

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

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1953

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT NEEDED

MOST of the changes in the N. C. Urban Redevelopment Act recommended by the Urban Redevelopment Commission are of a technical nature...

One amendment, however, goes to the very heart of urban redevelopment. The section of the 1951 law which defines a "blighted area" has this added provision: "Provided, no individual tract, building or improvement shall be considered a blighted area if any blighted area not subject to the power of eminent domain herein granted unless it is of the character herein described and substantially contributes to the conditions rendering such area a blighted area."

This proviso makes it practically impossible to work out a redevelopment plan for an entire area. The existing structure that cannot be purchased by negotiation or by eminent domain may prevent the redevelopment of a whole area.

The provision was not in the original draft of the act. It was added by representatives of the N. C. Real Estate Board and the League of Municipalities. It was inserted after

the measure had been introduced.

Representatives of the several Urban Redevelopment Commissions and the N. C. Real Estate Board are asking that the following proviso be substituted for the one now in the act:

"Provided, no area shall be considered a blighted area not subject to the power of eminent domain herein granted unless it is of the character herein described and substantially contributes to the conditions rendering such area a blighted area."

Proponents of the amendments believe that the change will adequately serve to prevent any possible abuse of the power of eminent domain by a redevelopment commission, and at the same time enable it to carry out the purposes of the Federal and State program.

We quite agree, and we recommend that the Charlotte City Council endorse the change by resolution this week, and that the Mecklenburg legislative delegation support the amendments which they are presenting to the General Assembly.

WELFARE SECRECY LIMITS YOUR RIGHTS

TO ARGUE, as Sen. Fred H. McIntyre argues, that you can get rid of chiselers by publishing welfare rolls, is to assume that chiselers are on the lists now.

We shall not make that assumption, for we do not know that it is a valid one. It may be true. It may be that welfare officials are careless, that they are poor investigators, that they don't try to uncover the chiselers.

But without proof, it is unfair to charge that the welfare rolls are cluttered up with chiselers and dead-beats. It reflects on the integrity and the ability of welfare administrators and case workers in North Carolina.

Beyond that, it is a weak argument for lifting the veil of secrecy on relief rolls, because it is not supported by facts. Eisenhower on this point is far from alone. In the pamphlet, Improving Public Assistance, the latest project of the Tax Foundation, a

research organization headed by John W. Finnes after an intensive study of 15 states permitting publication of general assistance rolls, the Foundation concludes that the abandonment of secrecy causes:

- 1. No pointed effect upon caseloads; 2. No widespread weeding out of chiselers; 3. Increased administrative efficiency; 4. Increased public confidence in relief rolls.

We favor the bill introduced by Mr. McIntyre and his 22 Senatorial colleagues. But we base our case not on the unproven assumption that you will get rid of a lot of chiselers, but rather on the plain, simple principle that the American taxpayer has a right to know what is being done with his money, any time he chooses to ask. Secrecy makes the welfare rolls opaque. If that, the curtain of secrecy should be lifted.

FRANCO DRIVES A HARD BARGAIN

WHEN President Eisenhower talks about foreign policy, he frequently uses the term, "enlightened self-interest."

It may not be possible to define the phrase in specific detail. "Enlightened self-interest" means first of all the interests of the United States as they appear to us. It means generally what we take it to mean, the self-interest of the United States within the framework of an enlightened attitude toward the growing society of free nations. It is the guiding rule for foreign policy. Hence, it is an excellent yardstick for our military and diplomatic leaders as they measure the importance of Spain.

The U. S. wants the use of air and naval bases in Spain. The Truman Administration sought to negotiate for them in return for \$125 million in economic and military aid. U. S. insisted, however, that economic aid funds should be earmarked primarily for projects that would directly contribute to the usability of the bases. On that point, the negotiations bogged down.

It is reported that Franco has upped the price for his bases. John M. Highfill, long time Associated Press diplomatic writer, says the General apparently wants "to find out how much the Eisenhower Administration may be willing to give," and cites these new demands:

- 1. A total of \$125 million in financial aid without any strings attached.
2. A large-scale military program, paid for by the U. S., to modernize the Spanish Army.
3. A United States guarantee of Spanish security.

There have been no indications that the Eisenhower Administration will be more generous with Franco than was the Truman Administration. From the purely military standpoint, it may be in our "enlightened self-interest" to have air and naval bases in Spain. If so, their value in our total global program can be calculated fairly closely. We should pay for value received, and no more.

There is no reason for the United States to go hat in hand to Franco. It is in his self-interest to have the military protection and economic aid that our original proposal

ALL ABOUT BOYS

YOU COME HOME from the office, weary of struggling with the complexity of world affairs and the state of the union. Sweet Morpheus beckons (the household word is sandman—but you are too lately of the ivory tower to lapse into the vernacular).

You yawn and mutter when you get up tomorrow's column. Suddenly you are settled with a wild idea and you say to the editor, "How would you like to write an editorial?"

"You mean you want me to write an editorial," she says. "Yes," you say. "Nothing controversial. Something you know something about—the kiddie boys and the weather." You begin to reconsider and wonder if you have gone off at the deep end and you say, "Maybe you had better not write about the weather. It's sort of tricky. And I don't even have a dog, so maybe you had better write about boys."

Then you look at her again and she still has on the tweed skirt and the sweater and the U. S. in motion picture glasses. She is either the Practical Girl or the Party-Going Girl. She has been transformed into Juliet, Violetta, Joan of Arc and Florence Nightingale, all rolled into one.

She assembles and begins to pore over an impressive array of background material for the editorial—Boys' Life, Parade of the Animal Kingdom, the Scout handbook, Mark Twain.

You recline on the couch and dose luxuriously. Two hours and one paragraph later she tips up gently on the shoulder. "Get up," Tom Sawyer, she says, "I'm tired of whitewashing the fence."

From The Hartford Courant

GOT A MEGABUCK?

THE Department of New Words had one reservation. It comes from the Atomic Energy Commission, which is used to dealing in scientific terms and millions of dollars. The AEC crossed-hair its interests in the cold, professional laboratory and came up with the term megabuck, loosely translated by those in the know as one million bucks.

Learners studies explain that "mega" means large or very large, and that in radio frequencies a megacycle is one million cycles. Easy to see. When the AEC speaks of a new laboratory, for instance, they may say it will cost 15 megabucks. That's \$15 million. Any questions?

These days can use a short way to say million. He could use a short word to say billion. What's that, a macrobuck?

Anyway, the days when one thousand bucks was a major figure in government are long past. So there's no danger someone will start using kilobucks. But the buck itself has got to a point where it seems like a microbuck.

U. S. population grew more in 1952 than in any other year. Especially the Republican and it—Elizabethtown (Ky.) News.

"I'm afraid we can't afford to me to have the operation now, can we, dear?" "No," replied the husband. "It looks like you'll have to talk about your last one for another six months."—Lerner (Mo.) Democrat.

Effects Of Permitting Public Inspection Of Welfare Rolls

(Reprinted from "Improving Public Assistance," a publication of the Foundation for Public Welfare, Chicago, Ill., 1952.)

FREE of the threat of Federal financial withdrawal, increasing numbers of states will doubtless examine the pros and cons of the secrecy question. Their decision might well be influenced by experience such as the following:

One state reports approximately 200 cases closed at clients' request in less than a year. Another reports that approximately two months of public inspection.

Illinois reports no appreciable reduction in caseload and applications following public inspection, but an increase in public confidence in the integrity of the rolls. Illinois also reports that many ineligibles from trying to get on the relief rolls. Beyond this, Illinois reports that recipients have been harmed by malicious gossip or that rolls have been used for electoral purposes.

Indiana's public inspection program became effective July 20, 1951. Significant results are reported in 5,800 closures for the period July-November, 1951, there were only 100 cases withdrawn from the welfare rolls. Welfare officials assign the case load drop to the elimination of the Aid Age and Survivors' Insurance program and improved economic conditions.

Indiana reports that few, if any, people are taking the time and effort to challenge the rolls. As a result, there is little likelihood that public inspection is assisting in pointing out the illegal receiver of assistance.

However, certain groups in Indiana maintain that if public inspection were to be credited with causing the caseload drop, official inspection can. The feeling here is that secrecy abandonment has

spurred administrative efficiency in welfare agencies. In short, welfare officials believe that the caseload before the public points out the undeserving. This being the case, effective inspection of the rolls would tend to minimize the number of individuals on the rolls.

Aside from specific data on the number of individuals on the rolls, individual opinion.

In one state a welfare official feels that abandonment would be administratively desirable as an answer to program criticism.

Another says strongly that inspection would do harm to the legitimate recipient without having any effect upon the chieftain.

A third argues that effective investigation and administration of welfare coupled with relative responsibility, lien, and reimbursement laws, are preferable to public inspection of the economic and humane operation of welfare.

By and large, experience and the opinion of welfare officials indicate that the causes: (1) no pointed effect upon case loads; (2) no widespread welfare support; (3) no effect upon administrative efficiency; (4) increased public confidence in relief rolls.

In the final analysis, conclusive data on the results of opening welfare rolls to public inspection are not available. Much of the pro and con argument is based on intangible factors, such as the psychological effect on welfare recipients, susceptible to public exposure. Nevertheless, any lasting government program must have the confidence and financial support of the public. Since public inspection undeniably has enhanced public confidence in the integrity of the welfare rolls, this might well be the determining factor in ending welfare secrecy.

See editorial, "Welfare Secrecy Limits Your Rights."

Epilepsy, Aged, Army, Debt, Etc., Etc. Will Be Investigated

By CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

WASHINGTON "SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS" are at it again. And early indications are that the 83rd Congress will cut into the 82nd Congress' budget and the record in the field of public assistance.

With the new session only a little more than a month old, the legislative hearings already were making headlines. Some of the probes were broad new ones: mental health, including studies of the aged, natural resources of the United States, and the problem of the aged.

The State Department, a favorite topic of Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy (R-Wis.) when he was a member of the minority, was the subject of his Senate Investigations Subcommittee study of the Internal Revenue Bureau had retained the familiar words, "tax fraud," to front pages.

164 "PROBE BILLS" were introduced in Congress last month. The bills were introduced in the House and Senate related to proposed investigations, studies or research to be conducted or directed by Congressional committees.

During the month of January in 1953—the first month of the 82nd Congress which was under Democratic control—some 70 similar measures were introduced, so the 82nd Congress proposed more than 50 per cent more probes in its first month than did its predecessor.

More than 100 legislative proposals concerning the aged were introduced in Congress during the first month of the year. Some 25 were introduced by Democrats and another five were sponsored by men from the Republican parties. In the case of some issues proposed for study, as many as six or more measures are considered with the same subject.

At least a dozen of the measures introduced in the past month are of present Congress related to military forces and veterans. Among them were calls for probes of armed forces desertions, selection of West

U. S. Seen In Supporting Role

Asians Vs. Asians—ke's Aim

By JOSEPH AND STEWART ASLOW

WHILE the country rings with the adventurous policy in the Far East, the Eisenhower Administration is actually considering a withdrawal from the fighting line on Korea.

This is to be the answer to the mounting political pressure to bring the boys home, which is now taking the form of a White House mail demanding that President Eisenhower "keep his promise" to end the Korean War.

The American divisions are to be replaced, of course, with South Korean divisions. In some measure this process has begun already. The new South Korean divisions created by Gen. James Van Fleet, have taken over a part of the battle-line. An estimated three American divisions have already been pulled back into reserve. But General Van Fleet, an aggressive-minded commander, at no time contemplated complete replacement of the American divisions by Korean training areas. And complete replacement is the new scheme's real novelty.

Americans In Reserve

IN order to reduce the substantial risk involved, 12 to 18 months will be allowed for the replacement process. Even after the American divisions are pulled out of the line, American heavy artillery and other special equipment will necessarily continue to support the South Koreans.

Although certain American divisions now in Korea may be redeployed to other parts of the country, a fighting reserve of approximately three divisions will be retained in Korean training areas, in case of an enemy offensive.

Then too, the South Koreans will continue to receive full American air and naval support, on the present scale. Furthermore, the Chinese indicated to the Soviets and the Chinese Communist that no hold will be forced—that all limitations on American air and naval activity will be brushed aside in the event of a major offensive by the enemy.

Finally, the Korean economy, which will be bled white of manpower by the increased demands of the army will be critically assisted by heavy injections of American aid. It goes without saying that the Korean forces will be armed and equipped with the limited Korean munitions in the form of foodstuffs and other consumers' products will also be needed, according to the most liberal forecast.

So far as the Korean War is concerned, these appear to be the main points. It is not clear how far the U. S. will go in withdrawing its units from the battle line. Nor is it clear how the Administration proposes to solve the difficult Communist problem, which is mainly army if Gen. Maxwell Taylor has no American troops fighting side by side with the ROKs.

It is clear that the U. S. will be withdrawing its units from the battle line. Nor is it clear how the Administration proposes to solve the difficult Communist problem, which is mainly army if Gen. Maxwell Taylor has no American troops fighting side by side with the ROKs.

Benson's 'Middlemen'

MEANWHILE, the farmers are taking their fire on Secretary of Agriculture Benson, a man of high integrity but outspoken views. His blunt statements in favor of a "free market" rather than "government bounty" and his description of price supports as "diplomatic insurance" received widespread approval. President Eisenhower's campaign promise for "no more farm price supports" has been taken seriously.

Farmers claim as much right to government subsidies as the manufacturer who gets tax amortization and tariff protection, or the workman who receives retirement and welfare benefits, or the big airlines and shipping companies who draw outright subsidies.

Charting The Course



U. S. Seen In Supporting Role

Asians Vs. Asians—ke's Aim

By JOSEPH AND STEWART ASLOW

more important, from the straight strategic standpoint, than the Korean War, they believe that the right way to defeat the Viet-Minh guerrillas is to arm the free Indo-Chinese.

Secretary Dulles broached this idea long before inauguration, to French Ambassador Jean Bonnet. Even now, the French are preparing to recruit and train 50 additional lightly armed Indo-Chinese battalions to be used to mop up and police territory won back by the Communists. But the less important character and special role of these battalions is noteworthy.

The truth is, the French have not yet found the secret of turning out native forces like the American-trained, South Korean units. Marshal Juin, Inspector-General of the French Army, is now en route to Indo-China to see what improvements can be made. He will visit Korea to have a look at the methods in use there, in the course of his trip to the Far East. Jun's journey follows discussions of the Indo-Chinese problem which Secretary Dulles held with leaders of the French government in Paris.

Not 'Aggressive' Policy

THOSE who should know policy that Secretary Dulles particularly likes to emphasize the Indo-Chinese aspect of the projected program, perhaps because this is the only policy which can be referred to as "positive." Even considering the proposed pull-out of native Indo-Chinese anti-Communist power, the total program does not add up to the more aggressive Far Eastern policy which has been so widely advertised. In fact, the net impression conveyed to the Kremlin by the withdrawal of American divisions from the Korean fighting line will almost inevitably be an impression of weakness.

It is wrong, none the less, to test the new scheme by the expectations aroused by campaign talk. The new policy is not gloriously "positive" or inspiring "hard." But it still has three great assets vital to the U. S.

First of all, it will materially reduce the toll of our Korean casualties, which is the greatest possible cause for national rejoicing. Second, the new policy will produce a widening breach in the Western alliance, which is also a matter for rejoicing of a different kind. And the new policy will produce a new situation, in which, on balance, the Korean War may cost the enemy rather more than it costs us. This may induce the enemy to accept an armistice at least. If not, further measures can be considered later on.

Quote, Unquote

True toll does not go unrecognized. The harder you work the more the income tax bracket—Greenwood (Miss.) Commission on Taxation.

A candidate was talking in town a couple of days ago, trying to get a \$120,000 interest in a barbecue. That remark stopped folks in their tracks, caused a near traffic jam, and created a lot of new interest in the campaign—Omega (Ga.) News.

Secretary Benson May Be 'Expended'

publicans were actually afraid to go home for the Lincoln Day speeches. Senate Agriculture Committee Chairman George Aiken of Vermont is trying to abolish the agricultural circuit, is pleading that the farmer, who has 64 cents in the pocket, the lid is too heavy to carry.

Murray argues that the world problem is not overproduction but underproduction; that the world is starving in some 200 million people, and that the world's food stocks up to \$1.5 billion; that an international food reserve is shrinking; foreign markets and declining farm prices.

Benson's 'Middlemen'

MEANWHILE, the farmers are taking their fire on Secretary of Agriculture Benson, a man of high integrity but outspoken views. His blunt statements in favor of a "free market" rather than "government bounty" and his description of price supports as "diplomatic insurance" received widespread approval. President Eisenhower's campaign promise for "no more farm price supports" has been taken seriously.

Farmers claim as much right to government subsidies as the manufacturer who gets tax amortization and tariff protection, or the workman who receives retirement and welfare benefits, or the big airlines and shipping companies who draw outright subsidies.

The farmers complain that Benson has headed the Agriculture Department with agricultural middlemen, not the men who

will the soil but those who "farm the farmers." Traditionally, these middlemen have fought against price supports in order to get higher prices for low and their own profits.

Note: Translated into commodities, the bumper boom over the past year has been: pork, from \$22.2 a bushel to \$27.20; corn, from \$19.70; hogs from \$17.90 per cwt. to \$16; corn from \$2.24 a bushel to \$2.12; corn from \$1.85 a bushel to 84 cents; cotton from 40 cents per pound to 31 cents, and butter-fat from 18 cents a pound to 70 cents.