

The Big Bull That Lives In Moscow

HISTORY may record some day that while the Big Four sparkled on the summit the really crazy crack in the Iron Curtain developed in the corn fields of Iowa.

That is where a delegation of Soviet farm leaders being plucked into the main stream of American life, while a U.S. group travels through the bread-basket of Russia.

Communists that they are, the Russians cannot emerge from their dunking in American farm culture without a fundamental suspicion that the largest bull in the world resides in the Moscow prairie-ganga factories that have portrayed American farmers as poor, starving peasants ground under the heel of greedy capitalists.

A Question About The Turncoats

ARE the three American turncoats in or out of the U.S. Army?

The Army would do itself and the public a service if it would make up its mind on that point and explain the reasoning behind its decision.

After the soldiers chose to go home with their Chinese captors rather than return to the U.S. following the Korean armistice, the Army discharged them dishonorably. Now that the trio is returning to this country, the Army says it will arrest them the moment their boat docks and then court martial them.

The bothersome question is not the punishment the turncoats richly deserve, but the procedure the Army seems to be twisting about in a mood of indecisiveness. If by dishonorable discharge the Army separated itself from these men, how can it now try them under military law?

Eloquence From The City Hall

TO ALL men who address their wisdom to the public comes an occasion an overwhelming urge to embrace the muse.

The occasion came to City Manager Henry Yancey yesterday and it must be said that he hugged his inspiration lustily.

Witness these phrases in his comment on drainage problems, a subject commonly couched in the most pedestrian of prose:

Water is a common enemy... When rain falls it falls on everyone, the just and the unjust alike... Nature determines that water should run to the lowest point and it is not the duty of the city to attempt to steer it otherwise... It is the duty of every person to get rid of it as best he can, and not dam it up so it backs up on the man above him.

From The Richmond Times-Dispatch

NAMING THE BABY? TRY THESE

THE CURRENT Virginia Health Department BULLETIN, devoted to a discussion of birth certificates, mentions in passing some of the unusual names on record in the Bureau of Vital Statistics.

There are, for example, Cranberry Turkey, Celestial Delight, Arie Zion, Fird Nab, Rollen Stone, Gasher Pickle, Early Arrival and Alpha Omega.

That list doesn't top one compiled by the Alabama Bureau of Vital Statistics a few years ago. Down there they have folk sporting such monikers as Strawberry Comrade Conring, Hard Times Smith, Piece o' Cake Johnson, Laxative Jones and Semi-Colon Divinity Duke.

Not to be outdone, a University of North Carolina professor did some research which produced Tr Heels bearing such handles as I Shall Rise and Go to My Father Smith, and Seven Times Shall Thou Waik Around Jericha Brown (called Thoo for short).

Whether owners of the above names are happy about the whole thing isn't known, but by the law of averages, at least some of them with Ma and Pa had used some judgment. Surveys reportedly show that more than a third of all the people wish they were called something

Sen. Kefauver Scores Again

By DORIS FLEESON

WASHINGTON
THE QUESTION of Sen. Kefauver's presidential possibilities—a matter many of his colleagues would prefer to ignore as would Adlai Stevenson—will soon come to the fore again.

Within past months Kefauver as chairman of a Judiciary subcommittee has conducted hearings in New York, Los Angeles and Chicago on a wide range of morality topics, including pornographic comic books, lewd photographs, increased violence in TV showings and suggestive advertising of motion pictures. Little noted here is the hearings attracted packed crowds and excellent coverage, including local TV.

Funds for the subcommittee are practically exhausted so the time is at hand when Kefauver must ask the Senate for more. What- ever is then done or said publicly, the cloakrooms will most certainly have much to say about the motives of the senator from Tennessee.

SURPRISE PARTY

The politicians, perhaps led by the press, will be inclined to pass off these morality hearings as an attempt by Kefauver to keep his name before the public. He will be more anxious of trying to repeat his 1952 success with the crime hearings.

It may surprise the cynical sophisticates of this capital to learn that there is actually a tremendous amount of interest in the subjects being covered by the Kefauver subcommittee. Parents, the clergy and educational elements of it are following them in numbers unsuspected here, where the term social program has all but reverted to meaning an evening of beer and soda.

Whether or not Kefauver's motives are suspect, there is reason to believe that many mothers and fathers are worried about the problems before-mentioned that they are abt-Diton-Yates or Turner.

The moral forces now behind Kefauver are largely unseen in Washington but are equally important in this country and have ways of making themselves felt.

'Maybe We Could Speak To Him Some Other Time'

Riots Are Not For Amateurs

By ROBERT C. RAARK

BARCELONA
YOU CAN tell when you are getting old by a lot of things you don't do. When the riots started in Casablanca, the first inclination was to climb on the horse and go help the rioters riot.

I remember well one weekend in Casablanca. This would be about 1947. When all the French officials went off to play golf over the weekend and thoughtfully left that says to the casern's army on the desk. The Senegalese troops slipped into the gun racks and turned the place into a bloody shambles. There were no officials around to be reached for comment at the time. They were, like I said, down in Marrakech or Fez playing golf. But since the Senegalese does not admire the Arab, I reckon a couple hundred died that weekend.

BASIC RESTALITY

Basic are the premiss of all the violence. Because all the wrong people get killed or stomped. And the basic restality of man gets loose from the cage and just runs mad.

Windows are broken and cows overturned and around empires awake so that you kick in the door of a neighbor who is innocent of anything but your own personal dislike. Fires are set and furniture broken to bits.

The thing about riots is that the innocent bystander is always the one who gets the bullet or the wallop on the head—either it is a war riot or a strike riot or a political riot or any other kind of riot.

Having had a bit of Mau Mau as well, recently, I think instead of visiting the riots in Casablanca I will stay home and try a bull-fight. I know it's barbarous, but it can't hold a candle to the way people act against each other.



HERB LUCE
DRAUGHTSMAN: JAMES M. POTTS

Risks Vs. Rights

Are J. S. Security Problems Finally 'Out Of Politics'?

By CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

WASHINGTON
RELAXATION of East-West tensions at Geneva is fully matched by easing of Democratic-Republican antagonism in the security field.

Proof lies in the strong bipartisan support given to creation of an impartial Commission on Government Security, charged with reviewing the entire fabric of internal security and recommending basic changes.

Senate and House conferees July 25 ironed out a difference on the design for the commission's final report, recommended Dec. 31, 1956.

IKE WILL OKAY BILL

President Eisenhower has said he has "no objection" to the commission and is expected to sign the bill.

This is not to say that Democrats and Republicans see eye-to-eye on all or even most of the details of the internal security problem. Democrats still smart from the charge of "20 years of treason," while Republicans still defend the Eisenhower administration's actions and programs in the security field.

But in backing the commission approach, both sides acknowledge a desire to take the security problem out of politics. Both are impressed by the enormous difficulties of balancing the nation's legitimate security interests against the protection of personal liberties—a task which "calls for the wisdom of Solomon and the patience of Job."

MANY LAWS, PROGRAMS

President Eisenhower's commission on Government Security can come up with an answer as soon as it likes. It will at least have the time which Congress does—two to study and analyze the bewildering array of statutes, executive orders and departmental directives which govern internal security.

Involved are varying and sometimes conflicting programs for the physical protection of national defense secrets and installations, the control of classified information, the screening of immigrants

and merchant seamen, the security clearance of more than two million Federal employees and many thousands of annual job applicants, and the similar clearance of as many or more employees of companies engaged in defense work.

IMPROVEMENT SOUGHT

One job which the commission may undertake is codification of the several internal security laws. Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey, D-Minn., one of the sponsors of the commission approach, says much of the security controversy can be traced to a "series of uncoordinated congressional enactments and executive orders and regulations. His contents much can be done to improve the system's efficiency while at the same time reducing its cost.

Chief problem in the minds of most commission proponents, however, concerns alleged abuses of individual rights, rather than the need for tightening security or cutting costs. Here the commission will face its toughest job.

Critics of the loyalty program initiated in 1947 by President Truman and the security program set up to replace it in 1953 by President Eisenhower claim both have involved denial of basic constitutional guarantees. Chief of these are the "due process" clause of the Fifth Amendment, and the right to confrontation of witnesses set forth in the Sixth Amendment.

Most defenders of the current security program argue the point in terms of expediency. Says Assistant Attorney General William F. Tompkins: "It would be desirable if all traditional privileges could be allowed but as against doing so there is the possibility of jeopardizing the FBI investigatory system. It is inevitable that any security program will result in some decisions on which all of us could not agree, but that does not mean that the program itself is not a good one."

Although critics say questionable decisions are not "inevitable" changes in the system proposed so far while extending greater protection to persons charged with being "security risks" would not resolve the basic conflict between the security program as such, and constitutional rights. Truman Arnold, one-time judge and outspoken critic of the security program, would prefer to see the entire setup junked rather than give "the appearance of a trial without its substance.

Congress hopes an impartial commission can come up with an answer. As with the first Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, its 12 members will be selected equally from the ranks of Democrats and Republicans. This rule was not followed in setting up the second Hoover Commission, which may help to explain the fact that the latter did not endorse its own report. The first force recommended that "an official inquiry into the appraisal of the government's personnel security program should be undertaken without delay."

PERSONAL CONCERN

Initial security matters of personal concern for several million Federal employees and defense workers, whose lives have been affected by the law and other government actions.

But for most Americans, the security matter is of a more general—less understood—in terms of a few sensational cases of individuals caught in the machine, whose rights and some innocently.

PUBLIC CASE

Latest case to come before the public is that of William Henry Taylor, an International Monetary Fund official who was recently declared a "security risk" by the government's International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board. Taylor has denied allegations by Elizabeth Bentley that he was a member of a Communist spy ring while the U.S. State Department during the war, and has challenged her to submit to cross-examination.

Taylor's attorney, ex-Rep. Byron N. Scott (D-Calif., 1953-59), wants to test constitutionality of the loyalty board procedure. Whatever the merits of the Taylor case, it highlights the leading question posed by the employee security program: Does a finding that an individual is a "security risk" often on the basis of testimony by unidentified witnesses constitute a denial of the right to trial by the process of law?

AN OLD QUESTION

The question is not a new one. It dates back to 1947 when President Truman, by executive order, established a loyalty program designed to remove from government employment any person about whose loyalty there was "reasonable doubt." Although the Truman program was designed to place the burden of proof on the government, procedures were widely criticized as denials of due process.

of individual rights, rather than the need for tightening security or cutting costs. Here the commission will face its toughest job.

BASIC CONFLICT

Although critics say questionable decisions are not "inevitable" changes in the system proposed so far while extending greater protection to persons charged with being "security risks" would not resolve the basic conflict between the security program as such, and constitutional rights. Truman Arnold, one-time judge and outspoken critic of the security program, would prefer to see the entire setup junked rather than give "the appearance of a trial without its substance.

Congress hopes an impartial commission can come up with an answer. As with the first Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, its 12 members will be selected equally from the ranks of Democrats and Republicans. This rule was not

followed in setting up the second Hoover Commission, which may help to explain the fact that the latter did not endorse its own report. The first force recommended that "an official inquiry into the appraisal of the government's personnel security program should be undertaken without delay."

PERSONAL CONCERN

Initial security matters of personal concern for several million Federal employees and defense workers, whose lives have been affected by the law and other government actions.

But for most Americans, the security matter is of a more general—less understood—in terms of a few sensational cases of individuals caught in the machine, whose rights and some innocently.

PUBLIC CASE

Latest case to come before the public is that of William Henry Taylor, an International Monetary Fund official who was recently declared a "security risk" by the government's International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board. Taylor has denied allegations by Elizabeth Bentley that he was a member of a Communist spy ring while the U.S. State Department during the war, and has challenged her to submit to cross-examination.

Taylor's attorney, ex-Rep. Byron N. Scott (D-Calif., 1953-59), wants to test constitutionality of the loyalty board procedure. Whatever the merits of the Taylor case, it highlights the leading question posed by the employee security program: Does a finding that an individual is a "security risk" often on the basis of testimony by unidentified witnesses constitute a denial of the right to trial by the process of law?

AN OLD QUESTION

The question is not a new one. It dates back to 1947 when President Truman, by executive order, established a loyalty program designed to remove from government employment any person about whose loyalty there was "reasonable doubt." Although the Truman program was designed to place the burden of proof on the government, procedures were widely criticized as denials of due process.



WILBER M. BRUCKER THURMAN ARNOLD HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
The Wisdom Of Solomon And The Patience Of Job

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

THE time is approaching when Congress will take a penetrating look at the flimsy foundation on which built our so-called defense of Europe. If a congressional committee should probe a little deeper than stops-out tours along the Rue de Rivoli, lunch at the Ritz and an evening at the Casino de Paris it will find a condition of no-alum and fair-weather friendships that would persuade some congressmen we should pull the plug on the whole thing.

This alarming statement is not written by one who believes in isolation, but rather one who holds the cultural, economic and friendship ties with Europe should never be severed. Defense, however, is something else again and business with a rusty revolver in the hands of a night watchman who sleeps most of the time and who couldn't hear to pull the trigger if he did find someone robbing the place.

Pessimistic Picture?
It seems like a pessimistic picture. However, here is a factual report on

Europe's NATO Defenses Flimsy

what the U.S. faces in regard to the defense of Europe. NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is a praiseworthy but none too successful attempt to make nations work together. Some main military sparks is Gen. Gruenther—brilliant, indefatigable commander of NATO's military organization. Gruenther has labored valiantly to whip together in fact an organization which two years ago existed only on paper. He has increased NATO bases from almost zero to 140. He has built miles of pipeline to bring oil and gas to these bases and he has materially improved the good and bad cooperation know-how of the 14 NATO nations.

Eisenhower himself would be the first to say General Gruenther has done a better job than did Ike.

However, when you probe beneath the surface of NATO's defenses here is what you find.

—Most of the 140 bases are American, paid for by the U.S. and manned by American troops.

2-The French, who were supposed to supply the backbone of NATO's manpower, have fizzled. Two French divisions which had been equipped by the U.S.A. were suddenly pulled out of NATO without a word to Gruenther and sent to North Africa—American equipment and all. Two additional divisions supposed to be mobilized by the French still aren't. That's four divisions minus.

Open Door Policy

3-The Norwegians are building NATO bases to protect them from Russian attack—and they need protection, for one thing. They have the "cultural" and "defensible" territory, but they are not. They need modern bases in Norway for Russian use later.

4-Modernization of the French army has been postponed indefinitely. Minister of Defense Koenig estimates that the French army cannot get modern equipment before 1965, by which time much

of the "modern" equipment to be ordered would be out of date. The French military budget has not even been voted for 1955-56.

5-Marshal Tito, with one of the newest armies in Europe, has gone neutral. He has vacillated between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., not after the Kremlin leaders came to Belgrade. It was after they heard he had gone neutral that they were encouraged to come. The Turks rushed to Belgrade to urge Tito to go for the U.S. Turkey and Yugoslavia were encouraged to come. The U.S. rushed to Belgrade to urge Tito to go for the U.S. Turkey and Yugoslavia were encouraged to come. The U.S. rushed to Belgrade to urge Tito to go for the U.S. Turkey and Yugoslavia were encouraged to come.

6—Neutrality is strong in Germany, the country we are depending on to hold the Western European defenses. A recent civil-dense test of German defenses showing that as in the United States, Germany was wide open to hydrogen warfare, brought forth a panic of neutralist press. German leaders wrung their hands over rearming Germany, claimed that the American weapons to be used by the new German army were obsolete.