

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

1888—Sixty-Fifth Anniversary Year—1953

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

FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1954

A THOUGHT FOR THE NEW YEAR

IN MANY RESPECTS, 1953 was a more hopeful year than 1952. In the troubled area of world affairs, the shift of power in the Kremlin gave signs of a change in tactics of Russian communism, if not in its long range strategy. And the prospect of some kind of peaceful coexistence between East and West did not seem quite so remote as in earlier postwar years.

In the nation, a change of administration cooled off the political temper of the people and there were fewer "fussings, shooings and blamings," to use the phrase of the small boy around the house, than in 1952. Moreover, the flood tide of McCarthyism, while still at a raging peak, appeared ready to begin the inevitable ebbing away.

There were other hopeful signs, too numerous to list here. And they added up to a critical appraisal of the year. The system, tested as never before in an uncertain half-peace half-war when a misstep might have plunged the world into chaos, has lost none of its basic strength or its flexibility.

The nation having successfully weathered eight critical postwar years, it is no longer amiss to take another look at the main threat not only to peace but also to our very survival. And that threat has been Russian communism as shaped by the late Premier Stalin.

FROM THE FIRST, the threat to our nation from communism has been threefold:

1. There was a Communist political threat. During the dark days of the depression, it was a very real threat, and communism as a political system remained attractive to many Americans during those critical years of World War II when Soviet Russia was an ally. It is not surprising, therefore, that when the case, we believe, to say that communism as a political threat has vanished from the American scene. Abroad, especially in those vast areas where overpopulation and underproduction create poverty and misery and death, it remains a political threat. At home, it is a threat that is disguised in such alluring, if false, promises. In brief, the Red soapbox orator at home would be a laughingstock of passersby today; abroad he must still be countered by policies and deeds that show the strength and benevolence of freedom.

2. There has been a communist espionage threat. The more responsible congressional investigating committees have shown very clearly that communists and

ON THE ENRICHMENT OF THE LANGUAGE

THE other day we were musing about some of the new terms the economists have coined to describe to each other what is happening to the national economy. We thought our glossary was complete, but when 300 of the nation's economists gathered in Washington this week, they came up with a few new ones.

Agreeing that the current decline in economic activity is a "moderate recession" rather than the preliminary to another "great recession," the economists split into three blocs:

1. The biggest group—a majority—thought the country was in the middle of an "orthodox recession."
2. A smaller bloc thought it was a "rolling adjustment."
3. A still smaller bloc holds to the "inventory recession" theory.

FROM UP IN THE CLOUDS, AN IDEA

MUSING about the sky-scraping height of the Oregon State basketball team, the St. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH recalls the suggestion of Coach "Phog" Allen of Kansas that the baskets be raised from 10 feet off the floor to 12 feet.

The P-D doesn't think much of the idea. It notes that Oregon State has a center who is 7 feet 3 inches high, two forwards who are 6 feet 8 inches, and two guards 6 feet 6 inches. And it concludes that raising the baskets would do no permanent good, that it would just be a matter of time until there were 8-foot centers everywhere.

That conclusion was reached because this week's Dixie Classic in Raleigh when Oregon State, ranked fourth in the nation, came a-cropper at the hands of Duke and Tulane, neither of which boasts a collection of beaumes.

Matter of fact, if the Classic is a fair index, it may not be necessary for St. Louis editorial writers to worry any longer about the upward trend in basketball players. As our sports editor Bob Quincy noted, there were some good big boys in the tournament—Stanley Haffner, seven-seven; Dickie Herrie, six-seven; Don Lange, six-four. But the real stars of the three-day tournament were Hall Brooks (5-11) of Seton Hall, Joe Belmont (5-11) of Duke, Rudy D'Emilio (6-0) of Duke, and Billy Lyles (6-0) of Wake Forest. It would be a good thing for the sport if less emphasis were placed on height.

The spectator doesn't get half as much fun from watching the tall boys lumber up and down the court in great, ungainly bounds as he does from the speedy,

fellow-travelers managed to infiltrate government, industry and labor in the halcyon days of U. S.-Russian friendship, even though the evidence on the success of their espionage is scanty, save for one or two notable examples. Through the careful and thorough loyalty programs of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, the communist espionage threat has been reduced to a minimum. It will never be entirely eliminated so long as there is one American willing to sell his country short, but it is now a task for vigilant professionals instead of professional vigilantes.

3. The flood of publicity about the first two threats from communism has seemed at times to confuse the American people about the gravest danger of all. It is not political; it is not espionage; it is the rigid, brutal fact of Communist imperialism, backed up by Communist armed might, production and manpower. Communist imperialism succeeded in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in Rumania, in Hungary and Bulgaria because the Russian military machine was kept intact after World War II, whereas the western democracies hastily demobilized and turned to peacetime pursuits. Into this power vacuum, Russia was able to move troops without fear of retaliation. Conversely, Communist imperialism failed in Iran, in Greece, in Berlin, and in Korea because the free world, led by the United States, showed resistance.

FROM THIS RECORD, there should be a lesson for Americans in 1954. So long as there is continuing evidence of Communist imperialism, as there is in Indochina today, and so long as Russia is strongly armed and the possessor of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, this nation must think for herself. The problems that beset him cannot be solved by emotion, prejudice, suspicion, scape-goating, or blind lashing out.

Freedom, as Gerald W. Johnson has said, is a dangerous business, and not the least of the dangers is that the freeman must think for himself. The problems that beset him cannot be solved by emotion, prejudice, suspicion, scape-goating, or blind lashing out.

Freedom, as Gerald W. Johnson has said, is a dangerous business, and not the least of the dangers is that the freeman must think for himself. The problems that beset him cannot be solved by emotion, prejudice, suspicion, scape-goating, or blind lashing out.

We've known for a long time that the English language is a flexible thing, and that professional men, in developing their own particular jargon, often follow Humpty-Dumpty's rule: "When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

But after reading all about the economists, we find ourselves in agreement with Chairman Martin R. Gainsbrugh of the National Industrial Conference Board who said that the forecasts had moved from "from cautious optimism to optimistic caution" about 1954.

more agile and better coordinated movements of the smaller guys.

In the second place, emphasis on height has shut out intercollegiate basketball a host of athletes who, in every category that that of height, would qualify for the game. Sure, they can play intramural and interfraternity matches, but they don't hand out scholarships and self-help jobs for those.

But if, in spite of the evidence from the Classic, basketball coaches keep looking for the skyscrapers, maybe somebody will organize a league for players who are six feet and under. We'll wager they would attract most of the spectators.

Everybody needs something, no matter how trivial, to be proud of, and it looks now as if the man who boasts he has never been in a drive-in movie will make it safely through another season.—KNOXVILLE (TENN.) JOURNAL.

Conversation: "Why don't you turn on the TV during our mid-day meal any more?" "I don't like to hear 'em tell about washing diapers, that's all."—MEMPHIS PRESS-SCIMITAR.

In addition to being the most richly productive, America's economic system does a better job of "sharing the wealth" produced than any other system of the world ever tried.—BASSETT (NEB.) LEADER.

As we get it, somewhat pessimistically, living costs are leveling off at a slow climb.—ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT.

'Say, Bud—To Settle An Argument—'



A British Viewpoint

'Agonizing' Choice, For Sure

From The Manchester Guardian Weekly

THE words of Mr. Dulles angered in France, and the words of Sir Winston will have caused still deeper consternation. He has underwritten the grave warning which Mr. Dulles gave of the consequences which will follow if France fails to ratify the European Defense Treaty soon.

The French people and Parliament have been told in effect, that they must choose between ratifying the treaty and sacrificing the support of the United States, and hence of Great Britain. That is a terrible choice to put before any people. Sir Winston was anxious that the possible consequences should be made completely clear to the French people; they ought also to be made completely clear in Britain. If there should be no shirring over the danger to France, then equally there should be no shirring over the calamitous effects for Britain of the situation which Mr. Dulles and Sir Winston refer. Mr. Dulles has said that failure to ratify the treaty soon will lead to an "agonizing reappraisal" of American policy in Europe, and he has added specifically that the reappraisal would concern the disposition of United States forces.

That can mean only one thing (bearing in mind the insistence of the Pentagon on full defense of Europe or none): it means the withdrawal of American forces from Europe. Such a withdrawal, beyond question, would be a disaster to the European countries could not possibly take the risk of being tied to an American alliance without effective American support. Great Britain, as a result, would be left with the choice of remaining as the only ally of the United States on this side of the Atlantic or of severing its close connection with America. "Agonizing" is less than adequate to describe such a choice.

Churchill's Plan Rejected

WE can only suppose that Sir Winston, when he spoke on Thursday, was deeply conscious of all that would follow from an American "reappraisal." That, perhaps, is why he thought it necessary to add his warning to the words of Mr. Dulles. There would not otherwise be any reason for aggravating the tensions with France at a time like this. It seems most unlikely that he himself would have wanted to put the choice before France in such a blunt and unambiguous form that what he heard at Bermuda, it seems, convinced him that the United States had taken an irrevocable decision to withdraw its troops from Europe. His own thoughts of an alternative method of rearming Western Germany—within a wider North Atlantic Treaty—were evidently unacceptable to President Eisenhower.

What Mr. Dulles said publicly in Paris, according to Sir Winston, corresponded to what he said privately to the American statesmen at Bermuda. Why should the United States take this position? Does it really regard the immediate rearm-

ment of Western Germany as so essential that, if France rejects it, America will tear down the existing structure of Western defenses? That is almost unbelievable. Yet if it is not so, the warning uttered by Mr. Dulles and Sir Winston's underwriting of it are inexcusable. And if it really is so, then the impatience of President Eisenhower, Mr. Dulles, and their advisers must have diminished their good judgment. They ought to know well enough, being thoroughly acquainted with the details of European defense, that the rearming of Western Germany is not immediately essential either for military or for political reasons. It is true, as Sir Winston said, that Germany cannot remain unarmcd indefinitely. But the period need not be set quite so definitely as the next six months.

What Can Be Salvaged?

WHAT can be salvaged from this mess? French ratification of the treaty has probably not been brought any nearer by the words of Mr. Dulles and Sir Winston. Its likelihood within the next few months is, indeed, remote. It confronts France with a decision which, quite apart from the threat of consequences from America, would be deeply difficult to take. It requires the French to hand over irrevocably a large part of the French armed forces, to enter an union which will certainly take other political matters under its authority, to bind itself to a dominant Germany, and to risk the future of its relations with its overseas territories. Small wonder, then, that Mr. Laniel and Mr. Bidault have asked that the North Atlantic Allies should act as "a counterweight and guarantee."

But neither at Bermuda nor in Paris were they given a fair warning. All that Sir Winston could say was that Britain would keep her troops on the continent "at least as long as the American troops."

This is not enough. If the French want a guarantee for 50 years, it should be given to them. If they want a guarantee that the British will stay, wherever the Americans do, that also should be given. Any thought that Britain can make herself secure by retiring behind the channel is out of date: it was almost out of date in 1940, and since then rockets and guided missiles have made the channel much less of an obstacle. It is true that, as Mr. Dulles has said, nobody can tell what military commitments will be possible 20 years hence and that the North Atlantic Treaty can be extended indefinitely. But that being so, why not give the French the guarantees they want? They can give them on our side, by much smaller means if we are asking them to accept. If EDC does fail, it will not be the fault of France alone. The fault will be shared by the failure of its chummates and Britain for its slothfulness. But the British Government still has time to make amends.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

HERE are my predictions for the year 1954:

World peace—The Russians can't afford an attack on the western world for some time, due to unrest in the satellite nations and a severe drop in their oil supply from Russia. Therefore peace, though precarious, will continue. There will, however, be sporadic trouble in the Near East, the Far East and North Africa.

Korea—Truce-peace talks will drag on interminably throughout the entire year of 1954. They will give no satisfaction to anyone. The Chinese Reds will duck out of every basic issue and Dr. Syngman Rhee will constantly threaten to start war again. However, the chances are he won't carry out his threat.

Business—Industrial production will be down about 10 per cent with retail prices also dropping. The Russians can't afford an attack on the western world for some time, due to unrest in the satellite nations and a severe drop in their oil supply from Russia. Therefore peace, though precarious, will continue. There will, however, be sporadic trouble in the Near East, the Far East and North Africa.

Unemployment—Unemployment will be about 3,000,000 by the end of the year. As a result of unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, federal deposits insurance, and other safeguards, there should be no depression.

Senator Taft's successor—The most missed man in Washington will be the late Senator Taft who was able to ride herd on rebellious Republicans. Today, with the Republicans facing a paper-thin majority, and with the needling every vote by the man who takes Taft's place is all-important and the big question is whether anyone is big enough to fill his shoes. Knowledge of California inheritance Taft's title and has increased in stature, but lacks his power. Bridges of New Hamp-

shire, Ferguson of Michigan are possibilities to fill his shoes. But I predict that the Senate will be run at first by a coalition of Republicans, with brainy, witty Eugene Millikin of Colorado emerging as the leader of the Republicans.

Farm future—Farm prices will continue pretty much on their present level though with some declines. Secretary Benson's plan for flexible support prices will be vetoed by Congress, which will re-enact rigid price supports. With the government already investing billions in the business program I predict that, within four months, this figure will reach \$6,750,000,000—the limit set by law—and the Congress will increase the Commodity Credit Corporation's crop-buying powers to eight billions or more.

Powder rates—Congress will veto the proposed increase of first class mail to four cents, but will increase second class mail (Newspapers and magazines) 30 per cent, and third class mail 50 per cent.

Taxes—As of today income taxes are automatically reduced 10 per cent while the excess-profits tax expires altogether. Simultaneously, social-security taxes are automatically increased, which means a big saving for upper-bracket taxpayers but little saving for the lower brackets. Families with an income of \$3,000, for instance, will see their taxes increased 20 percent counterbalanced by the increased social-security payment. General Motors, for example, will save half a billion in excess-profits tax but will pay \$100 million more in social-security taxes.

Therefore I predict that the White House will demand that Congress postpone the social-security increase until after the election, but that Congressman Dan Reed of the Ways & Means Committee will stand

Government Scientists Study Effect Of Coloring On Foods

By FREDERICK C. OTTMAN

WASHINGTON
I WAS sitting there, red-handed, when up stroled George P. Larrick, deputy commissioner of the Food & Drug Administration. The man responsible for my crimson paw.

So I told him my troubles. The other night Hilda was in a hurry to get the dinner cooked and she asked me, please, would I wash a few sweet potatoes, dry 'em, grease 'em, and place same in the oven to bake?

Well, sir, they were the prettiest sweet potatoes I ever did see; a deep scarlet like the map of Russia. So I put 'em in the sink and the water turned pink. I dried 'em and got red on the pot towels.

I put cooking oil on 'em and it dribbled red on the stove and the floor. Quickly I slammed 'em in the oven and was in the midst of cleaning up the mess when Mrs. O. returned to ask who had been murdered. He died, whether anyone eating such a dyed orange would suffer any possible ill effects. The dye didn't shock her, and I told Larrick, his Food & Drug Administration is responsible. Why in the name of all that's honest were you allow the dealers in sweet potatoes to dye them red?

CHEMISTS WORRIED
Larrick said I'd pointed on him at the exact psychological moment. Even as he examined the stains remaining on my hands, he said, the Administration's chemists were poring about the colors going into and—in particular—out of foods.

On Jan. 19, he said, the Administration would open formal hearings on the subject of whether orange growers would be allowed to continue tinting their sweet orange color with coal tar dyes.

The trouble is, he said, that some of us eat, particularly in their own hands with them when fully ripe. Citizens in other parts of the land refuse to buy 'em that color, so the packers have been dyeing them to make

them look as sweet as they actually are. This has been perfectly legal. Easterners, however, are particularly critical of color.

"Some of these dyes used on oranges and in certain cakes, candies, and soft drinks," Larrick, "were approved 40 years ago as noninjurious. Our chemists got to thinking a while back that perhaps they should be proved still to be harmless to the rats, even when eaten in large quantities, but three of them made the animals only-eyes or, at least, sickly."

Larrick said these three dyes had to be among those used on some oranges. He said even so, he doubted whether anyone eating such a dyed orange would suffer any possible ill effects. The dye didn't shock her, and I told Larrick, his Food & Drug Administration is responsible. Why in the name of all that's honest were you allow the dealers in sweet potatoes to dye them red?

As for the red sweet potatoes, Larrick said he hadn't yet given his own hands with them when fully ripe. Citizens in other parts of the land refuse to buy 'em that color, so the packers have been dyeing them to make

them look as sweet as they actually are. This has been perfectly legal. Easterners, however, are particularly critical of color.

Knowland Has Big Assignment In Carrying Out Double Role

By JAMES MARLOW

WASHINGTON
YOUNG and earnest Sen. Knowland is not noted as a humorist, which is probably just as well. What he faces in 1954 is enough to keep any man serious all year.

The 45-year-old California Republican has the double job, which is really only one and the same job, of trying to fill the shoes of the late Sen. Robert A. Taft and steering President Eisenhower's program through the Senate.

Knowland seems determined not to be a rubber stamp for the White House but to speak his mind in disagreement with Eisenhower whenever he sees fit. This is strictly in the Taft tradition.

But Knowland has yet to demonstrate that he can be as outspoken as Taft and still keep his fellow Republicans in the Senate from taking this as a cue to run off in all directions themselves.

The dark-haired Knowland has been in the Senate only seven years but he has succeeded as a majority leader. He worked hard at his new responsibility through the closing weeks of Congress. But his task in 1954 was mild compared with the one confronting him now.

Rising above any personal bitterness he may have felt because the Republican party wanted Eisenhower in the White House instead of him, Taft labored hard both for the party and the President.

Because of his great prestige and influence, Taft was able to disagree openly with Eisenhower on his own points but still shepherd the Senate Republican votes regularly for the administration.

Knowland, if only because of his own inexperience and youthfulness, lacks the Senate influence of Taft, yet it is upon him Eisenhower must depend for the progress of his program through the Senate in 1954.

And Knowland's task is even a

little more difficult than Taft's, for the Ohio Republican enjoyed an

advantage, although small, which Knowland lacks. In 1952, when the 83rd Congress convened last Jan. 3, the Senate had 48 Republicans, 47 Democrats and 10 Independents. Oregon, where he had been elected a Republican, Now the Senate has 48 Democrats, 47 Republicans and 10 Independents.

Even with that small edge last year Eisenhower had to depend on Democratic votes to ball him out on some major issues.

So Knowland will, perhaps more times than once, have to woo some Democrats, a tendency which may increase as the year progresses. He will have to make compromises on Eisenhower programs.

When Eisenhower this week announced a policy of placing defense contracts in unemployment areas, some Democrats, but particularly the Southern Democrats, are expected to object to this policy depriving their areas of work, protested loudly.

Shortly afterwards Knowland called this Eisenhower policy a disappointment and said he would support legislation, after Congress comes back next Wednesday, to modify it.

Not long ago, after Eisenhower said he hoped Communists in government would be removed by a 1954 election issue, Sen. McCarthy said it would be a main one. Knowland said it would be an issue.

For many points but still shepherd the Senate Republican votes regularly for the administration.

Knowland, if only because of his own inexperience and youthfulness, lacks the Senate influence of Taft, yet it is upon him Eisenhower must depend for the progress of his program through the Senate in 1954.

And Knowland's task is even a little more difficult than Taft's, for the Ohio Republican enjoyed an advantage, although small, which Knowland lacks. In 1952, when the 83rd Congress convened last Jan. 3, the Senate had 48 Republicans, 47 Democrats and 10 Independents. Oregon, where he had been elected a Republican, Now the Senate has 48 Democrats, 47 Republicans and 10 Independents.

Even with that small edge last year Eisenhower had to depend on Democratic votes to ball him out on some major issues.

So Knowland will, perhaps more times than once, have to woo some Democrats, a tendency which may increase as the year progresses. He will have to make compromises on Eisenhower programs.

When Eisenhower this week announced a policy of placing defense contracts in unemployment areas, some Democrats, but particularly the Southern Democrats, are expected to object to this policy depriving their areas of work, protested loudly.