision of the Espionage Act that forbids the publication of secret information. The Alsops say they did not see the document, adding that the information it contained

People's Platform

Causes Of Instability In Latin America

Davidson

EDITORS, THE NEWS:
 I READ with great interest an editorial "Arms Alone Won't Do the Job," June 11, 1954. This editorial was of particular interest to me since I am completing my doctoral dissertation on the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. This agency has, since 1942, carried out cooperative programs in the fields of health and sanitation, agriculture and education in Latin America.

The passage of Point IV legislation through the institution made responsible for such work in Latin America. This has been a fascinating study of what can be accomplished through cooperation. It has made the resolutions of the various Inter-American conferences live.

The increased emphasis on our part of government seems wholly out of line with our best interests in Latin America and with the best interest

of Latin America. The basic forms of aid are the ways through which the American republicans can improve their standards and give their people a chance to live. Many officials in the United States and Latin American states have recognized that the basic causes of instability in these areas stem from undernourishment, disease, ravaged bodies and illiterate populations. In these conditions, communism flourishes.

If we fight the conditions which spawn communism, we can achieve peace and freedom. We do not need nuclear arms, they need good health, full stomachs and education. Where the masses are illiterate and ground down by poverty and debilitating disease, the freedoms we cherish have little meaning.

As you can see this is a subject upon which I have strong feelings, and I would like to see you for the brilliant ground gave to a successful Point IV effort.

—E. C. BUELL

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON
 GOP National Chairman Len Hall didn't quite know what to make of it when he first received a letter from Henry Wallace which, in effect, supported the Eisenhower-Benson flexible farm price-support program.

Probably there is no man, not even Henry Wallace, who has kicked around more than Henry Wallace. He has been called a pinko and a dreamer. He has been maligned and scolded at. However, since Wallace was not only vice president of the United States, treasury secretary of agriculture under Roosevelt, once secretary of commerce and his father was secretary of agriculture under Harding, his letter to the Republicans may be political manna from heaven in the present hectic farm debate.

Henry Wallace Backs Benson Plan

out for Benson's flexible price supports. "If we had the price supports that Henry Wallace would have had, we would have had 75 per cent more wheat that had advocated as secretary of agriculture and he felt the same supports should be applicable to wheat and corn." "The problem," Wallace explained to this writer, "is how the farmer can get the greatest net income after a war when the abnormal demand for his products ends."

He went on to explain that whereas the demand for wheat and corn is fairly stable in times of peace, the demand for corn should increase because of the growing demand for pork and beef. "Furthermore," explained Wallace, "we have put down the export of wheat. We've curtailed the necessary man-hours per acre through the use of machinery. We will double synthetic nitrogen in a few years, so that a 15-cent pound of nitrogen will produce 20 pounds of grain. No corn is going to be

Ever-Normal Granary

a lot cheaper to produce and the price of wheat will go down. "Wheat," said the man who started acreage limitation and price supports, "is different. Lowering the price of wheat won't increase its output because it is consumed by humans, not animals."

Wallace said that he believed the ever-normal granary for corn would be about one billion bushels a year. This amount should be kept on hand every year as a holdover to insure a steady supply of animal food and a steady price. Asked how he felt about the Benson-Eisenhower farm program, Wallace said he had not come pretty close to his own farm program, therefore he couldn't help but support it. Wallace is now living north of New York City where he is getting much more fun out of his chief interest in life—agriculture—than he ever got out

WHAT NEXT?

it would be best to select for the honor an object most criminals would find practically useless, or of little re-sale value. With the way things have been going, it looks as if it will be the bookcase.

The atomic age really brings change. The newspapers these days devote almost as much space to the protons, neutrons, electrons and isotopes as they do to the morons.—SAVANNAH MORNING NEWS.

the man who revolutionized the nation's agriculture is now working to develop a new type of strawberry which will be both big and sweet, a new type of giardola which will produce disease, and a new type of chicken that will both lay eggs and put on weight.

NOTE: What makes farm leaders and Midwest congressmen sore at the administration is like many promises during the election campaign that he would back rigid farm price supports. At Kason, Minn., on Sept. 6, 1952, he talked about 70 per cent of parity price supports. He has not done it. He promised: "I have pledged that the Republican Party will provide farmers with economic protection without putting them in federal chains." Later the same day he said: "The government must help achieve economic stability in ways which minimize federal controls and protect the farmer's freedom to run his own business."