THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1952

THE FAIR DEAL—A DOUBLE MYTH

SEVERAL days ago we sought to show, by a percentage breakdown of Federal budget figures, that the current heavy burden of taxes is due to the "military state" rather than the "welfare state".

Today we advance another thesis: that the Fair Deal is a double myth, used on the one hand by President Truman to curry favor with certain groups of voters, and used on the other hand by the enemies of Mr. Truman to drum up support from other groups of voters.

If one tunes his ear to the hue and cry of the current political hubbub, he comes to believe that this terrible thing known as the Fair Deal is already upon us, that somehow it must be rooted out and destroyed. Well, let's see.

The Fair Deal has never been adequately defined, to our satisfaction, at least. To many people, it means "socialized" medicine, the Brannan Plan, and Civil Rights. Actually, the Fair Deal covers more territory than that, though Mr. Truman himself probably doesn't know exactly how much more.

If we omit some proposals that should be included, or if we include some that should be omitted, it is because the Fair Deal is such a vague entity. Nonetheless, here goes:

Agriculture: mandatory price supports for major commodities; system of production payments (Brannan Plan); strengthen regulation of commodity exchanges.

Education & Welfare: expand coverage and benefits of unemployment insurance, compulsory health insurance; Federal aid for medical training; aid to education; scholarships for higher education; aid to co-operative and nonprofit housing; aid to prefabricated housing; establish a Federal Department of Welfare.

Labor: repeal Taft-Hartley Act; create labor extension service; authorize grants to states for industrial safety.

Miscellaneous & Administrative: antipoll tax law; antilynching law; Fair Employment Practices Commission.

Taxes & Economic Policy: extend authority of Federal Reserve Board; St. Lawrence Seaway; Columbia Valley Administration.

All of those measures were requested by President Truman in his state of the union, economic, and budget messages of 1950—the last year before the Korean War put a crimp in his hopes for a Fair Deal.

But the interesting fact is that not a one of the proposals listed here was adopted by Congress in 1950! Nor have any of them been adopted by the 82nd Congress in 1951 or 1952!

The threat, if you choose to call it that, still remains. Mr. Truman will undoubtedly pretend to push his Fair Deal so long as he is in office. But the hard truth of the matter is that a coalition of Southern Democrats and conservative Republicans has successfully blocked the Fair Deal, and will continue to do so in the foreseeable future.

BRANNAN AND HOOVER SHOULD BURY AX

THE running feud between Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan and former President Herbert Hoover is speeding up.

This feud may have had its genesis back in the 1930's when Mr. Brannan, as a rising young Department of Agriculture official, worked at improving the lot of penniless farmers out West, many of whom attributed their poverty to policies of the Hoover Administration.

Mr. Hoover became an elder statesman, Mr. Brannan a Cabinet member. Then Mr. Hoover was named head of a bipartisan commission charged with recommending reorganization of, among other things, the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Brannan didn't agree with all the recommended changes. His stand was criticized by the Citizens Committee which was set up to push enactment of these recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

About ten days ago Mr. Brannan lashed out at some of the statements of the Citizens Committee.

A week ago Mr. Hoover berated the "sickening conduct" of some Government officials.

Night before last Mr. Brannan awakened the ghost of the Teapot Dome, and said that this man who "now casts doubt on the moral fiber of public employees" is "the same Herbert Hoover who sat in the Cabinet of Warren Harding along with Albert Hall and Harry Daugherty and didn't utter a word".

Now boys, boys—especially you Charles—let's sit down and talk this over quiet like.

In the first place Mr. Hoover didn't even mention the Department of Agriculture in his speech last week. He was talking about general Federal personnel policies, which qualify for criticism.

Secondly, Mr. Brannan would probably not deem it kosher if, about 25 years from now, someone gets up and condemns him for serving with some present and recent Cabinet members against whom he hasn't spoken.

Mr. Brannan, like most Government executives, is understandably sensitive to criticism of Government employees. And it should be doing some reorganizing in his Department, although not along the lines recommended by the Hoover Commission.

For instance, in many counties throughout the country various Agriculture offices are being brought under one roof, instead of being spread around town. The Hoover Commission wants things changed around so a farmer can get most of his information at one particular office. Maybe that would be better than Brannan's solution, but most farmers who have been trotting all over town, from PMA to SCS to REA, will be pleased with the "one roof" policy.

Secondly, some farm men have raised what seems to be a valid objection to the Hoover Commission recommendation that one county board of farmers advise Department men on policy regarding the several Agriculture agencies in the locality. These objectors feel the present system, under which various Department agencies have their own advisory boards, enable farmers to learn adequately one type of work in which their interests lie. If they had to advise on the activities of all Department of Agriculture activity in their locality, they feel, they would have to quit farming and become "professional advisers" in order to do a good job.

Regardless, the Department of Agriculture needs a lot of revamping, and the Hoover Commission has made many sound suggestions about it which we think should be adopted. But let's clear the atmosphere. To begin with, let's say that Mr. Hoover isn't responsible for the activities of Mr. Hall, and we won't ask Mr. Brannan to account for Mr. McGrath. Why not shake hands and get in harness?

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

OF ALL the little controversies that have swirled across the political horizon in the past few years, the bickering over the size of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's personal staff is among the least important.

When His Excellency returned from Tokyo, he brought within him a staff of eight persons, all paid by Uncle Sam, including a pilot of multi-engined aircraft. After a few weeks, the pilot sought other employment, but the other seven have stayed close by the General as he made occasional sorties from his sanctuary in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City.

Now, it is revealed, the Army has ordered a cut in the General's entourage. Instead of a court of seven, he will be permitted three—an officer aide, driver-orderly, and secretary—in accordance with Army regulations.

One of the General's aides charged that Secretary of the Army Frank Pace's order was a "reprisal" against General MacArthur.

That is so much hogwash. When General Eisenhower was at Columbia University, he was allowed three assistants. General Marshall also has three. Since five-star generals are retired at full pay for life, there is no reason for the taxpayers to subsidize a lavish establishment of personnel for them especially, as in the case of General MacArthur, when the assistants devote most of their time to promoting the political future of their retired Army chieftain.

EX - COMMISSIONER REAPS THE HARVEST

THE case of Joseph D. Nunan Jr., Commissioner of Internal Revenue from 1944 until 1947, typifies the lax interpretation of law and ethics that has been a trademark of the Truman Administration.

A 1919 act forbids an ex-employee of the Government to handle "any claims against the United States involving any subject matter directly connected with which (he) was . . . employed (in the Government)."

Yet, through a loose interpretation of the law, the Bureau of Internal Revenue granted Mr. Nunan nine waivers and his law firm 93 waivers to argue tax cases before the Bureau after he left the Federal pay roll. The Treasury put a literal interpetation on the law, holding that it applied specifically to claims brought *against* the Government. In Mr. Nunan's case, the Treasury decided, the claims were brought by the Government against the taxpayers. Hence, the law did not apply.

Clearly this is a violation of the spirit of the law if not the letter. And the charges leveled against Mr. Nunan by Senator John J. Williams, Delaware Republican who has dug out much of the growing collection of income tax scandals, are quite impressive. In one case, for example, Senator Williams says that Mr. Nunan represented the International Brewing Co., against which the Government had a tax claim of $812,000. Nine months later, the claim was settled for $4.500, quite a sizable reduction. Senator Williams also said that four other waivers were granted Mr. Nunan to represent two brothers who were in the brewery business, that tax claims against them totaled more than $2,000,000, and that criminal prosecution for tax evasion had been recommended. Yet the Government has recovered "not one dime", Williams said, nor has there been any criminal prosecution.

This week the former Internal Revenue Commissioner is to have his inning before the House Ways & Means subcommittee investigating income tax scandals. He has denied any improper or illegal actions. But he will have a hard time explaining how and why the Bureau he formerly headed was so co-operative in placing a loose interpretation on a law that should have prevented him from appearing in tax claim cases.

'Well, It Was Nice To Have Seen You Again, Anyhow'

Truce Stalemate Will Force Decision One Way Or Another

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

AS THE TRUCE talks drag on in endless bickering in Korea, one fact has become strikingly obvious here in Washington. The policy makers have evolved all sorts of detailed plans for dealing with what might happen. But they are completely unable to decide what to do about what actually is happening—namely, the indefinite prolongation of the Korean truce talks. This is the huge, glaring gap in American policy.

The truce talks have already, after all, been going on for very nearly a month after weary month, with no end yet in sight. Whenever they seem to move in the direction of agreement, and the usual "tentative optimism" begins to be expressed in Tokyo or Washington, some entirely new issue is injected by the Communists. Vishinsky proposes that the talks be moved to the United Nations, or the Chinese Communists insist that Russia be accepted as a "neutral" nation to police the truce.

The Communists know that the United Nations cannot conceivably accept these proposals. Yet they can quite easily continue to inject such issues, simply to keep the truce talks going, and to give the negotiators at Panmunjom something to talk about. What then?

THERE IS NO ANSWER

These reporters have asked this question many times, and never found an answer. The plain fact seems to be that there is no answer. The policy makers have simply shuddered away from the nightmare choice which confronts them. For either they must accept the indefinite prolongation of a strategically impossible situation, with a great proportion of this country's still inadequate military strength committed in an exposed position, on a peninsula of little strategic value. Or they must be ready to take unilateral action to force the issue, accepting both the risk of general war and the alienation of all this country's allies.

The terms of any truce, if not actually dictated, are "generally negotiated in response to the superior pressure of one side or the other. And as such pressure on the Communists now exists, since the thirty-day ground cease-fire was, probably mistakenly, agreed to by the United Nations negotiators. On the ground, Communist troops are now well dug in, expending little or no precious materiel, and in excellent jump-off position in case of general war.

PRISONER PROBLEM

The prisoner issue is the most important, and here it has been decided that we cannot, with honor, go so far as to return to certain death the Chinese and Korean prisoners, who have signified that they do not wish to return to the Communist paradise. Yet we might confront the Communists with a face-saving accomplished fact, simply by announcing that these prisoners have been placed in the wrong category, and are to be considered henceforth as political refugees.

Precise, approved plans already exist also for carrying the war to the Chinese mainland, if the Communists again attack in force. Plans for withdrawing most American forces from Korea if a successful truce is negotiated, to the accompaniment of a flat warning that renewed aggression will be regarded as an act of war, have also been evolved. Yet the great gap still remains—what to do if the Communists neither attack nor make a truce, simply disregarding the real issues while injecting an endless series of unreal issues. This is what has been happening for months, and is still happening

People's Platform

Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editor. The News reserves the right to condense.

'Ike' And The Politicians

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I DO NOT feel that any letter from me carries much consequence; but with respect to Eisenhower there is one thing I have not seen any comment about, and which is so outstanding that it should not be overlooked. That is with respect to his sticking to his present job come hell and high water insofar as his Presidential future might be concerned.

Eisenhower says to his fellow-countrymen in effect: "You have put me in a job that requires the very best I have got in me to try to save the world from destruction by a force of maniacs; and by gosh here I stay until this job is well along. From PMA to SCS to REA, will be pleased with the "one roof" policy.

Secondly, some farm men have raised what seems to be a valid objection to the Hoover Commission recommendation that one county board of farmers advise Department men on policy regarding the several Agriculture agencies in the locality. These objectors feel the present system, under which various Department agencies have their own advisory boards, enable farmers to learn adequately one type of work in which their interests lie. If they had to advise on the activities of all Department of Agriculture activity in their locality, they feel, they would have to quit farming and become "professional advisers" in order to do a good job.

Regardless, the Department of Agriculture needs a lot of revamping, and the Hoover Commission has made many sound suggestions about it which we think should be adopted. But let's clear the atmosphere. To begin with, let's say that Mr. Hoover isn't responsible for the activities of Mr. Hall, and we won't ask Mr. Brannan to account for Mr. McGrath. Why not shake hands and get in harness?

This, I believe, is called either looking for their first job, having to hunt from place to place, and receiving the same discouraging answer.

Industry has a difficult problem in this respect. It takes time to train employees, and if the employee is then called by the draft, the firm does not benefit from the time and expense of his training. On the other hand, if the trainee should wish to return to the firm, he will have veterans job rights, and no firm can face with equanimity either the humanitarian or practical aspects of firing at one time a great many established members of its organization to make room for these returning draftees. Consequently, many firms continue to say "NO" to all but a very few applicants in the 18 to 25 age bracket, and the youngsters feel unwanted at an energetic and vulnerable period of their lives.

I submit that these are additional facts which should be taken into consideration when this knotty subject of UMT and the draft is under discussion.

—KATHLEEN M. BARTLETT

Answering Dr. Pack

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

IN A recent letter to these columns, Dr. George T. Pack of New York, maintained that he had been misquoted by the press, and that he did not say, "cancer cannot be cured".

Never in my life, says Dr. Pack, have I made such a statement, "because cancer is being cured in greater and greater frequency".

Dr. Pack is a reputed specialist in this field and should know whereof he speaks. But others of equally notable authority hold contrary opinions.

For instance, Prof. Charles Oberling, M. D., a prominent teacher and investigator in cancer research says: "We have to confess that the problem of cancer has not yet been achieved". The same authority further states that the annual mortality rate from cancer is exceeded only by diseases of the heart.

And Dr. Edward A. Gall makes this specific observation. "Cure for cancer is still unknown. Moreover, detection of cancer in most cases is still a factor of luck or accident."

Then, too, there are statistical figures, compiled by World Almanac, showing that since 1927 there has been an increase of more than 5,000 cancer deaths each succeeding year.

If, as Dr. Pack alleges, cancer is being cured, the instances are vastly in the minority, and doubtless more in the order of a local or non-malignant variety of tumor. But be that as it may, certain is the fact that medical science has not yet set the woods afire with cancer cures, even with the aid of more than $100,000,000 donated to research in this field in the last decade.

— A. W. BLACK

Another Facet Of UMT Issue

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I HAVE read with interest your editorial and that of Robert Ruark on the relative merits of UMT and the draft, and now, through the medium of your columns, I would like to draw attention to a facet of this subject which seems to have been overlooked.

Young men of school-leaving age are finding it difficult to obtain jobs because of the uncertainty of the draft situation.

One Charlotte firm I know well has a definite policy of not hiring any man under 26 unless he has had a year's military service.—And here are these youngsters of 18, 19 and 20, full of hope,

High Taxes On Legal Hooch A Boon To The Bootleggers

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

ALTHOUGH I am not a drinking man myself, since I consider alcohol a basically treacherous fluid, which encourages undue frivolity among the young and causes little veins to bust in the cheeks of the old, I cannot but decry the high cost of distilled spirits as a grim tuning fork to the tenor of our times. This is not a stand I might have taken in past, when an attitude could have been called prejudiced by an occasional dab of dandruff-remover of the soul.

But pure, clear-eyed, unhungover citizen that I be — brat that doctor says I think that ten bucks a gallon in tax is too danged much for anybody to have to pay for a jug of hooch, I am now prepared to answer that Omar Khayyam's querulous query about what it is that vintners buy that's one-half so precious as the stuff they sell. They buy battleships, bud, with tax on tea.

THE STEADY INCREASE

An employee of mine, a fellow with little telltale marks of a lusty liver on his personality, has broodingly compiled a table of national decline, based on the rise in booze taxes since repeal. In 1933 the tax on a proof gallon of spirits was $1.10. In 1941 it had risen to $4. In 1952 it is now $10.50. That is better than $2.60 per quart of Federal tax alone, which works out in the vicinity of 16 cents in the government till for every hearty slug — if you are not a strict one-ounce man and occasionally waste a little.

If you seek a sermon in Scotch, or basic truth in bourbon, it is simply that what has happened to booze is what's happened to just about everything in the era of murder by taxation. The idea is to tax it, and tax it some more, and then slap another blaster on it, until nobody can afford it. Then everybody quits buying it, and the goose no longer renders up the golden breakfast.

This is important for several reasons. In the first place, revenue from tidelands oil off Long Beach was supposed to be held in trust for the people of Long Beach; or, under the subsequent U. S. Supreme Court ruling, for the Federal Government.

Second, California claims that it can administer tidelands oil more efficiently than the Federal Government. However, failure to put meters on the wells would seem a powerful argument to the contrary.

Tidelands Oil Pilfered

ANOTHER interesting reflection on California efficiency is a recent report by M. D. Hughes, chief harbor petroleum engineer of Long Beach, that tidelands oil was subject to pilfering.

"It is possible for almost anyone to drive a tank truck into the field and load up," the alert Long Beach Independent reported. The newspaper also quoted harbor engineer Hughes as stating:

"There is an unnecessarily large number of unsealed clean oil outlets at all test tanks, trap settings and tank farms that are inadequately controlled."

When this and other tidelands oil irregularities came to the attention of the California State Legislature, its committee on oil issued a critical report, warning that because of inefficient administration, it might become necessary to take tidelands oil lands away from the City of Long Beach.

"There is evidence of substantial unauthorized use and administration of at least a large portion of the granted lands," the California State Legislature said of the Long Beach tidelands operation.

Since Long Beach is by far the wealthiest tidelands development off the Pacific Coast and since California has claimed it can operate tidelands oil more efficiently than the Federal Government, the above critical report plays squarely into the hands of Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Texans Stirred Up Over Nonexistent Oil

BEAUMONT, TEXAS

IN this, the largest oil-refining city in the world, tidelands oil is almost a fighting word. The average Texan is so sore about it that he talks as if Texas were about to secede from the Union.

Native Texan Tom Clark, who as U. S. Attorney General brought the tidelands oil suit, and native Texan Mastin White, solicitor of the Interior Department, who helped, are excoriated almost as if they were top members of the Kremlin.

To people of the other 47 states, tidelands oil may mean nothing more than the oil wells drilled under water off the coast of the United States. But to Texans, it has become almost as symbolic as the Alamo.

Most of this is due to Texas pride, which runs strong in the Lone Star State; but part also to the fact that three of the wealthiest oilmen of the Southwest—H. L. Hunt, Clint Murchison and Roy Cullen—see the tidelands oil issue as an effective stick with which to beat Washington over the head.

Vigorously anti-Truman, Hunt and Murchison both siphoned money up to Senator McCarthy to help defeat Sen. Millard Tydings in Maryland, while Roy Cullen paid a million dollars for part interest in the Liberty Radio network in order to put liberal commentator Bill Shipeoff the air and substitute for him rabid anti-Acheson propagandа.

These three are among the leaders of the battle against elder statesman Tom Connally, which is why Texas Attorney General Price Daniel, who knows little about foreign affairs, has suddenly become an expert on foreign affairs. Daniel has struck a gold mine of campaign contributions, and talks learnedly about Formosa just as if he really knew where Formosa was and who lives there.

The more the young attorney general talks about foreign affairs, the more he pleases his big-money backers and the more he convinces at least himself that he knows just as much as the present chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Connally.

No Profitable Tidelands Wells

TEXAS is such a wide-open, friendly and sensible state that it's hard to understand how it can get so worked up. However, Californians are just about the same. The paradoxical thing is that Texans are worked up over something that so far doesn't seem to exist. What few Texans seem to know is that not one dollar of tidelands oil royalty has yet been received on the wells drilled off the Texas Coast in the Gulf of Mexico. In fact, the wells drilled so far have been duds.

Only one tidelands oil well, according to the records of the geological survey, has struck anything. This well is in block 243 and produced 49 barrels in a day, after which it was plugged as not being worth the running of a pipeline. Of about five other wells near Beaumont, drilled close to the shore line some time ago, one is bringing in a small return.

In contrast, fifteen or twenty wells have been drilled in water several miles off the Texas Coast at a loss of more than a million dollars each.

Louisiana, on the other hand, has brought in some lush tidelands wells. But Texas, where the term tidelands oil is almost a fighting word, hasn't been so fortunate. Maybe Texans are getting all steamed up over nothing.

California Tidelands

IN California, also, there's been so much oratory about tidelands oil that few people are aware of some certain highly interesting facts.

Thus is the failure of the companies operating on behalf of the City of Long Beach to put meters on their wells. Without meters, it is obviously impossible to measure accurately the flow of oil, and accordingly fix the amount of royalty accruing to the people of Long Beach or the Federal Government.