THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON.....Publisher
J. E. DOWD.....General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH.....Executive Editor

TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1955

Stevenson States The Case For Unity

IN AN HOUR of gathering doubt and confusion about Far Eastern policy, the words of Adlai Stevenson last night had the ring of common sense.

U. S. war talk has indeed alarmed this nation's friends more than it has deterred its enemies.

There is suddenly the real danger of a division in the free world coalition.

This weakening of the grand alliance pledged to defend itself is, as Mr. Stevenson said, a greater peril to enduring peace than a few disputed islands off the China coast.

The United States has been pursuing virtually a lone-hand policy in the Formosa crisis.

It is a role that has left America's allies frightened and, at times, bewildered.

Carried to extremes it would leave Uncle Sam with only such support as would come from Chiang Kai-shek's aging and unreliable army. In addition, it would cost America the respect and good will of millions of Asians.

The entire free world has a stake in the outcome of the Formosa Crisis.

This is a time for collective action and resolve.

It is a time to awaken to the fact that a breach in the ranks is just what the Red bloc wants.

It is also a time for Americans to realize that the unity of allies and the friendship of the people of the free world are more important than the fate of two island rockpiles in the shadow of the Chinese mainland.

A New Victim Of Political Vigilantism

THE State Department's dignity—already battered and bruised—has taken another buffeting.

Its handling of the Edward J. Corsi case was cowardly.

By ousting a veteran public servant from his job as deputy refugee relief administrator on the basis of unsubstantiated charges, the department yielded to political vigilantism of the worst sort.

In insisting that security is not the issue and offering Mr. Corsi a "less sensitive" job, it did not right the wrong.

The Corsi career has been interesting. He was a loyal enough Republican to hold the job of industrial commissioner of the state of New York under Thomas E. Dewey. His first public office of note was as federal commissioner of immigration in New York, a job to which he was appointed by Herbert Hoover. He ran for the Senate on the GOP ticket in 1938.

John Foster Dulles, in naming Mr. Corsi a special assistant to the secretary of state some months back, referred to him as "my dear friend." Secretary Dulles noted also that, for the job, Mr. Corsi was "the best qualified man in the United States."

But Mr. Corsi had dared to criticize the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952. So he immediately incurred the bitter enmity of Rep. Francis Walter (D-Pa.), who seems to regard any criticism of the immigration law as Soviet-inspired subversion. It was Mr. Walter who was hurling the wild, substantiated charges at Mr. Corsi, an Italian immigrant. Mr. Corsi promptly denied that there was anything to support the charges.

The target of Rep. Walter's abuse may or may not have joined organizations in the dim and distant past that are now frowned upon by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. But there is today no reasonable doubt as to Mr. Corsi's loyalty to the United States. Preliminary security investigations gave him a clean bill of health.

Yet Mr. Dulles, rather than stand up for his personal appointee, capitulated.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time it has happened.

The U. S. State Department has a long record of pulling the rug out from under faithful employes. Just a few months ago, it was John Patton Davies who had to go.

Since the end of World War II, it has not taken very much to brand a man as "dangerous" or a subversive. Sen. Mundt opposed the appointment of Harvard University President James B. Conant for high commissioner of Germany on the grounds that Dr. Conant was "too bookish a sort of fellow." Evidence was introduced tending to show that the defendant—or rather, the appointee—was indeed literate, and worse, had written a book.

Earlier, there was the spectacle of Sen. McKeller smearing David Lillienthal with a "Red taint" because his parents came from Czechoslovakia, now a Soviet satellite.

We thought that this sort of nonsense was beginning to fade out of the American scene. Apparently not.

"I never came down here asking for any job," said Mr. Corsi when the ax fell. "Mr. Dulles, in a personal telegram, requested me to take on the work. I came here solely relying on the integrity and honesty of Mr. Dulles."

Is it any wonder that President Eisenhower is finding it difficult to get first class citizens to serve in his administration?

New Sounds: Strange To Your Ears?

"WHAT has happened to U. S. popular music?" wailed the longhair critic. "The crazy, mixed-up kids who perform it don't even stick to conventional instruments anymore."

He was referring to the Sauter-Finegan orchestra, an organization which jangles bells, hammers on Chinese gongs, toots recorders and employs an occasional kazoo to produce the necessary sounds for THE DOODLETOWN FIFERS, MIDNIGHT SLEIGHRIDE and other lively tunes.

We hate to point, but what about music's serious side? The funny instrument fad is not confined to the crewcut faction. To the blare of nationwide publicity, a Charles Ives symphonic work received its radio premiere last year. Its main appeal was the fact that the score called for two jew's harps.

It was Leopold Stokowski who decided to conduct this little item and sent orchestra managers on a nationwide search for jew's harp players.

A few years earlier, Mr. Stokowski got it into his head that he wanted to have a try at Lou Harrison's CANTICLE NO. 3. This upset orchestra managers even more than the jew's harps. They had to comb through automobile junk yards for 18 brake drums to use as percussion instruments. The score called for them.

George Anthiel's BALLET MECANIQUE requires a real airplane engine. But, in a recent New York performance, a recording of a jet plane's roar was substituted.

Some compositions by Villa Lobos, the Brazilian composer, call for "small animal cries."

Sheep bleats and a miniature hurricane are needed for DON QUIXOTE by Richard Strauss.

One of Maurice Ravel's two DAPHNIS AND CHLOE suites employs a wind machine.

Whistles are used in some of Darius Milhaud's music.

George Gershwin's AN AMERICAN IN PARIS requires four taxi horns—tuned to a, b, c and d.

The strange sounds aren't confined to modern music either. One obscure Havdn symphony includes a hurdy-gurdy (not to be confused with an organ grinder). Some Beethoven and Mozart music calls for a glass harmonica—a rack of water-filled goblets played by caressing the rims with the fingers.

Funny instruments? Look who's talking. Today's Doodletown fifers are merely following in the masters' footsteps.

From The Richmond News Leader

THIS PROMOTION WILL SELL SPUDS

VERY SOON now, we see by the WALL STREET JOURNAL, the potato growers will be upon us. In 30 large cities, full-color billboards will proclaim the glories of the lowly spud. In other areas, a singing commercial will inform the televiewer that "Whitey," the California long white potato, takes a shower before going to market. Idaho growers alone are putting up $180,000 for sales promotion this spring, and the National Potato Council has appropriated a special fund of $50,000 to push the potato along.

The idea of all this, obviously, is to cause more people to eat more potatoes. There was a time, back in 1900, when that statistical nonentity, the Average American, ate 180 pounds of potatoes a year. Last year per capita consumption amounted to 104 pounds; and while this represents a little gain from the year before, the growers understandably feel that life can be made more beautiful yet.

But the one thing that fetches us in the prospective hoop-la and promotion is not the billboard or even the singing commercial. Who cares if Whitey takes a shower? It is the prospect that nutritionists will declare that "potatoes contain no more calories than an apple."

Now that is the sort of potato promotion that ought to sell spuds! There comes a time when many of us glumly pass up potato cakes and sadly turn our eyes from a mound of mashed potatoes with a lovely capping of brown gravy. "*Starch*," says a nagging inner voice, and "*calories*," says another.

If this campaign materializes, all that will be changed. "See," we can snap back at the inner voices, "a *nutritionist* says no more calories than an apple!" Also, if more argument is needed, and it would amaze you how these inner voices can argue back, we shortly will have testimony that *two potatoes contain as much vitamin C as an orange*. So there! You want we should have rickets, huh?

Make it French fries, ma'am. Double order.

Dirksen And Reed Want Limit On U. S. Income Tax

First In A Series

By WILLIAM P. HELM

WASHINGTON

CONGRESS will open an inquiry next month on a plan to limit Uncle Sam's income tax to 25 per cent in peacetime.

At present there is no limit. The tax on an individual's net income starts at 20 per cent and is scaled up to 91 per cent; on corporate net income the maximum is 52 per cent.

The Sixteenth Amendment to the constitution, ratified in 1913, permits Congress to tax incomes at whatever rates it pleases. It could demand 100 per cent of any income. Ten years ago during a two-year transition to pay-as-you-go taxation the tax on a few very large individual incomes actually exceeded 100 per cent.

BEFORE BOTH HOUSES

Repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment and adoption of a substitute limiting federal income taxes to 25 per cent are sought by advocates of the change. The proposal is pending in measures now before House and Senate. In the former, Congressman Chauncey Reed of Illinois is among chief sponsors; in the latter, Senator Everett Dirksen of the same state.

SEN. EVERETT DIRKSEN
'An Unbearable Burden . . .

Those members and others are calling on Congress to submit the plan to the 48 states for consideration. Hearings next month are to be held by a House judiciary subcommittee which will report its findings to the full committee of which Congressman Emanuel Celler of New York is chairman. The full committee then will decide whether it will recommend to Congress that the proposed amendment be submitted to the states for ratification.

AMENDMENT PROCESS

To submit the amendment, a two-thirds vote of both houses is necessary. Whether the limit is to be adopted then would be up to the states for decision. They would have seven years in which to act. Three-fourths of the states would have to approve to put the new provision in the constitution.

Thus it is not up to Congress to decide the issue. The only question Congress would answer in the coming proceedings is whether the proposal should be submitted to the states. The latter would make the decision.

PERTINENT PARTS

The proposed amendment makes provision for higher income tax rates in times of emergency and gives Congress the right, under certain conditions, to impose them. Here is the pertinent portion of the text of the Reed-Dirksen amendment:

REP. CHAUNCEY REED
. . . On Our People'

"The maximum top rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all top rates) of all taxes, duties and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to or measured by income shall not exceed 25 percentum;

"Provided, however, that the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all members of each House may fix such a maximum top rate in excess of 25 percentum for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding one year each, if such rate so fixed does not exceed the lower rate . . . by more than 15 percentage points. . . .

BACK TO THE STATES

"Congress shall have no power to lay or collect any tax, duty or excise with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of . . . death, or by way of gift."

Effect of the last-named proposal would be to return to the states exclusive power to tax inheritances, estates and gifts.

Outspoken design of those advocating the substitute amendment is to compel Congress, through denial of vast tax collections, to lower federal peacetime spendings. If Congress can't raise the money by taxes, it will have to spend less — such is the argument.

ALARMING CLIMB

Congressman Reed voiced it in the 83rd Congress when he introduced an identical measure upon which no action was taken. He then was chairman of the judiciary committee, now is ranking minority member. He said:

"For the past 20 years taxes have been increasing at an alarming rate until they have reached a point where they constitute a well-nigh unbearable burden on our people and a serious threat to our economy. There is imperative need of a reduction all along the line.

'HUGE WASTE'

"Between April 30, 1945, and June 30, 1952 — a period of seven years of which almost five years were peacetime years — the federal government collected $323 billion in taxes which is $75 billion more than the $248 billion collected during the entire previous life of the republic beginning with 1789.

"At the same time the expenditures of the federal government have been appalling, and there have been huge waste and extravagance. In five peacetime years, from July 1, 1945 to July 1, 1950, which has five days after the beginning of the Korean war, the federal government spent $214 billion, an amount greater by $34 billion than the total amount spent during the 152 years from the beginning of the republic in 1789 to July 1, 1941.

NEXT STEP: SOCIALISM?

"In 1931 the cost of the federal government was $50 for each man, woman and child. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, it was over $300. It has since been increasing steadily."

The condition, he continued, calls for correction; upon its solution, he added, will depend whether "We are to have in this country private enterprise . . . or socialism."

There are those who oppose the plan and dispute Mr. Reed's views, and their objections will be outlined in a succeeding installment.

'But My Friend Mr. Dulles Was Right Behind Me'

China's Chou Will Smoke Peace Pipe At Conference

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

AGAINST THE background of talk by Americans of imminent war and the use of nuclear weapons, Communist China's Foreign Minister Chou En-lai intends to spring a peace offensive at the forthcoming African-Asian conference in Indonesia. This report, current here, is taken seriously by those who fear a Communist propaganda coup at the conference to be held in the resort center of Bandung.

Chou will unfold a plan for peaceful coexistence of Communist and non-Communist nations in Asia. He will charge that the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, initiated by Secretary of State Dulles, is merely an American device to embroil Asian peoples in a war for American interests. While three of the Asian powers to be represented at Bandung — Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines — are members of SEATO, the big, populous powers have stayed out of this defensive alliance.

NEHRU'S STAND

The effect of Chou's appeal on such leaders as Prime Minister Nehru of India cannot be discounted. In a recent speech in the Indian parliament Nehru denounced war and declared that his country would never take sides in an armed conflict even if every other nation was involved. The Indian Prime Minister strongly intimated that America was pursuing a warlike course in Asia.

Burma and Indonesia, both uncommitted in the East-West power struggle, also would be susceptible to an appeal for peaceful coexistence. These countries have grave internal difficulties as they struggle to achieve independent statehood and economic stability. They fear that the upheaval of another war would destroy the progress they have made thus far and open the way either to some form of totalitarianism or to chaos and ruin.

According to reports here, Chou En-lai will couple his appeal for peace with a denunciation of the United States for threatening to intervene to protect Nationalist Chinese garrisons on the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

But far from planning an attack to coincide with the beginning of the Bandung conference, as has been widely reported, Red China's Foreign Minister will talk peace and mutual prosperity on an Asia-For-Asians basis.

PAPER TIGER

There is more than a possibility, however, that a warlike faction in the little group now ruling China under an ever-narrowing despotism could upset these plans. The belief is growing that there are those in Mao Tse-tung's government fanatical enough in their anti-Western, anti-American hatred to risk war by launching an attack in the Formosa Strait. They would thereby hope to prove the often-repeated charge that the United States is, in fact, a paper tiger.

Communist propaganda also will stress the threat of nuclear tests, with special emphasis on the hydrogen bomb explosions at America's proving grounds in the Pacific atolls. Some pressure had been generated here for American initiation of a move to have a United Nations commission pass on the question of the possible danger of radioactive material in the atmosphere as a result of atomic explosions. Such a move prior to the Bandung conference might forestall Communist propaganda about American tests. But so far as can be learned, no such move is in the offing nor are any steps contemplated to offset other possible repercussions of the African-Asian meeting.

The plain truth is that the drift of events in the Orient has in recent months greatly jeopardized the hopes of the West to gain the support of still-uncommitted peoples. The deterioration in Japan is so rapid that some plan for joint action must be put forward in the immediate future if there is not to be an upheaval with disastrous consequences for America.

People's Platform

The Battle For All Of Organized Labor

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

I am writing you, as just an average citizen of this city, who takes a great deal of interest in the current CWA-Southern Bell dispute.

The way it looks to me, the gallant fight the striking telephone workers are waging is not just for themselves, but for organized labor everywhere in the South. If they lose their fight for full arbitration rights, and settle for the company's "no-strike clause," it is my firm belief that it will tend to set the pattern for any future labor-management disputes, whether it be communications or textiles or what have you.

For too many years, the working people of the South have sat back and let "Big Business" run things their own way. It is a known fact that living costs are as high and higher; wages are lower; and number of working hours are longer, here in the South, than in any other equal-sized section of this country.

Is it any wonder, then, that the rest of the country fails to respect us, or to recognize the vast potentialities and capabilities of our great Southland? And is it any wonder, too, that they think of us as "illiterate, bare-foot, patched-pants" weaklings?

If the working people don't stand up and fight for their own rights, how do they ever expect to be anything but the virtual slaves to "Big Business" that they are today? God willing, I sincerely hope the telephone workers win this fight, for it will let organized labor get "its foot in the door" so far "Big Business" will never again be able to slam it shut in the faces of the working people of the South!

—MRS. R. H. YOUNG

College Situation Handicaps Youth

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

MY SINCERE thanks for your editorial, "Crisis In Education," which appeared in the April 5 issue.

You are to be commended for your knowledge, and understanding of the college problem we have here in Charlotte and the Piedmont area.

Our unsolved local situation not only handicaps the young men but places an unnecessary burden on the North Carolina taxpayer when he is asked to pay for dormitories at distant places.

—W. A. KENNEDY
Member, Charlotte College Advisory Board; Chairman, Chamber of Commerce College Improvement Committee.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Times Have Changed Since FDR Passed

WASHINGTON

A LOT of things have happened since that day ten years ago when FDR passed away. It was an April day, full of hope and sunshine. A great war was about to be won. Everyone could feel it. Peace was just around the corner. The big things he had fought for were almost within reach . . . and then his body came home—came back on a flag draped caisson from Georgia, came slowly down Pennsylvania Avenue up which he had driven four times to take the oath as President . . . The town seemed empty after that. And a little numb. Actually, FDR hadn't been around much that winter. He was in Warm Springs after his election, in Hyde Park for Christmas, then to Yalta, then back to Hyde Park, then to Warm Springs again —then back to Washington to lie in the east room of the White House—silent and alone . . . But even though he had been away, people always felt that he was here, that he had his hands on things, and so the town was empty. Even the guards around the public buildings, the folks who sit on park benches, the elevator operators, the taxi drivers, seemed a little lost. For Roosevelt was their President. They felt he was working for them. And they knew they had lost a friend.

The little man who took his place, a humble man, was in Sam Rayburn's office late in the afternoon when he got a phone call to come to the White House immediately. White-faced and grim, he left. He knew what the call meant . . . At the White House later Harry Truman took the oath of office as President of the United States. The Cabinet stood by shocked and shaken. Miss Perkins, who had known FDR since their early reform days in Albany, broke down and wept. Henry L. Stimson, a Republican who had served in three Cabinets and who once had battled against young FDR in New York state, also wept—unabashed . . . He had opposed Roosevelt on domestic issues, served in his Cabinet on international issues . . . Henry Morgenthau looked ten years older . . . The new President, shaken, nervous, finally went home to his apartment, suddenly discovered he was hungry . . . The icebox was empty, so a neighbor brought in roast beef and ice cream. Thus, after 12 years under one President, a new administration began to function.

The funeral train that carried FDR to Hyde Park was crowded with Cabinet members and old friends. They stayed awake most of the night. Outside as the train passed were bonfires, people standing, waiting to pay homage to the last visible remains of their dead leader. All night through Philadelphia, Trenton, Newark, New York, people stood along the tracks . . . At Hyde Park the Cabinet and the Supreme Court stood on one side of the rose garden, opposite the grave. The new President stood on the other side. With him were Mike Riley of the Secret Service, Mrs. Truman—and Jimmy Byrnes. Jimmy, who had left Washington, supposedly for good, just two weeks before, had hastily flown back to board the funeral train . . . Taps were blown. A West Point cadet handed Mrs. Roosevelt the flag which had been draped over her husband's bier. She bore up well . . . The dead President was lowered into his grave.

That night as the special train rolled back to Washington, Harry Truman spent most of his time with three men—Jimmy Byrnes, Ed Pauley, George Allen. Of these, only Pauley, the California oil man, continues close to him. Byrnes, whom Truman appointed to the highest Cabinet post, has fought him bitterly, tried to carry South Carolina for Eisenhower . . . George Allen, who was given high honor by Truman and a lush job in the RFC, is now Eisenhower's partner in the farm at Gettysburg and in a Howard Johnson restaurant.

Churchill Erred At Yalta

So times have changed. The man who succeeded Roosevelt is now out of office, the man whom Roosevelt made commanding general in Europe is in office; and when the Yalta records were released, few people whom he had befriended, few he promoted to high office, rose to defend his good name . . . In contrast, Winston Churchill, who was equally, perhaps more to blame for the mistakes at Yalta, retired last week in a blaze of glory. He lived to defend himself . . . Some years ago, before he came back as prime minister, Churchill confided to a friend that he wished he had passed on as Roosevelt did at the height of victory, at the glorious climax of the war . . . However, he lived to enjoy other glories, lived to defend himself, and I for one am glad he did . . . No one attacked Churchill for the mistakes he made at Yalta. They attacked the dead man who could not defend himself.