



## THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON — President and Publisher  
ROBERT H. GRIFFITH — General Manager  
ROBERT H. LAMPERT — Advertising Director  
C. E. PRINCE — Editor  
PERRY MORGAN — Associate Editor  
R. L. YOUNG JR. — Managing Editor

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1958

### Which Expert Do You Read, Senator?

"I would appreciate it very much," says Keri Scott in his current newsletter, "if you would let me know how you feel on matters before Congress."

Well, senator, let's take the matter of halting nuclear tests and thus ceasing to shower earth with poisonous radioactive wastes. This is a matter of elemental importance to everybody living and those yet unborn, and you may have to vote on any agreement that may be reached to stop the tests.

We feel, in short, that you ought to do the right thing. But we don't know what the right thing is. The question that worries us most is whether you, your fellow senators and the President know.

For you must depend on experts to tell you whether any agreement with the Soviet can be guaranteed of execution. In other words, if we stop testing and they don't, we find out in time to resume testing and keep our defenses up.

When the Atomic Energy Commission admitted its underground test was detected 2,300—instead of 250—miles distant, there seemed some reason to believe the U.S. could afford to risk a test ban. The underground shot was made for the purpose of measuring the risk.

But now Dr. Edward Teller, a hydrogen bomb expert on whom the government leans for advice, says the AEC's erroneous report doesn't matter anyway. "According to past experience," he says, "an agreement to stop tests may well be followed by secret and successful tests behind the Iron Curtain."

It is almost certain that in the competition between prohibition and bootlegging the bootlegger will win.

Then, we'd say the tests must continue. But there are experts who say that an agreement with the Soviet can be made foolproof, and not only that:

They accuse administration experts of distorting evidence in order to stifle public inquiry and debate.

The disagreement between the experts becomes rather violent on occasions. Which expert to believe? There seems no alternative to placing confidence in those employed by the administration which have access to the secrets of the Atomic Energy Commission.

But this is forced confidence, and not the kind founded on inquiry and discussion. It is not the kind Dr. Teller himself is talking about in his *Our Nuclear Future*, to be published soon by Criterion Books.

"In a free, democratic country, the majority believes that something should be done—it will be done. The sovereign power in a democracy is the people. It is of the greatest importance that the people should be honestly and completely informed about all relevant facts. In no other way can a sound decision be reached."

Unfortunately only the experts have all the relevant facts, and they cannot agree on them. So the ideal of representative government, as expressed by Dr. Teller, seems to be getting more remote even as means of communication multiply.

Why use the right word, senator, in asking how your constituents feel about matter before Congress, or about this matter anyway. It is next to impossible for a layman to think on the matter.

But we do have one thought—that this is an age when necessary secrecy is begetting unnecessary secrecy at an alarming rate, and citizen and senator alike are placed more and more at the mercy of the experts.

Every blow the Senate strikes against secrecy for secrecy's sake will be greatly appreciated by citizens seeking the "relevant facts."



### Priming The Pump

## A Laugh For Lord Keynes

By STEWART ALSOP

THE LATE LORD Keynes, a sardonic fellow who enjoyed a good laugh, must be chuckling in his grave. For Keynes, the apostle of deficit spending to cure a depression, was the intellectual godfather of the New Deal, and among proper Republicans, "Keynesianism" has long been a very bad word indeed. Yet one thing is now clear beyond dispute—the Republican administration is as wholly committed as the Democratic leadership to the proposition that a big deficit is much to be preferred to a big depression.

To be sure, Republicans and Democrats approach the inevitable deficit from opposite directions, like the confused soldiers in "The Lays of Ancient Rome"—"those behind cried forward, while those before cried back." The Democrats are crying "spend more," while the Republicans are crying "tax less." In the end, both sides

which are published three weeks or more before the overall unemployment estimates, almost always accurately forecasts the unemployment trend. The March unemployment compensation claims will be available next Thursday. If the figures show even a slight rise, Nixon and Mitchell are extremely likely to press the administration for a big tax cut then and there.

There are differences only of degree, and a big tax cut can be written down as dead certain

that the Nixon-Mitchell program has five main parts: (1) the \$1.8 billion housing bill, the freeze of farm price supports at the 1957 level, the speed-up in road building, an extension of unemployment benefits, and a bigger and more expensive education bill.

It is impossible to put a price tag on this program, since so much—especially as regards farm price supports—will depend on the state of the economy. But \$2 billion to \$3 billion additional spending is a reasonable guess.

MORE FOR DEFENSE

Add \$1.3 to \$4 billion over the President's original estimates for

defense. There is a lot of congressional sentiment for doubling or even tripling the Navy's Polaris nuclear submarine program, for ordering another hundred or so B-52 bombers and other hardware for the Air Force, and for upping the Army from fifteen to eighteen divisions. If these things are done, an additional \$4 billion for defense may turn out to be a highly conservative figure.

Add a final and most important factor. The President's original estimate of a barely balanced budget was based on the assumption of a continued rise in personal and corporate incomes. All the signs now point the other way, suggesting a further heavy loss of revenue piled on top of a huge tax cut. Even allowing for cuts of \$1 billion or more in foreign aid, it takes only a little figuring with a pencil and paper to come out with a deficit in the range of \$10 to \$15 billion. The highest peacetime deficit of the New Deal and Fair

## Will TV's Ed Murrow Enter The Lists Against Tammany?

By DORIS FLEESON

WASHINGTON  
REPUBLICAN prospects in New York are improved by the break of hostilities between Liberal Party leaders and the Democratic organization. Both the governorship and a United States Senate seat are at stake this fall and the outcome will materially influence the 1960 political picture.

The Liberals have challenged the Democratic professionals by openly projecting the name of Edward R. Murrow, the distinguished news analyst, as a candidate for the Senate against the incumbent Republican, Irving M. Ives. It is not a sudden burst of rebellion but a culmination of frustrations.

### STONY RESISTANCE

For some time all the potential enemies suggested by Liberals, either in the balance-of-power party of that name or in the Democratic organization, have met with stony resistance from Carmine De Sapio of Tammany Hall and his unstable associates. This resistance has famed recent years carrying over from 1956 when many Liberals felt Tammany and its friends did little for Adlai Stevenson and Sen. Estes Kefauver.

The pros are pretending to scorn Murrow. But in their private discussions they are bound to take into account the history of Ives' last race when the Liberal Party refused to endorse the regular Democratic named to run against him, Brooklyn Borough President Joseph V. Cassano.

### IVES LIKED

The Liberals are far from hostile to Ives; in fact, they thought so much of him as compared to Cassano, they didn't endorse him last fall. They alternate from him conservative Republican votes upstate. So they bestowed the honor on one of their own, Professor George Connor.

The result was that Ives carried New York City and was elected handily.

The man in the middle of the new row is Gov. Averell Harriman, Democrat. The Liberals will endorse him all right and he will be a clear favorite to win a second term. But Harriman wants to roll up such a majority that he can run again for President in 1960. It is important to him, therefore, that Ives be isolated by a strong and unifying candidate for senator.

### VERY CHERFUL

Ives is looking very cheerful about it all, though he still insists that for physical reasons he has not made up his mind to seek reelection. He also says he has no favorites among Republicans eager to be governor.

One of his closest Rockefeller friends, has been here this week seeking advice and counsel of old friends in government. They have wanted him to be the next governor or cut bait soon and let politics offer a rough passage to the amateur with any illusions that it is a sport, not a fight to win.

### BIG MESSAGE

A Harriman-Rockefeller contest would offer the drama of very rich, very famous names locked in combat. The two men have been personal friends. But Harriman has been bloodied in political combat and the presidential contest would be a new test of his nerves.

The new governor, Rockefeller, must realize that he would, if elected, lose not his social and business life, but a determined politician displaying those characteristics which won a fortune for him. He would lose a rougher, tougher days of unrelenting capitalism.

## It Is Better To Have Laughed And Lost

Humor is emotional chaos remembered in tranquility.

—JAMES THURBER

GRATIFYING concern for the fate of laughter in this somber age has been expressed by two aficionados of the condition—Malcolm Muggeridge, former editor of *Punch*, and Charles Moore, New York Times literary critic and occasional parodist.

Mr. Muggeridge says that the decline of humor in Britain and America "is more alarming than either the hydrogen bomb or the Sputnik." Mr. Moore gives us an ardent plea for parody, a literary device which is currently being scrutinized critically by the justices of the U.S. Supreme Court of all people.

It is good to know that somebody cares.

But when Mr. Muggeridge complains about the death of laughter in the United States and the average American's low comedy rating he is talking through his bowler.

There is plenty of comedy. Comedy is, in fact, the axis on which the whole broadcasting industry revolves. Television thrives on it—even the commercials are "comic." "Anything for a laugh" might well be one of our minor national mottos, as Gilbert Seldes has suggested.

It is not more comedy that we need but more humor—and there is a difference. Comedy merely provides amusement. Humor is a rarer thing and provides rarer rewards.

Humor, says Stephen Leacock, may be defined as the sense within us which sees a kindly contradiction in the incongruities of life, and the expression of that sense in art.

There has been great humor in the past—Aristophanes, Cervantes, Twain, Carroll—and fine humor is still being produced in the Sputnik age—Thurber,

White, Perelman, Nash. But pitifully few youngsters are emerging to carry on the great tradition. As a matter of fact a suffocating decorum tends to deaden and flatten most of the latter day attempts at humorous prose. Platitudinous irreverence is decidedly out of fashion and the result is that people and institutions must be handled with a kind of milk-and-honey delicacy lest they blacken the leader's eye or discover a Marxist in his family tree.

We wonder seriously if George S. Kaufman and Morrie Ryskind could get away with anything so blatantly exhorting as *On Time I Stood in 1958*, especially the scene Mr. Moore recalls in which a line of men in black robes come prancing on the stage singing the music of George and Ira Gershwin:

We're the one—  
two—  
three—  
four—  
five—  
six—  
seven—  
eight—  
nine Supreme Court  
judges.

We have powers that are positively royal.  
Only we can take a law and make it legal.

This delightful parody of an immensely venerated institution would undoubtedly be frowned upon today when even the court's critics prefer to twit it with the dourst dignity.

What remains of a great tradition of humor is the crime of dullness compounded by hypocrisy. Nobody ever gets hurt. Nor is anybody profoundly stirred. In place of humor there is only humoring.



SECRETARY MITCHELL  
Cut Taxes Now

are likely to get their way—plus a deficit which will make the New Deal deficit look like nothing at all.

### TIMING AND SIZE

Within the administration, there is no longer any resistance whatsoever to a big tax cut, if the economic state continues. The only debate is on the timing and size of the cut. What might be called the Nixon-Mitchell plan, led by the vice president and the secretary of labor, want a very big tax cut, and they want it right away, given any further indication at all that the economy is slipping.

For example, the figures for unemployment compensation claims,

which are published three weeks or more before the overall unemployment estimates, almost always accurately forecasts the unemployment trend. The March unemployment compensation claims will be available next Thursday. If the figures show even a slight rise, Nixon and Mitchell are extremely likely to press the administration for a big tax cut then and there.

### JOHNSON'S PLAN

Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson has been put on one of his accustomed spectacular operations, jamming through the Senate a Johnson anti-recession program. The Johnson program has five main parts: (1) the \$1.8 billion housing bill, the freeze of farm price supports at the 1957 level, the speed-up in road building, an extension of unemployment benefits, and a bigger and more expensive education bill.

It is impossible to put a price tag on this program, since so much—especially as regards farm price supports—will depend on the state of the economy. But \$2 billion to \$3 billion additional spending is a reasonable guess.

### MORE FOR DEFENSE

Add \$1.3 to \$4 billion over the President's original estimates for



SECRETARY ANDERSON  
Cut Taxes Later

Deal years was, incidentally, the net deficit of less than \$15 billion.

### TEST OF THEORY

The Keynesian theory of course, is that government pump-priming will reverse the downward economic trend, and thus sharply increase government revenues. If the theory works, the deficit could be very much less than simple addition and subtraction would indicate.

In any case, it is clear that the Keynesian theory is due to be far more thoroughly tested than it ever was in the New Deal days—and, ironically, under a business-minded Republican administration.

From The Washington Post & Times Herald

### WHO'S ON FIRST?

THE publication of the 30th edition of that useful and well-known reference book, *Who's Who*, raises the interesting question whether Gresham's Law—or the principle that quantity drives away quality—applies to celebrity as much as to coinage, literature, education and so on. All we know is that when the first edition of *Who's Who* was published in 1890, the editors found only 6,000 persons who were so to speak, anybody at all. Now there are between six and seven times that many. In fact the new volume seems to contain almost half as many names as the far less selective Domesday Book of 1086, which, as you know, was compiled mainly for tax purposes and included not only all the baronial big shots but also such innocents as royal tenants, cottiers, vicars and verger.

Anyway, a comparison of the first and the latest volumes of *Who's Who* affords an interesting commentary on the changing character of American life in 1898—or just on the eve of the Spanish War—there were, for example, in all these United States, only slightly more than 1000 government functionaries of one kind or another—presidents, vice-presidents, cabinet dignitaries, generals,

ambassadors, governors, mayors and other local politicians—deemed worthy of notice. Today there are nearly 5000 such; yet (and this may astonish you) their proportions to the whole roster of celebrities has fallen from 12 per cent to slightly less than 10 per cent.

The only moral we can deduce from this is that there are other and much easier roads to celebrity nowadays, such as winning a Nobel or a Pulitzer prize like Werner Forssman and Albert Camus and Hurry A. Trask and Buford Boone, or just by becoming known like Hal March, Mike Wallace, Phil Silvers and Al Carnoy to millions of television watchers. This, it seems, is enough to put you in a class, or at any rate in a book, with James Kadar, William C. Friday, Jean-Paul Sartre and the Rev. Sister Mary Ann Ida of Mundelein College, Ill. On the other hand there are some who have been losing the battle for the spotlight and have accordingly been dropped or, if now dead, relegated to the companion volume called *Who Was Who*. We call your attention to the infinite palios of that intonation of the verb "to be," "how fleeting" is the mystic, "how very fleeting" is the glory of this world!

## Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON

IN a town which highlighted the dog troubles of Elliott Roosevelt, the marital troubles of Jimmy Roosevelt, and the Trujillo troubles of Franklin Roosevelt, it's not surprising that a public relations trouble that for five years little has been said about the operations of an other relative of another president—Col. Gordon Moore.

Today, Col. Moore, the President's brother-in-law, comes before the Harris investigating committee.

### No Immunity

This writer, who was the first to report that EDJ Jr. was working for dictator Trujillo and who aroused considerable White House wrath for reporting on the friends of Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, believes that no presidential friend or relative who uses the great prestige of the White House should be immune from public scrutiny.

No president, of course, can pick the man his sister-in-law marries. But he can see to it that his brother-in-law does not use White House dinners and telecasts to further his private business, especially where that business involves influence before government agencies.

### Charming Fellow

Col. Moore is a charming, likable ex-army officer who was discharged from the service September 7, 1951, whose economic fortunes have skyrocketed since he entered the White House and since

## Ike's Brother-In-Law Takes The Stand

WASHINGTON

he, Moore, has been able to invite George Baker, president of National Airlines, to a presidential state dinner Feb. 1, 1954, to invite other clients to receptions for the Queen Elizabeth, and to see him in the background of telecasts when the President of the United States reports to the nation.

### Nice House

Col. Moore's business has zoomed to such extent that he not only occupies a nice house opposite Ambassador Joe Davies' palatial estate near the Washington Cathedral, but he also has a weekend estate, "Holiday Farm," and racing stable in the foxhunting section of northern Virginia.

Moore has been part owner of a Dominican shipyard, financed by Trujillo, with George V. Hobbs, Jr. and John H. Cross, vice presidents of National Airlines, as executives. Gibbs was later fired by Trujillo and Col. Moore has now sold his stock.

### Intimate Terms

Col. Moore has continued on intimate terms with the dictator of the Caribbean for some time, has made many trips to Trujillo City, and two years ago negotiated a complicated deal for the importation of 5000 tons of green beans into the U.S. as hog feed. This classification meant that he paid a duty of 15 cents per cwt. instead of 665 cents; also that

the sugar was not charged against the Dominican quota.

Later when the U.S. Customs Bureau reversed itself and charged 96.3 cents on Moore's shipment, Sen. Jack Kennedy of Massachusetts introduced a bill (from which he later withdrew) which would have given the colonel's sugar special treatment.

The fact that the President's brother-in-law has such intimate terms with the Dominican dictator has not been lost on other Latin American countries where the United States has been trying to encourage democratic governments.

### Borrowing Easy

Col. Moore enjoys a relation with Bob Baker, executive vice president of American Security and Trust, which would make other businessmen green with envy. He is able to walk in and borrow large sums with almost no collateral; once borrowed \$50,000 for the Air Coach Transit Association on no real security other than office furniture.

Moore runs a factoring business where he borrows money from Baker's bank then loans it to small nonstock airlines which have to wait to collect from the slow-paying government. For this factoring service he charges 1 per cent.

Col. Moore introduced his friend and employer, O. Roy Chalk, to Baker of American Security and Trust, and Chalk was trying to buy the streetcar and bus lines which serve the nation's

### Protect The Birds And Battle Insects

Salisbury

Editors, The News:

OFTEN in the spring of the year I've seen birds that come back from the South. These birds had run into cold winds, hail, snow and sleet.

They were shaking like the old-fashioned pioneer boy who never worked a hard day's underground.

Some of these birds actually get so cold that they go to sleep and never wake up. We should do all that we can to preserve and defend our song birds because they are insect eaters and when we meet the final battle against the insect pests.

—JAMES W. JEWELL

### Branching Out

No longer vice president, Moore has branched out far beyond his early career and so has Trans Caribbean. On January 15, it became the first nonstock airline in the history of the U.S. to get a regular scheduled route—from New York to Puerto Rico. It got this route despite the official opposition of the Puerto Rican Government, which filed a brief favoring Capital Airlines.

In the fall of 1952, U.S. Air Lines, a nonstock, faced bankruptcy. Its bankruptcy account was overdrawn. It had only one DC-3 that could get off the ground. Its insurance had been canceled. The U.S. had canceled permission to fly military passengers and was threatening to revoke its certificate of air carrier.

Suddenly the President's brother-in-law became an executive. In one short week, stock in U.S. Air Lines shot from 12 1/2 cents up to 26 cents.