New York Times (1857-Current file); Oct 16, 1956; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2005)
pg. 32

The New York Times
ESTABLISHED 1851 REG. U. S. PAT. OFF
"All the News That's Fit to Print"
ADOLPH S. OCHS, Publisher 1896-1935

Published Every Day in the Year by THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY

ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER
President and Publisher

ORVIL E. DRYFOOS
Vice President

AMORY H. BRADFORD
Secretary

FRANCIS A. COX
Treasurer

OFFICES OF THE NEW YORK TIMES
New York City.....Telephone LAckawanna 4-1000
Main Office...Times Building, 229 W. 43 St. (36)
Times Tower.....Times Sq. (36)

ALBANY.....Press Room, State Capitol
BOSTON.....News, Herald-Traveler Building; Advertising, 140 Federal St.
CHATTANOOGA.....c/o The Times
CHICAGO.....News, 435 N. Michigan; Advertising, 333 N. Michigan
DES MOINES.....c/o Register & Tribune
DETROIT.....News, Free Press Building; Advertising, Guardian Building
HOLLYWOOD.....6305 Yucca Street
LOS ANGELES.....News, Times Building; Advertising, 3242 W. 8th St.
MIAMI.....Advertising, Ainsley Building
NEWARK.....744 Broad St. (2)
PHILADELPHIA.....News, Bulletin Building; Advertising, Packard Building
ST. LOUIS.....Advertising, Shell Building
SAN FRANCISCO.....News, Chronicle Building; Advertising, Russ Building
SMITHTOWN.....43 West Main St.
STAMFORD.....Gurley Bldg., 322 Main St.
TRENTON.....Press Room, State House
WASHINGTON.....News, 1701 K St., N. W.
WEST HEMPSTEAD.....337 Hemostead Turnpike
WHITE PLAINS.....175 Main St.

ANKARA.....Milli Mudafaa 12–5, Yenisehir
ATHENS.....15 Odos Carneadou
BELGRADE.....Hotel Moscow
BERLIN.....12 Kurfuerstendamm
BONN.....19 Bahnhofstrasse, Bad Godesberg
BUENOS AIRES.....San Martin 344
CAIRO.....17 Rue Mahmoud bey Bassiouni
DUBLIN.....14 Blackheath Pk., Clontarf
GENEVA.....Villa L'Archette, Versoix
HAVANA.....Refugio 106, Altos
JERUSALEM.....Public Information Office
JOHANNESBURG.....c/o The Star
KARACHI.....Bungalow 15/2 Mhd. Ali Housing Colony, Drigh Road
LONDON.....Adelphi Bldg., W. C. 2
MADRID.....Fortuny 41
MELBOURNE.....56 Walsh St., S. E. 1
MEXICO CITY.....110 Avenida Morelos
MOSCOW.....12/24 Sadovo Samotechnaya
NEW DELHI.....30 Nizamuddin East
OTTAWA.....Citizen Building
PARIS.....37 Rue Caumartin
RABAT.....24 Avenue de Meknes
RIO DE JANEIRO.....Rua Senador Dantas 14
ROME.....Via Della Mercede 54
SANTIAGO, CHILE.....Bandera 75
SINGAPORE.....Finlayson House
STOCKHOLM.....Svenska Dagbladet Bldg.
THE HAGUE.....Vijverweg 1, Wassenaar
TOKYO.....Asahi Shimbun Building
VIENNA (8).....Langegasse 8

MAIL SUBSCRIPTION, U. S., TERRITORIES

Edition.	1 Yr.	6 Mos.	3 Mos.
*Daily and Sunday....	$27.50	$14.75	$7.75
†Weekdays	13.50	7.25	4.00
Sunday	15.50	8.75	4.75

*One week, $1.00. †One week, 50c.
For Rates to Other Countries Apply Subscription Dept.

The New York Times also publishes a Bound Volume, a Microfilm Edition and an Index. Prices on request.

The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and local news of spontaneous origin published herein. Rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

THE CHOICE OF A CANDIDATE

Despite the sound and fury of the political campaign, the fact of overriding importance in this year's Presidential election is that the choice lies between two men who share a middle-of-the-road position. Different as they are in temperament and training, Dwight Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson have in common a distrust of extremist positions and a clearly demonstrated faith in both the philosophy and the method of moderation. For this, Mr. Eisenhower is still suspect by the reactionary wing of the Republican party. For this, Mr. Stevenson was rebuked at the Democratic national convention by Mr. Truman.

It is important to note where and how Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Stevenson differ on the issues of the day. But it is also important to note that in the area of many fundamental matters—for example, at home, the difficult problem of school integration and, abroad, the question of relaxing tensions in the Far East and the Near East—the approach of both these men is to conciliate rather than coerce, to clarify rather than confuse, to unify rather than disrupt.

I. The Stevenson Campaign

The campaign which Mr. Stevenson has made reflects this basically moderate and responsible point of view. Mr. Stevenson has hit harder than he hit in 1952, but for the most part he has stayed within the bounds of propriety and fairness. The tone and temper of his speeches have been on a generally high level. His choice of a Southern platform to reaffirm his support of the Supreme Court's decision on school integration was a forthright and, let us hope, a profitable act. If he has not had all the right answers to the many issues, both foreign and domestic, which he has discussed at length and with candor, he has at least asked many of the right questions.

We said in 1952 that we thought Mr. Stevenson to be the strongest candidate his party could nominate for the Presidency. We reaffirmed this opinion before the Democratic convention met last August. We continue to hold it today, as the present campaign nears its end. We do, however, disagree sharply with Mr. Stevenson's position on the Selective Service Act and we regret his willingness to encourage American parents and their sons to believe that "in the not far distant future" we can dispense with this presumably unpopular but nevertheless indispensable instrument of American defense. Moreover, we are not reassured by the nature of the commitments Mr. Stevenson has made, particularly in his bid for the support of three large groups of voters.

* * *

The first of these commitments is in the area of farm policy. Mr. Stevenson has gone all-out for high, rigid price supports. We do not regard this as a sound policy, and we think that the result of putting it into effect would be costly to American agriculture and to the American economy as a whole.

Farm prices reached their peak in March, 1951, during the fighting in Korea, as a consequence of wartime scarcities. The subsequent decline reflected the end of those scarcities, and the record shows that more than four-fifths of the total decline, from top to bottom, took place while high, rigid price supports were still in effect. In fact, since farm prices had recovered from their December, 1955, low of 88.1 to 90.1 by July of this year, it could be said that as far as the net decline to date is concerned, all of it occurred while high, rigid supports were in effect.

High, rigid supports thus did not halt the decline of farm prices. What they did do was to stimulate production for which there was no natural market, force the Government to take over a stockpile of nine billion dollars' worth of unwanted farm produce and burden American agriculture with an unmanageable surplus which has continued to work against a proper recovery of farm prices.

The investment of more billions of dollars in high, rigid price supports strikes us as a proposal for more inflation without the benefit of any compensating correction in the fundamental economics of American agriculture.

* * *

A second area in which Mr. Stevenson has made commitments that seem to us to be a cause of future trouble is in the matter of labor legislation. Mr. Stevenson has endorsed the idea of a "guaranteed annual wage" without reference to the special problems which such a wage would raise for many industries. He has called for the outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the substitution in its place of a new law to "equalize" the processes of collective bargaining. He has criticized the Eisenhower Administration on the score of rising costs of living, but he has failed to discuss the dominant part played in this process by the successive rounds of sharp increases in industrial wages.

Organized labor is already powerful, with a monopoly on the labor supply in most industries. If the authority of organized labor is now to be "equalized" as it was under the one-sided Wagner Act, a new stimulus will be given to the wage-price spiral.

* * *

Finally, there is the matter of Mr. Stevenson's commitments in the field of social welfare legislation—better housing, better schools, better provision for old age, better protection against the hazards of ill health. We are in agreement with his objectives here. In fact, in these very matters we have frequently criticized President Eisenhower for his failure to follow through in urging strongly and consistently upon Congress the enactment of some of the best measures he has sponsored in this field. Nevertheless, strongly as we sympathize with Mr. Stevenson's purposes, we question the wisdom of the emphasis he has employed in presenting his case to the public.

In the first place, this emphasis has been almost exclusively on the responsibility of the National Government in these matters and only to a very small extent on the primary responsibility of the state and local governments. It is Mr. Stevenson's assumption that the resources of the latter governments have been largely exhausted—"state revenues are reaching their limits" * * * "for various reasons the local communities have been less and less able to foot this bill"—leaving greatly increased aid from Washington as the only alternative. We do not agree with this assumption. While we strongly favor some additional aid from Washington, we think that the state and local governments could and should do far more than they are doing now in these matters, and we regard as an unhealthy and potentially dangerous trend this centralization of responsibility in Washington and this eagerness of state and local governments to sidestep the unpleasant business of taxing their constituents directly.

In the second place, though Mr. Stevenson has made no estimate of the total expenditure he would like to see the National Government make for social welfare, it is clear that he regards the present program of the Eisenhower Administration as woefully inadequate and that he would increase it greatly. Yet, aside from a passing reference to the possibility of higher Federal income taxes in the specific matter of school aid, there has been no suggestion in Mr. Stevenson's speeches as to how these increased costs would be met. Federal taxes are already high. The alternative to still higher Federal taxes is further borrowing. It is not reassuring to remember that the Democratic party has a tradition which is not averse to borrowing.

The forces now making for inflation are world-wide and rampant. During the present political campaign we have published more than 110,000 words of direct quotation of Stevenson speeches and statements. We have not found anywhere in this large record a strong pledge of economy in the management of the Federal Government's affairs. The emphasis has been on spending—socially useful spending, to be sure—but spending.

II. The Eisenhower Record

We have already noted, in an earlier paragraph, our disappointment over the President's failure to support some of his own measures more vigorously. This may be in part the consequence of a too-academic view of the proper separation of executive and legislative powers, but, in our judgment, it has been a defect of leadership. Nor is this the only disappointment we have had or the only area in which we have expressed criticism of the Eisenhower Administration.

We were sharply critical of the early failure of the President and his Cabinet to stand up to Mr. McCarthy. We have been consistently critical of the Administration's handling of the security issue in the civil service and of its resort to what we think has been rightly described as the "numbers game." We have disagreed with the President about T. V. A. We recognize that Mr. Wilson has been a successful business man, but we would not have chosen him to be Secretary of Defense. We think that Mr. Dulles, while competent and industrious and undoubtedly successful at some important points, has added unnecessarily to the problems of the State Department by some of his own less fortunate statements and interviews.

Let us add here, as another of the things that have not gone the way we wish they might have gone, the nomination of Mr. Nixon as his party's candidate for the Vice Presidency. On Mr. Nixon's behalf, we think it is fair to say that he has worked hard in his present office, that he has grown with it, that he has been a good ambassador for the United States in his foreign travels and that he has conducted in 1956 a more moderate and more honorable campaign than he made in earlier years. But the memory of the divisive tactics of those earlier campaigns lingers, and Mr. Nixon's career has certainly not revealed much evidence of deeply rooted and consistently held principles. Party strategy, rather than party policy, has been Mr. Nixon's chief concern.

So far as Mr. Nixon is concerned, those independent voters who favor Mr. Eisenhower's re-election must rely, first, on the President's apparently strong recovery to good health and, second, on the not unreasonable assumption that Mr. Nixon, who is above all adaptable and quick to follow the trend of public opinion, knows today and would continue to know tomorrow if he should ever assume the office of the Presidency that the Eisenhower brand of Republicanism is far more popular and far more successful than the Republicanism of those reactionaries who seek to ride into office on the President's coat-tails.

* * *

There are two persuasive arguments in favor of the re-election of the President. First, despite disappointments, there is much in the record of the Eisenhower Administration that is of real and lasting value to the country. Second, it is a matter of major importance that the modernization of the Republican party and its rescue from the rut of reaction into which it had fallen after twenty years out of power be carried forward another stage under the leadership of Mr. Eisenhower.

We have spoken here of the threat of inflation which now hangs over every country in the Western World. For at least a decade this has been a problem calling for corrective action by responsible public authorities. The Eisenhower Administration has shown more alertness in dealing with this problem than was shown by the preceding Democratic Administration or than is being shown today by the Democratic party in its 1956 campaign.

The Federal Reserve System has been restored to its proper independence of the Treasury. It has used its authority to check both speculative activity in the stock markets and the too-rapid expansion of bank credit—thereby producing, on the part of those Democratic critics who would apparently let the inflation roll, the accusation of "tight money." The national budget has been brought into balance. The Federal Government is no longer pumping borrowed money into the stream of credit.

It is true that prices have risen under Mr. Eisenhower. But the extent of the rise, during the three and a half years of his Administration, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, has been 2½ per cent. During the four peacetime years of the Truman Administration, from June, 1946, when wartime controls were removed, to June, 1950, when the Korean War began, the index rose 27½ per cent. (During the war, of course, it rose much higher.)

* * *

Nor does the list of good works end here.

In the field of foreign policy the President has steered a course in close cooperation with our allies overseas and continued and expanded the policy of mutual aid and mutual guarantees wisely initiated by previous Democratic Administrations. His Atoms-for-Peace plan is in process of becoming the first practical step in coping with a dread menace. His Open-Sky inspection plan has given the democracies the initiative over the Soviets in the controversy over arms limitation. His performance at the Geneva conference was the single most effective action taken to convince the neutralists, and even the Communists themselves, of the good faith of this country's peaceful purposes.

Meantime, at home, American business has been set free of bureaucratic controls from Washington. The practice of collective bargaining, without Federal intervention, has been encouraged, and with fewer costly strikes. Widespread assurance on the part of investment capital concerning the purposes of the Administration has contributed to the favorable conditions in which most sections of the American economy have prospered to a remarkable degree. A beginning has been made in ridding American agriculture of the burden of overhanging surpluses. Employment is high. Earnings are good. Best of all, and certainly at least in part because he is personally so well liked and so widely trusted, Mr. Eisenhower has helped to create a spirit of goodwill and confidence which has served this country well in a time of international tension.

On the balance of the argument, as weighed and stated here, we support the President for re-election.

Topics of The Times

Are We Speeding Too Slowly?

The armchair traveler has a first cousin who is also a vicarious adventurer: the armchair speedster. Most persons, whether they look at the practicing speedsters with awe or envy, fall at least some of the time into this category. They have sped a time or two themselves, probably, but by and large they do their speeding vicariously—watching races or reading with dim comprehension of the astounding records set by pilots and others. How fast can a man go? the armchair speedster frequently wonders. No answer has been provided as yet to that one. But an Air Force pilot (Lieut. Col. Frank K. Everest) voiced a strong opinion before the American Rocket Society in Buffalo the other day about how fast man *should* be going by now. We are dawdling along—that is, our fastest representatives (our pilots) are—at under 2,000 miles an hour when, according to Colonel Everest, we should be up to 7,000 miles an hour. Laggards, the lot of us, no doubt about it.

A Look at Some Speed Marks

Before warming to the subject it might be well to take a look at how fast we have gone in various fields. The aforementioned Colonel Everest has set the air speed record—a paltry (in his view) 1,900 miles an hour. That is the air record, at least as it stands as this is being written. Man has run the 100-yard dash in 9.3 seconds, has splashed along in a jet speedboat at 216 miles an hour and ridden a horse one mile in 1 minute 33 seconds. An auto speedster has accelerated to 394 miles an hour to do a mile in a little over 9 seconds. Man has ice-skated a mile in 2½ minutes and ridden a bike a mile in under 2 minutes. A swimmer has done a 100-meter breast stroke in 1 minute and a fraction. Another athlete has walked two miles in 12 minutes 45 seconds—a speed that is the envy of many a commuter.

The Incentives to Speed

Speed, as Webster's defines it, is the "act or state of moving swiftly." Why man wants to move swiftly, Webster's doesn't undertake to say. But that he does is palpable. Speed is a means of comparison, hence of competition. Small boys, particularly, race not against a clock but against each other to make comparisons (highly vocalized) and gain prestige. Beyond that, time is a challenge, and to be able to do something faster—to beat the clock—is thought of by man (at least energetic men) as a triumph. Speed in doing things, or producing things, is most useful and important; speed in moving quickly against time barriers—doing something faster than it has ever been done before—is a heady sport and a valuable one. Besides all that, fast motion itself is an exhilarating physical experience. For one or all of these reasons man has always been interested in increasing speed, and the chances are he always will be.

Speed and Progress

Speed is inexorably linked with progress. Without speed, or increasing speed, one might say, no progress. The effects of increased speed are felt in fields both narrow and broad. Modern dentist drills are not nearly so painful and bothersome since their revolutions per minute have been stepped up. Faster machines increase production in countless industries. Speedier transportation takes business man and vacationer to remoter places in shorter periods of time—presumably allowing the former to expedite business and the latter to educate himself the better. Speed is a basic factor in rocket development; extreme power must be generated to produce the speed that will make feasible the propelling of these objects—be they miniature earth satellites or guided missiles—over long distances.

The Matter of Direction

All of us in this age have come to terms with speed—both human and mechanical—in one way or another. Some have tried to ignore it, others have been participants, most of us have been applauding bystanders. All have been affected by it. Most of the changes attributable to speed have been beneficial, though not all. All speed is not in the right direction, or in the right hands. Most of us would readily agree with one Robert Greene who in 1594 delivered himself of the following: "Quick speed is good where wisdom leads the way."

MAINE RETURN

You who sleep beneath the elm
And feed its roots with sunset strength,
While shafts of Northern Lights unhelm
A soaring sea gull's fretted length,
Is there indigenous to death
A oneness with the star and loam?
I ask because in timid breath
I feel your spirit has come home.

The purple columbine, the phlox,
The morning glories, trellis-wise,
The sedum sunning on the rocks—
All whisper in a soothing guise.
And now a white dove looms above,
It circles low—its call is love.

MARJORIE ANDERSON.

In The Nation

To Clarify the Issue on Bomb Tests

By ARTHUR KROCK

WASHINGTON, Oct. 15—Not until Adlai E. Stevenson's speech tonight is carefully analyzed and officially answered will it be possible for the voters to understand the issue over the testing of super-nuclear weapons by the United States. The Democratic candidate has been developing and reshaping his proposal since his first statement on the subject (April 21, 1956). And the President's last comment (at Pittsburgh, Oct. 9) suggested he is still addressing himself to Stevenson's original plan.

But of all the issues the Presidential nominees have posed for a verdict from the voters on Nov. 6, none more urgently requires a public understanding of what it substantially is. Even then, since many persons accepted as nuclear, military and diplomatic authorities will continue to disagree, the present confusion will not be wholly resolved. And voters who prefer Stevenson's optimism to the President's caution in prescribing means to attain their common disarmament goal may not consider this sufficient reason to vote for Stevenson. "Major" issues are not made so at the will of a candidate: that depends on whether the voters agree with his evaluation.

It is now plain, however, that after Stevenson audiences in crucial California showed a favorable response to his attacks on further super-bomb tests that other audiences had failed to indicate, he decided he could advance his candidacy by continuing and expanding these attacks. Clearly he concluded he had found the "major" issue between himself and the President that Republican orators and political observers were saying the Democrats had been unable to develop. And this conclusion was comforting to Stevenson because he considers that the issue is one of "national morality."

Some Obscurities

This correspondent today made an unsuccessful effort to get an advance summary of tonight's speech, since it will not be released for publication and analysis until this department has gone to press. Hence there can only be speculation here on what the speech will contain if it is to state Stevenson's proposals with finality and with a precision lacking heretofore, and if it is to answer the President. As Stevenson began to speak at Chicago the following were the areas of doubt remaining in his previous discussions of the subject:

¶April 21, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, he said: "I believe we should give prompt and earnest consideration to stopping further tests of the hydrogen bomb. * * * As a layman I question the sense in multiplying and enlarging weapons of a destructive power almost incomprehensible. Of course, I would call on other nations to follow our lead, and if they don't and persist in further tests we will know about it and we can reconsider our policy." He has not repeated this call for unilateral stoppage of the tests by the United States. The explanation made in his behalf is that, since Prime Minister Eden and Foreign Minister Shepilov meantime have approved the idea of stoppage, the point about unilateral action by the United States is "moot." But Stevenson, up to tonight, had not explained why he abandoned his original proposal.

¶Sept. 5 he said he wanted to "halt further testing of large nuclear devices, conditioned on adherence of other large atomic powers to a similar policy." Sept. 21 he said he wanted the United States to promote international "curtailment" of the tests. Later he termed his goal a "moratorium," and still later a "renunciation" of the tests by the atomic powers. When Stevenson spoke tonight this conflicting and confusing terminology was unresolved on the record.

The Arguments Against

¶The President and Administration spokesmen have based their opposition to stopping the H-bomb tests on these grounds: (1) It would imperil the national security unless there were a prior and enforceable agreement with Soviet Russia to do the same. (2) Though Soviet tests of huge bombs can now be detected, there is no certainty that all can be in that vast land mass; certainly tests of smaller weapons are not infallibly detectable, and these can be fused into the equivalent of a super-bomb. (3) To abandon the H-bomb tests means to abandon the research anterior to them; then, if other nations broke the agreement, assuming we detected that, the time we lost in research could deprive the United States of its present "commanding lead." (4) The tests are vital to attainment of the knowledge how to reduce and prevent the deadly "fall-out." (5) They are vital also in simultaneously teaching us how to defend the nation from the super-bombs being tested.

Stevenson has the opportunity tonight to answer these points, and if he does the debate will be advanced toward a comprehensible status. If he does not answer, he will neither have clarified nor met the issue he has raised. His speech, which will appear in the news columns of this same edition of The New York Times, should be examined with all the foregoing in mind by any who hope to evaluate a high policy dispute that scientists and politicians, by violently contradicting one another, are forcing to adjudgment by popular polls.

Letters to The Times

Racial Differences Queried

The Factors Affecting Capacity for Education Discussed

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

According to a news item in The Times for Sept. 18, Dr. Frank C. J. McGurk said "that as measured by psychological test performance Negroes as a group did not possess as much capacity for education as white people."

Such an assertion is bound to be used in the fight against integration, but it must be made if it is rooted in the findings of scientific inquiry. Dr. McGurk is quoted as saying that the nation "will have to be more factual about race differences, and much less emotional." How factual was his statement?

If he means that Negroes are not as well prepared for education as a comparable group of whites he is probably correct. The disadvantages of being a Negro take their toll very early, but they take their toll on intelligence tests as well as school performance. The lower test scores cannot be used to explain inferior school performance so long as functioning in both areas is stunted by inferior housing, health, nutrition and education.

Measuring Intelligence

An intelligence test is no mysterious instrument. It measures the ability to manipulate various symbols under such varied conditions as complexity, difficulty, speed and abstraction. The test constructor assumes that those who are given the test have had relatively equal opportunity to become acquainted with these symbols.

It is patently absurd to attempt to measure the intelligence of a non-English-speaking child by means of a verbal test in English. It is no less absurd with a white or Negro child from a materially or culturally impoverished home for whom the test symbols are meaningless. If the school curriculum requires knowledge of these symbols then the test will have predictive power about future school success, at least until such time as the school provides remedial service. This is very different from measuring intellectual potential or the capacity to learn.

Dr. McGurk argues that "since 1918 the vast improvements in the social and economic status of the Negro have not changed his relationship to the whites regarding capacity for education." Does he believe that Negroes have gained so much more than whites as to have overtaken or even approached them? The United States Census Bureau reports contradict him.

Much of the Negro gain occurred in the decade of the Forties. Yet by 1950 the percentage of professional and technical workers was almost two and one-half times greater in the total labor force than among nonwhites; the percentage of managers, officials and proprietors was six times greater and that of craftsmen and foremen two and one-half times greater.

The median income for all white persons with income was $2,471 and for nonwhites was $1,196. The United States Public Health Service reported changes in death rate from 1919 to 1948. The death rate for whites had been reduced from 13.1 to 8.6 per 1,000; for nonwhites, from 19.8 to 12.8. There has been progress for both groups, but even a Pollyanna would have difficulty in seeing this as sameness of circumstance.

Attitudes of Inferiority

Does Dr. McGurk believe that higher income and occupational status immediately and completely eradicate attitudes such as those of servility and inferiority? Psychologists Muzafer Sherif and Hadley Cantril give research evidence of the tendency of a minority group to accept in part the norms of the majority group, and specifically of Negroes, to denigrate their very color. A better job or a higher wage is no panacea; it does not suddenly dissipate the feeling of being unwanted.

It is much easier to demonstrate that Dr. McGurk has abused research data than to draw conclusions about the intelligence of the various races. One cannot now prove the superiority of any one race or equality among them. Nor can one say that Northern whites have superior learning capacity simply because they score higher than Southern whites on intelligence tests. It seems reasonable to believe that the races of mankind are equally endowed.

This thesis finds tentative support in a study by Dr. Benjamin Pasamanick in which Negro and white infants were compared. The study suggests that the two groups have equal potential for learning, and that subsequent experience in "being a Negro" handicaps that group.

MILTON SCHWEBEL.
Associate Professor of Education, New York University.
New York, Oct. 8, 1956.

Hospital Volunteers Needed

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Many of us at some time have been patients in hospitals and know how much visits from friends mean. But when one is disabled by a long-term illness and the hospital is one's only home, how much more do these visits signify.

Ours is a large modern hospital, with a patients' library of 9,000 books, and its appeal is to women with time on their hands; to part-time librarians, former teachers, saleswomen in book shops, housewives with a good reading background; and to writers like myself. This is genuine rehabilitation work with both children and grown-ups, a valuable recreational therapy, and one of the most personally rewarding phases of volunteer service. I know, because I have been doing it for fourteen years. We have also a new respiratory center, which means iron lungs and rocking beds, and which calls for volunteers with special understanding and intelligence.

Please address the Patients' Library, Goldwater Memorial Hospital, Welfare Island, New York 17, N. Y., or telephone, from 9:30 to 4, Monday through Friday, MU 8-3500.

GRACE HEGGER LEWIS,
The Women's Auxiliary, Goldwater Memorial Hospital.
New York, Oct. 14, 1956.

Preserving Small Business

Importance of Maintaining Effective Fair Trade Laws Emphasized

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The article, "Whither 'Fair Trade,'" by Alfred R. Zipser, which appeared in the Oct. 5 issue of The Times, describes the Fair Trade Laws as depression-spawned. Fair Trade is one legal sanction for resale price maintenance which is older than the depression, older than the twentieth century.

It was the United States Supreme Court in 1911 in the Dr. Miles case which made the Fair Trade laws necessary. And the late Justice Brandeis in 1913—almost two decades before the depression—wrote an article in Harper's Weekly, setting forth the whole philosophy of Fair Trade and the economic need for this kind of statute. Actually, thousands of manufacturers believe effective resale price maintenance is important to them and to their distributors in a time of prosperity as well as in depression.

There is one important difference between Fair Trade and other forms of resale price maintenance. Under Fair Trade no product can be fair-traded unless it is in free and open competition with articles of similar class produced by others. Other forms of resale price maintenance make no such requirement for competition. Fair Trade fosters the competition offered by small business while it safeguards the manufacturer against the necessity of having to compete with himself, which occurs when retailers carry on price wars on his trade-marked product.

Specific Help

It should be remembered that whatever happens to Fair Trade there is going to be plenty of resale price maintenance carried on in this economy under other legal methods. Fair Trade is the only form of resale price maintenance which specifically helps the independent small business man to compete.

As Mr. Zipser noted, in the price wars in the Thirties between retail giants and the small retailer, many thousands of the little fellows went under. The proponents of Fair Trade believe that a healthy small business is essential to the well-being of the American economy and they are taking steps to develop legislation to meet the adverse state court decisions on Fair Trade.

Bargains have an understandable appeal to every American in his role of consumer. But there could be bargains galore in consumer prices tomorrow if the laws which now protect labor and the farmer were repealed. The American in his role of citizen, however, recognizes that the farmer and labor are vital segments of our interdependent economy, and that it would be no bargain to repeal these laws which help to safeguard the well-being of the farmer and labor.

Every American, as a citizen, will have to ask himself whether it is a bargain to let the competition and the contributions of small business be destroyed. Will it be a bargain to let big business get bigger and to eliminate to the vanishing point the opportunities of being one's own boss? If small business is also recognized as an important segment of our economy, then the American public will understand that effective Fair Trade laws are essential to the preservation of small business.

NICHOLAS S. GESOALDE,
Secretary, New York State Pharmaceutical Association.
New York, Oct. 8, 1956.

Spanish Exiles in Russia Recalled

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Repatriation of hundreds of Spaniards, as reported in the press, who fled to the Soviet Union during the Spanish civil war recalls an unhappy incident that befell some of these Spanish exiles during World War II.

During the exodus from Moscow and Leningrad in 1941 many of the more able-bodied Spaniards were evacuated to Kuibyshev. Here, with Russia sorely in need of civilian manpower, they were mobilized for work making war supplies.

Conditions were frightful both for Russians and Spaniards—shortage of food, sleeping on bare floors, horrible working conditions, etc.

Many of the young Spaniards, unlike the stoical Russians, vocally and openly protested against their hard lot. Some even expressed a desire to be sent back to sunny Spain. As might have been expected, they were arrested by the secret police and thrown into prison.

It was only through the intercession of the Spanish Communist leader, Dolores Ibarruri ("Passionara"), an intimate of Stalin, that the young Spaniards were released.

I, together with the Moscow foreign colony, was at the time in evacuation in Kuibyshev and learned of this incident from impeccable sources.

HOMER SMITH.
Addis Ababa, Oct. 3, 1956.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.