



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 29, 1955

Talk Is No Cure, But It's Palliative

THIS has been a somber and historic week in international affairs, during which men and institutions acted characteristically. A Communist head of state declared the Chinese people's determination to acquire more real estate—Formosa. The President, in spite of less than ideal health, declared this country's intention to defend Formosa and possibly the Straits area, not clearly established small islands off the Chinese mainland. The House, with habitual impulsiveness, overwhelmingly endorsed the President's broad request to fight if necessary. And as usual it was in the Senate where searching questions were asked of the ambitious chairman of the joint chiefs of staff and other military and naval leaders, and where second thoughts and reservations appeared. Then yesterday afternoon the U. N. Security Council called a meeting for Monday, at which time Red Chinese may be asked to participate in a conference on the dangerous Formosan situation, as they were asked to do in Geneva concerning Indochina.

THERE is no denying the gravity of the whole affair. With both Chinese and Americans building up their military and naval strength in the Formosa Straits area, the move is clearly a lead to a war that could hardly be confined or easily stopped. But it does not appear that this tense situation has resulted from any misstep, during this week's activities, on the part of the U. S. "Clearly the Communist Chinese" island-hopping and repeated declarations of designs on Formosa required fast and firm counter-action. The President chose to do this through his request to Congress, and while this was not necessary in part, it serves to demonstrate the solidarity of Americans regarding the defense of Formosa, and to point up possible flaws in the U. S. position. The disadvantage of this presidential deference to Congress is that it has led to a Donnybrook, had some legislators chosen to delay action. Fortunately, and thanks primarily to Democratic leaders

like Chairman Walter George of the Foreign Relations Committee, this was not the case.

Our main concern stems from the apparent possibility that the U. S. might be thrust into war by defending untenable and strategically unimportant bits of geography on the very doorstep of China, like Nationalist-held Quemoy, which lies but five miles off the port of Amoy. The President—and subsequently his military advisers—was not definite regarding its position without or without the U. N. line of defense. Mr. Eisenhower referred to it as "one of the natural approaches to Formosa," as it would be more readily understandable if a Communist fortress overshadowed an American port, also one of the natural approaches from Formosa to China, and there has been enough talk about invasion and bombing of the new mainland by Americans as well as Nationalist Chinese, to make the Communists genuinely fearful of attack and fear, when one's homeland is threatened, causes men to do reckless things, which could mean war.

FOR this reason the neutralization of these coastal islands, which are quite apart from Formosa and the Pescadores to which the Communist Chinese have no valid claim, may be a real to strive for in U. N. discussions of the issues, along with release of prisoners held by the Chinese Reds.

We are not optimistic about prospects for agreement on either of these issues. We are, however, convinced that they should be discussed in the U. N. A reduction in the present tensions, resulting from these talks, would make them successful, even if no agreement on the coastal islands and prisoners were achieved.

Prolonged discussion by all parties concerned is the next and logical item on the agenda in this explosive situation. This technique, which has been successful in other crises throughout history, may render unnecessary the use of diplomacy's ultimate, awful weapon.

Sugaw Creek: Full Speed Ahead

ANY efforts to scuttle a law diverting industrial waste from Charlotte into famous Sugaw Creek should be firmly resisted by the City Council.

There are backstage murmurs that just such a movement is being organized—although some businesses are dutifully making plans for to-the-letter compliance.

Enforcement of the law is scheduled to begin June 1. A \$3 million addition to the Sugaw Creek sewage disposal plant is expected to be completed by that date. The industrial outflow merely prohibits the dumping of trade waste into open streams and requires that each system be discharged into the sewage system. But certain standards must be met by industrial plants before they can discharge wastes into the municipal system.

Councilmen cannot afford to yield to pressure now and abandon their position on Sugaw Creek. This nagging nuisance must be cleared up. It has been a course of irritation for far too long.

Next step will be the improvement of Irwin Creek where a \$2.5 million sewage plant addition is being constructed. This

project, however, will not be completed for some time and the ordinance will not be enforced on Irwin until the new facilities there are in operation.

Charlotteans should not rest easy until all streams in the area cease to be a menace to the health and welfare of the community.

Inflation Note

BEFORE U. S. captains of finance get too cheery about the relationship of 1955 stock prices to 1929 highs, they ought to remember that a dollar in 1929 would purchase approximately 56 per cent more than it will today.

How does this fact have any bearing on a true appraisal of present investment values? An underwriter for several mutual investment companies drew us a picture today: "If a person in 1929 had appeared with one of today's dollars and wanted to buy stocks, he presumably would have been asked to supply 56 per cent more dollars to make up the difference in the price of what he wanted to buy."

From The Washington Post

KNOCK ON THE DIOR

WELL, M. Christian Dior, who knows how to crash a headline whenever he feels in the mood for popular attention, has whipped up another tasty soufflé of excitement, much to the delight of the Hollywood press agents, for whom the publicity pickings have been of late rather slim. M. Dior in his wisdom has now decided that female elbows and female knees are by their nature unifying and unesthetic objects which must therefore be discreetly veiled—preferably in one of his creations, if you can afford it—and thus protected from the inquisitive eye.

Last summer, you remember, Monsieur made a similar ruling concerning the female bosom which has been generously evidenced late. The bosom, he decided, must also be covered up, and to the extent that nature and the dressmaker's art permit, suppressed. The general effect, as we gather from the pictures of the Parisian models, and from our attempts to translate the lingo of the fashion reporters, is rather like that of a pleasantly rolling landscape after it has been methodically worked over by a bulldozer. Thus, hereafter, until Monsieur changes his whim again, the upward aspect of the female, and stylishly draped female form will be, as the poet puts it,

busy for a time making up fresh prints of photographs illustrative of the subject at controversy and the clipping services were kept equally busy cutting them out of newspapers and sending them back where they came from. A similar storm of outrage has now broken out among those actresses whose genius may be said to reside mainly in their gams. Thus we are invited once again to examine the legs and gently dimpled knees of Betty Grable and to ask ourselves whether banishing them forever from our sight would not be as esthetically shameful as hiding the Discobolus in the storeroom of the museum at Montreal.

This is the sort of question we are quite content to let the professional aesthetes answer; but knowing the hypnotic influence exerted by M. Dior upon the female half of mankind, we anticipate a sagging market in finger tip skirts and Bermuda shorts.

We dare say that the late Percy Hammond, who was considered in his day something of a censor in these matters, would have agreed with Monsieur; for nearly half a century ago, in thoughtfully reviewing a musical comedy in which the chorus appeared for one number in a kind of ballet costumes, Mr. Hammond decided that "the human knee is a joint and not an entertainment." Of course there was a time when a special value was placed on mishapen or calloused female knees as a badge of virtue, since they were taken to indicate that a considerable portion of their owners' time had been spent upon them, either in meritorious labor or in humble prayer.

Matusow Tells How He Lied, At Taxpayers' Expense

By STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

THE YOUTHFUL, former Communist, former aide to Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy, is currently writing a remarkable political confession which may cause major explosions. For the author of this confession, Harvey Matusow, calmly explains how he made a business of bearing false witness, and how the American government made his business a profitable one, courtesy of the American taxpayer.

An advance draft of Matusow's book, each page signed by the author, has been obtained by this reporter. Here is an example of the sort of thing Matusow, who was a chief witness against Owen Lattimore, has revealed:

LIED ABOUT LATTIMORE

"I claimed my testimony with the dramatic assertion that Owen Lattimore's books were used as the official Communist Party guide to Asia. Once again, I told a complete falsehood. I did not care what happened to Lattimore. I cared about what was going to happen to me. My ungrounded attacks on Lattimore just placed me in the role of expert of experts. I had reached the top of

the ladder. Lattimore was later indicted."

Lattimore is still, of course, under indictments. Obviously, Matusow's remarkable decision to tell how he lied, and thus risk going to jail for perjury, is likely to make a lot of extra work for the Justice Department. Matusow has already signed one sworn affidavit in which he admits false testimony in a case in which he was a chief government witness. No doubt there will be more such affidavits.

Legal lying by such professional-ex-Communist informers as Matusow, which has been tolerated by all three branches of the American government, has done irreparable harm to the individual American citizen. But it has also done irreparable harm to the whole American political process. Consider the following example of the political uses of the legal lie. Matusow was to testify before the McCarthy Committee at hearings in Salt Lake City—most likely of course to be privileged, or libel-proof.

"I had also made up my mind how I would place in the record a statement, Cap the number of Communists working for the New

York Times and Time Magazine." I had previously discussed this with Sen. McCarthy and had his approval. Once the facts were in the record, McCarthy knew that he could accuse the Times and Time Magazine, Inc., of being pro-Communist.

LIED ABOUT MANSFIELD

Or consider this example, when McCarthy sent Matusow into Montana in 1952 to attack the Democratic senatorial candidate, Mike Mansfield:

"As I talked I reached in my brief case, using the same gestures I had seen Sen. McCarthy frequently use. 'Now I have here in my brief case documented proof...' I pulled out a photostatic copy of an old copy of the Communist Party publication 'New Masses.' The impression was that I contained a bylined story by Mansfield; that he had written the story and had actively, knowingly supported the Communist Party. But I knew that the story was merely a reprint of his remarks in the Congressional Record."

There is no space here to convey the full, glib, flavor of Matusow's revelations. But the examples quoted suggest how incredible it is that Matusow should

have continued to receive taxpayers' money for his services as an "expert witness."

It may be said, of course, that Matusow, having lied before his lies. It may also be said that Matusow, having swung from communism to McCarthyism, has completed the circle—and the fact that the publisher has a decidedly left-wing coloration will be cited in support of this charge.

Certainly, on the record cited by Matusow himself, no one would be likely to claim for him exceptional trustworthiness or political wisdom. Yet he has documented for much of his amazing story. And the story is also inherently credible, simply because Matusow himself is the chief ob-

ject of his own accusations.

At any rate, Matusow's revelations simply cannot be ignored, either by Congress or by the Justice Department. In this sense, in writing his astonishing confession, Matusow may have performed a useful service. But in the years since the trial of Alger Hiss, the cult of the ex-Communist, as the undisciplined architect of the loyalty of citizens, has grown like a cancer. Matusow's confession is likely to be a serious investigation of this new post-war psychosis of the informer, and thus could have good results for the political health of the United States.

Why Do Some People Grow Tall?

From The National Geographic Bulletin

AMERICANS are growing taller all the time, but they need still more stature before they equal the Nilotics of Africa, the world's tallest people.

The Nilotic tribes live near the headwaters of the White Nile where two of Nature's centuries-old giant forces are at work. A. D. Some of their men tower a lofty 7 feet. Their average height is 5 feet 10 inches, about 2 inches taller than the typical American male.

Anthropologists agree that Americans are adding height and enormous loads of brushwood on their heads. They love to leap and stamp in dance ceremonies, jangling ankle bells, flaunting money and tossing bright headresses. Amazing high jumpers, they clear the bar at 7 feet 6 inches after a takeoff from a foot-high termite mound. They are skilled hunters.

But because hardly account for their bean-pole stature. More important is the fact they are great cattle raisers and beef eaters. The high protein value of the meat is thought to help their lanky growth.

Biologists also point to another factor. Long, thin bodies seem better adapted to dissipating heat in dry tropic areas such as the Nilotic upland home country.



They Swung, The Navy Way

Case Of The Near-Mutiny

An Editorial In The Sanford Herald

WE WROTE a review the other day of "The Caine Mutiny Court-Martial," the stage play. Later we editorialized on the Fort Bragg mutiny, or which six young soldiers were sentenced to seven years at hard labor. In the process we were reminded that the Navy never has had a real mutiny.

On occasion, however, it had a near miss.

In November, 1842, Midshipman Philip Spencer conspired with two seamen, whose names are remembered only as Cromwell and Small, to take over the United States brig Somerset. This technique, which has been successful in other crises throughout history, may render unnecessary the use of diplomacy's ultimate, awful weapon.

Spencer was declared guilty of attempting to incite mutiny. Small confessed his part in the affair but Cromwell claimed innocence. There was overwhelming proof, however, that both seamen were guilty.

A PIOUS STICKLER

Commander Alexander Siddell Mackenzie, U. S. Navy, in command of the brig, was a pious stickler and a stickler for doing things the Navy way.

As the Somers sailed homeward to New York from Liberia, he ordered the colors hoisted. Then, at his command, the drums rolled, a gun boomed, and the crew walked away at the whips. To the bitter ends of the ropes were fastened the necks of Midshipman Spencer and Seamen Cromwell and Small. As the three mutineers swung together from the gallows, Mackenzie addressed his crew and, upon finishing, asked for three cheers. Into his personal log he wrote:

"Three hearty cheers never went up from the deck of an American ship. In that electric moment, I verily believe the purest and latest patriotism burst forth from the breasts of even the worst conspirators."

The captain then had the ensign half-masted and read the service for the dead, concluding:

"Preserve us from the dangers of the sea, and the violence of enemies, bless the United States, watch over all that are upon the deep, and protect the inhabitants of the land in peace and quiet, through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

STITCH IN THE NOSE

In a rough sea and by lantern light, the bodies of Spencer, Cromwell and Small were committed to the deep. According to the tradition of the day, each was sewn into a canvas bag, a shot at his feet, with the sailmaker passing the needle through the neck for his final stitch. The church pennant was hoisted above the ensign, the only bunting ever to fly at that honored position, and the crew was dismissed after singing the Hundredth Psalm.

But the case did not end with the burial of the dead. Young Spencer was the son of John C. Spencer, Secretary of War in President Tyler's Cabinet, and when the Somers reached port, protests were made in his behalf. Commander Mackenzie was tried by court-martial on the charge of murder, and the verdict was death for six weeks. Mackenzie never yielded from the position he had held when writing at sea.

"Safety, our lives, and the honor of the flag entrusted to our charge, require the prisoners be put to death." In the end he was honorably acquitted. President Tyler approved the verdict.

In the Navy's records the case is entered as attempted mutiny. The Navy is specific in the point that not once in its history has there been a real mutiny.

At one point Radford was asked: "Would Russia intervene if the United States was dragged into war with China?"

"Russia will do what's best for Russia," Radford replied in effect. He added in his opinion Russia would not intervene.

Some senators expressed their distrust of Chiang Kai-shek and the fear that he might drag us into a war that we did not want.

"We can control China because we

States must defend the offshore islands, even those within swimming distance of the great Communist cities of Amoy and Foochow.

Much of what Adm. Radford said cannot be published here, since he deals with military secrets. He made it clear to the senators that he still vigorously favored defending the offshore islands, including the great Communist cities of Amoy and Foochow. However, Radford was frank and appeared to give all sides.

Radford did not believe that American defense of the offshore islands would lead to war on the Chinese mainland. He said he was sure we could call China's bluff. Some senators were not so sure.

At one point Radford was asked: "Would Russia intervene if the United States was dragged into war with China?"

"Russia will do what's best for Russia," Radford replied in effect. He added in his opinion Russia would not intervene.

Some senators expressed their distrust of Chiang Kai-shek and the fear that he might drag us into a war that we did not want.

"We can control China because we

States must defend the offshore islands, even those within swimming distance of the great Communist cities of Amoy and Foochow.

Much of what Adm. Radford said cannot be published here, since he deals with military secrets. He made it clear to the senators that he still vigorously favored defending the offshore islands, including the great Communist cities of Amoy and Foochow. However, Radford was frank and appeared to give all sides.

Radford did not believe that American defense of the offshore islands would lead to war on the Chinese mainland. He said he was sure we could call China's bluff. Some senators were not so sure.

At one point Radford was asked: "Would Russia intervene if the United States was dragged into war with China?"

People's Platform

More Aid To Injured Workmen Advocated

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

MAY I commend The Charlotte News for pointing up in its editorial the inadequacy of workmen's compensation in North Carolina. I personally know of some of the hardships caused by the \$30 maximum weekly compensation, and \$8,000 ceiling on total compensation. As you indicated in the most recent editorial on the subject, this week, liberalization of the workmen's compensation act would advantage both employees and employers, and would result in less drain upon welfare funds, to which many injured North Carolinians must now turn for support.

The N. C. Industrial Union Council strongly favors liberalization of the act at this session of the General Assembly, and urges your readers to contact their legislators and ask them to support this better deal for the working men and women of the state.

H. D. LISK, President
N. C. Industrial Union Council

Vet Hospitalization Issue 'Cozenacked'

Hamlet

Editors, The News:

CONCERNING Mr. Reimner's "voice" winning editorial on "Cozenacking," Kerr Scott and veteran hospitalization—soon after I arrived home after the first World War I began reading in the newspapers.

U. S. government was going to build hospitals to be known as "veterans hospitals." It was my understanding then and still is that these veterans hospitals were to be at the disposal of all veterans at any time they needed medical treatment. No mention was made that there would be any charge made against a non-serviceman connected with hospitalization.

At this government, our government, has become unable to render free medical treatment to all veterans, let that fact be made known to the Congress or to the issue to the Congress of the United States and let them decide.

We, the veterans, will abide by the decisions of the Congress.

In closing, I have only this to say: If this country becomes involved in war, today especially if we are invaded — who will the people depend on the most to give them aid at any time they need medical treatment? The answer is — as we all know — the veterans.

—ROBERT CAMP BOYD SR.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON

HERE is the backstage story of what happened during the Senate committee debate on the President's joint resolution for the protection of Formosa and the offshore Chinese Nationalist islands.

At first it looked as if the resolution would sail through the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, jointly meeting, in one day. Dulles was testifying with vigor and effectiveness. Sen. Rowland of California, the great champion of Chiang Kai-shek, kept saying, "Let's vote, let's vote." There was no opposition to Dulles' soever.

Then, suddenly, 76-year-old Sen. Barkley was sitting with eyes half-closed during most of the discussion, as if his mind was far away. Obviously, however, it was not.

"Isn't this just a predated declaration of war?" the former vice president asked Dulles in a little aback.

"Well, some people might think so," he replied sharply.

Barkley was referring to that part of the President's resolution which gave

'A Predated Declaration Of War'

WASHINGTON

him the right to bomb the Chinese mainland. Barkley felt that this was a blanket authorization to violate the borders of a foreign country, and might well lead to war.

"It's an international law," continued the ex-sec, "wouldn't you interpret this as a predated declaration of war?"

The secretary of state, who is one of the most noted international lawyers in the United States, hesitated, almost stammered.

"Yes, I would," he finally admitted. Every member of the joint committee at the time Sen. Barkley's question had previously indicated 100 per cent support for the resolution, seemed confused.

After this, the questions became more searching, continued longer. Each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was subjected to careful cross-examination.

Radford Is Candid

Adm. Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was extremely candid, and even his critics admitted he made a good impression. The senators knew before they called him that he had leaned toward, in effect, a preventive war, and a blockade of the Chinese coast, and was adamant that the United

Frank Gen. Ridgway

WASHINGTON

Gen. Matthew Ridgway, chief of staff of the Army, was equally frank. As previously pointed out in this column, he disagreed emphatically with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Radford. However, Ridgway was careful not to say anything that would restrict his opinions to military questions only. He made it clear that he did not believe the United States should help Chiang Kai-shek in holding either the island of Quemoy, situated just inside Amoy harbor, or the island of Matsu, which helps to blockade Foochow harbor.

At no time during the testimony before the two Senate committees was a line drawn as to where the United States would stop in defending Chiang Kai-shek's forces.

Whereas the Pentagon has been of the opinion that the United States would defend Quemoy and Matsu, despite their proximity to the Chinese mainland, the State Department has had the contrary viewpoint, and this question was not solved. The line at which we would resist the Chinese Reds was left fuzzy.