



WHO'S NEWS THIS WEEK

By LEMUEL F. PARTON

NEW YORK.—Meeting Francesco Malipiero at a party in the Royal Danielli in Venice, soon after the World war, I thought he was one of the most charming and brilliant men I had ever seen. There was in the company another Italian musician, a famous conductor, who was the lion of the evening. I have forgotten his appearance and his name, but everything about Signor Malipiero is vividly remembered.

On the way home in a gondola, I asked the conductor for an appraisal of Signor Malipiero as a musician. There was considerable condescension in the reply.

Malipiero was gifted but erratic, it was even hinted that he was "unsound," in some deeply subversive sense. But my Virgil eagerly agreed that the signor was a most extraordinary human personality.

As recently as four years ago, a Malipiero opera threw the Royal opera house of Rome into a tumult of howling and cat-calls. Mussolini banned it as "inimical to the faith and sound teachings of the new Italy." But, by this time, Malipiero had become a world-famous musician, and he was soon restored to favor.

This status is unquestioned as his symphony, "Elegiaca," was given its first performance in New York, with John Barbirolli conducting. For many years, critical opinion discounted him as somewhat of an outlaw and disturber. Now it has caught up with him, as it did with Stravinsky and Richard Strauss. Both the "Fire Bird" and "Salome" were met with cat-calls when they were first produced.

Critics note some mysterious "enervating influence" in Malipiero's new symphony. It may be an afterthought, but the explanation seems clear as I recall my conversation with him. His face saddened and he seemed ten years older when I mentioned the war.

For his ballet, "Pantea," he had written of "the struggle of a soul hurling itself into the struggle for liberty, only to find oblivion and death." The war had been to him a tragic and devastating experience. He said it had profoundly shaken both his art and his life.

Never again would the suave fluencies or banalities of music have meaning for him. He was impelled to a deeper search.

This disillusionment was sublimated in irony. He was suspected of slyly sabotaging the grandiose new Italian state. It was in March, 1934, that his opera, "The Fable of the Exchanged Sons," with the text by Luigi Pirandello, all but caused a riot in the Royal opera house.

So far as I could learn at the time, there was no brash heresy in the work, but, as elaborated by the text, a subtle hint that ultimate truth is forever elusive and supreme power dead sea fruit. That, of course, is dangerous doctrine in a totalitarian state, and it was quickly and savagely resented. The next day, Il Duce forbade another presentation.

Malipiero is a poet and a mystic. Of dominant presence, with sharply cut Roman features and hair brushed back in a thick pompadour, he is at the same time extraordinarily gracious, friendly and unassuming.

He lives in a quaint stone villa, forty or fifty miles from Venice, centuries old, rambling and tumble-down. Cut in the stone door lintel there is a Latin text, "To the obscene, all things are obscene." That was his answer to the critics of one of his operas.

The art of living engrosses him as much as the art of music and he studiously maintains a relationship of courtesy, dignity and friendly intimacy with the creatures in his retreat—he has a gift for friendship with animals and thinks that much of the trouble of mankind is due to its insensitiveness to the subhuman and superhuman. His music is apt to range into those zones.

He was born in Venice in 1882, beginning his violin studies in his sixth year. His father was a political exile and the family was in Germany for many years. Wagner was a crashing strain of modernity which profoundly affected his work.

Consolidated News Features. WNU Service.

Quarrel or Fight
"Many a man seems to enjoy a quarrel," said Uncle Eben, "on de theory dat it's better dan a fight."

Find Solomon's Seaport—Kaiser at Wedding



1—An ancient seaport used by King Solomon on the Red sea has been unearthed by archeologists in Palestine. Photograph shows shallow rooms uncovered by the diggers. 2—Gen. Saturnino Cedillo, one-time close associate of President Cardenas of Mexico, whose activities caused the government to re-enforce its troops at San Luis Potosi to prevent a revolt. 3—Ex-Kaiser Wilhelm chats with the bride of his grandson, the former Grand Duchess Kyra, following their marriage at Doorn house, Netherlands. Prince Louis Ferdinand, the groom, looks on.

Menuhin and His Fiancee



Yehudi Menuhin, concert violinist, is pictured in London with his bride-to-be, Miss Nola Nicholas of Melbourne, Australia. Miss Nicholas is the daughter of a wealthy Australian drug manufacturer.

HORSE AND BUGGY DAYS



Mrs. E. Roland Harriman, society trotting enthusiast, is shown aboard the high wheeled sulky which Jay Eye See pulled to a world record of 2:10 back in 1884 as she gave the ancient relic a workout over the track at Goshen, N. Y.

Giro Lands Mail on Post Office Roof



A new chapter in air mail history was written in Chicago as Pilot Johnny Miller settled to the post office building roof with his autogiro carrying 135 pounds of mail from the Municipal airport. A feature of the program observing the twentieth anniversary of air mail flight, the demonstration showed the practicability of vertical landing and take-offs by means of the autogiro and the attendant saving in time.

ACE JUMPING FROG



"Zip," the prize hopping frog of eight-year-old Eddie Robinson of Stockton, Calif., showed plenty of zip at the historic Angels Camp Frog Jumping jubilee in Calaveras county recently when it pounced out 15 feet 10 inches to set a new world's record. The jubilee honors Mark Twain, who wrote a story about a jumping frog and other figures of the early days in the Mother Lode gold mining section.

Toe Shine Boy Does Rushing Business



America's first "Toe Shine Boy" is enterprising young Keoki Kepoo, who does a rushing business of massaging the pedal digits of fair swimmers at Hawaii's popular Waikiki beach at Honolulu.

Washington
Crop Law Bogs Down

Washington.—Almost before its operation is well started, the new federal crop law appears to be bogging down. From what I hear around the offices of senators and representatives at the Capitol, there is plenty of rebellion against the law which is supposed to plan agriculture on a scientific basis. Indeed, if one reads some of the letters, the conclusion is inescapable that Secretary Wallace and his "scientific planners" are going to have more trouble than a one-armed paper hanger in administering that law.

It is difficult to provide a clear analysis of the trouble because of the complex character of the law, the confusion as to what can and can not be done under its provisions, the varying attitude of the farmers who are its "beneficiaries" or its "victims," according to their views. The problem of telling what is wrong is made the more difficult because practical people seem to be unable to get anywhere in their efforts to get the "scientific planners" to recognize human nature as well as the material forces that must be considered in farming.

I have talked with a number of Department of Agriculture people; individuals who are supposed to understand the crop control law. They are most convincing; the pen-and-ink sketches that they have made leave only the question as to the reaction of human beings. The department propagandists surely is sufficient to smother any criticism. It is formidable. But it, also, leaves that question of human relationships, wind and weather, to be determined. Even in that regard, every now and then Secretary Wallace issues a statement or makes a speech which seems to do away with any possibility of trouble from those influences.

In the meantime, however, the cotton growers of the South went into a rebellion about the acreage allotment. They succeeded in getting, rather in forcing, Secretary Wallace to obtain congressional action allowing for an increase of 2,000,000 acres of production this year. He went after that legislative action as an emergency, and there was plenty of sentiment in congress for it, because as a matter of cold fact there is a very large majority in the house and senate who doubt that the new crop control law is going to work. To the request for additional acreage, therefore, there was only a little objection since additional acreage meant an obvious increase in general production with the chance for increased return to the farmers who grow the cotton.

Only lately, another tidal wave of rebellion developed. It came from the corn farmers. They had received their allotments of acreage and, like the cotton farmers, they found themselves between the upper and nether millstones. Their rebellion surely lent credence to statements in debate when congress was considering the bill that it conferred more power on a federal agency than ever ought to be conferred in a free country, and that there was no possibility of this power being exercised wisely since none knew its scope. The cotton and corn revolt, therefore, would seem to support assertions in the senate that the two chief sponsors of the bill, Senators Pope of Idaho and McGill of Kansas, had no understanding of the measure they were fighting for. At least, the explanations they made never were able to permeate what I am pleased to refer to as my brain.

Farmers Protest

The corn protestors made their first concentrated move only recently at Macomb, Ill., and the sum and substance of that meeting seems to be that those farmers have had their bellies full of compulsory crop control. They called it un-American; they described it as ruinous and pledged united action against its continuation.

Of course, no one in Washington can tell exactly how many farmers are in sympathy with the position taken at the Macomb meeting. There are 566 counties in what is designated as the corn area. Whether there is a large majority against the compulsory, dictatorial type of law, or whether there is only a sizable minority can not now be accurately stated. It can be stated as a definite fact, however, that farmers do not spend their money to go several hundred miles for a meeting of protest unless they are being badly damaged. Communists and other radicals would go dashing anywhere to hold a protest meeting, but farmers are not built that way. So the Macomb meeting must be taken seriously. It must be given additional weight as well because it followed on the heels of heated protests from the cotton growers.

As to the number of farmers represented in the Macomb meeting; that is to say, the farms and farmers represented by that protest, it might be enlightening to quote here the published statement of Claude

R. Wickard. Mr. Wickard is a divisional AAA director and one of the really close advisors to Secretary Wallace. Said Mr. Wickard: "Complaints have come against the corn allotments as high as 1,100 from one county."

Obviously there could not be that many complaints from more than a limited number of counties. But even if there are only half that number of protests from any considerable number of counties, the representatives and senators who voted for that legislation are bound to get plenty of kicks in the pants next November. And the plight of those members of the house and senate appears to be made worse by the statement attributed to the Department of Agriculture by Representative Andresen of Minnesota. Apparently, Mr. Andresen had been getting baskets full of kicks about the acreage allotments and went to the department to find out the facts. He returned to tell his colleagues on the floor of the house:

"The administration (AAA) will not yield an inch. The allotments have been made according to law and the farmers can take them or leave them."

In that statement, it seems to me, there is unbounded arrogance and Mr. Andresen did the country a service when he repeated it to the house of representatives. It is an attitude of the dictator, of the worst sort of regimentation and it bears out the very thing which Senator Borah of Idaho predicted would happen when he opposed the legislation. Senator Borah's blast in the debate was, of course, branded as the criticism of a Republican, and it was his colleague, Senator Pope, the Idaho New Dealer, who was running about the country last year as the chief member of a committee of senators which was drumming up sentiment for the legislation before the extra session of congress called last November.

By way of prediction, I think there can be no doubt that the wheat farmers will find themselves shocked, instead of their wheat, when they get their acreage allotments later. They will find that the law is compulsory, not one of free co-operation as advertised when the bill was being debated in congress.

Why the Rebellion?

What is the reason for these conditions? Why is there rebellion among the farmers when, according to Secretary Wallace, there was a great majority for application of the crop control provisions? Frankly, I believe there are several factors to be considered as having influenced the passage and subsequent application of the compulsory regimentation.

In the first instance, it is quite apparent now that many representatives and senators were subjected to red hot steam from professional farm lobbyists, from Secretary Wallace and his lobbyists and from the minority of farmers who wanted something, anything, that would cause the government to pay them money. That belief is predicated upon a knowledge that the vast majority of the farmers are too busy with their own affairs to be active in politics. The legislators thought they were doing what the farmers wanted them to do.

In the second place, there surely was much misrepresentation about the legislation. At all times and on all occasions, Secretary Wallace and those who were seeking to put over the legislation vigorously stressed the statement that the provisions of the plan were voluntary. There was to be no compulsion in it; the farmers themselves were to decide; the department here in Washington would do exactly what the farmers wanted. All of which is very well and good, except that the farmers were not informed how much pressure could be exerted to make them volunteer. They either had to "volunteer" or find they could market none of their product without being penalized.

What is the result going to be? Congress soon will be quitting for the year, and there is no likelihood of any amendment that will alter the situation—unless something intervenes to keep congress in session far into the summer months. The only thing to look forward to, then, is the result of the fall elections. If the revolt that is represented by the protests of the cotton and corn farmers is widespread, it will show up in the votes at election time. Those who fought so hard for it in congress will meet trouble in primaries and in the election as well. To me, however, there is an added significance. These protests reveal a growing sentiment among farmers, a resentment, against having the federal government bureaucrats run the farms from Washington.

© Western Newspaper Union.
Puerto Rico a Flower Garden
The tropical island of Puerto Rico is a veritable flower, with 3,353 varieties of brilliantly colored flowers growing on its mountains and coastal plains.