

'It Just Soaks In And Disappears'



EDITORIALS

*Never Forget That These Editorials Are The Opinion Of One Man
And He May Be Wrong*

The Unemployment Problem

One of the great myths of the moment during the Christmas rush, or during the vacation season, the college student who works in the summer, the seasonal worker who only wants just enough work to get on the compensation lists so he can take the paid 26-week vacation guaranteed by those who work 50 weeks of the year and get only a two-week vacation.

We hear frequently about the five million unemployed, but included in this frightening figure are the "won't works," the "can't works," the "part-time works" and the true "want works."

The "won't works" include the 100 per cent bums who "won't work" on any kind of job, and the larger collection who "won't work" unless they can pick the kind of job, the pay scale, the working conditions and fringe benefits that they demand.

The "can't works" include the physically and mentally unfit, who wander from job to job, pitiful, in need of help but unable to remain gainfully employed at even the most menial types of work.

The "part-time works" include the housewife who helps out in a department store

while all these millions are being worried about by the professional worriers there are millions of jobs open, but with no takers. Try to hire a domestic in a city of any size from 10,000 up.

We are inclined to believe that the egalitarian tripe that is being pumped into the public by the schools, the church, the courts, the news media, the politicians and other fuzzy thinkers is basically responsible for this trend which sees people who are not fit for any other type of working turning up their nose at the only job they can really ever be fitted for.

There is NO really serious employment problem at this time in our country. And we say this despite all the figures to the contrary.

Reform Not Enough

There is a growing feeling that tax reform is not enough, and that what the United States badly needs is a completely new program of taxation. The likelihood of getting a new tax program is remote; indeed, however.

The United States government collects a far larger per cent of its overall taxes from the income tax than any modern nation, and such remarkable industrial recoveries as those of Germany and Japan have come in a tax climate far different than the American.

We collect 83.4 per cent of all federal taxes from the income tax, while Japan gets only 64.9 per cent that way and Germany just 60.2 per cent. Each of these countries gets the difference by tax on sales; 34.5 per cent in Japan and 38.2 per cent in Germany. Our government only gets 14.8 per cent of its income in this fashion.

This situation is worsened by the fact that a very large part of American income is taxed twice: first as a corporate profit

and then again as personal income.

This cuts off expansion capital and damages the will of those caught in this category to take chances on new products, new methods or new markets.

If new jobs are to be created more capital has to be put in the hands of those people capable of creating those new jobs, and the simplest way is to let them keep some of the money they already have.

This rise in individual income and employment would permit greater volumes of business, and if a tax were applied at the consumer end of the market, rather than at the producer end more money would be raised in the final analysis.

This argument, up to a point is that used by President Kennedy in urging a tax cut, but it is our view — a view shared by a majority of congress and most rational economists — that what we need is not a tax cut, but a tax change, and reforming the present patchwork system is more difficult than writing a totally new tax program which is what we favor.

Too Much Education?

Since Sputnik arrived on the celestial scene education has been raised to a level about six notches above religion, family, and logic, and it is about time that a few words be said on the subject of Too Much Education.

Temperance in all things, including education is a pretty good principle, but nobody seems very interested in putting such a principle to work.

Surely, even the dullest among us would agree that the apt student, who is self-motivated should be given every opportunity to explore the outer fringes of his capabilities. But on the other hand it is both a gross waste of time and money to attempt to force education upon those who lack both the aptitude and the motivation.

And as any educator will wryly agree; motivation of parent is not sufficient to motivate the student.

The forced-feeding of our children with a diet of education that is in many instances indigestible has been a major factor in creating the refusal of so many young people to accept work in service fields such as domestic service, waiters, maids and butlers.

The combination of our lip-service to equality and the thin patina of "education" that is sprayed like the dew on each and all has convinced thousands of young people that there is something demeaning about the service trades, where there is a tremendous demand for people, and a most inadequate supply.

We parents are party to this snobbism, by despising the idea that we might be rearing a headwaiter, and preferring to hypnotize ourselves with the hope that "junior" is a budding nuclear physicist; when in many sad instances "junior" would make a far better headwaiter, live a happier life, earn more money and make a far greater contribution to society.

Nothing is sadder than the individual who believes that a school diploma is the key to immediate success.

Education cannot be stressed so strongly as a first duty of civilized man but education can be debased by trying to spread it too thinly.

Deadly Game

One of the more dangerous parlor sports currently engaged in by American diplomats is guessing how deep the split is between China and Russia. This is rather like guessing whether a cobra or a rattler is the most deadly snake.

Whether we console ourselves, overly that these giant powers are too concerned with their own special problems to get involved in other areas of the world, or whether we frighten ourselves by saying that their "feud" is a paper dragon aimed at lulling us into some sense of false security the net product is negative. So we say it is a great waste of time, and a positive threat to spend too much energy on this guessing game.

We say that the first consideration of America must be in putting its own house in order, and in this are such huge house-keeping problems as solvency of the national government, and after giving first service to this primary consideration we Americans should spend our energies on keeping ourselves militarily sufficient, but not drunk with money or power.

Then comes such problems as protection of our water resources, soil conservation, transportation, housing, health, education and governmental tradition.

This is a king-sized package of jobs that needs careful and constant attention at home. Surely we cannot isolate ourselves from the small world in which we live today, but we can make of ourselves the kind of shining example that will win respect, rather than fear which is at present the most basic tool being used by both Russia and ourselves to influence world affairs.

We must remain strong, but strength without morality is more a curse than a blessing; and among these fundamental moralities is one that has to do with putting one's own house in order.

JONES JOURNAL

JACK RIDER, Publisher
Published Every Thursday by The Lenoir County News Company, Inc., 403 West Vernon Ave., Kinston, N. C., Phone JA 3-2376. Entered as Second Class Matter May 5, 1949, at the Post Office at Trenton, North Carolina, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Second Class Postage Paid at Trenton, N. C.

PERSONAL PARAGRAPHS

BY JACK RIDER

Recently some of my friends have taken a dim view of my blunt criticisms of President Kennedy. They especially resent my calling him a liar, since, they feel, it is disrespectful to call the head of state by such a four-letter word. I admit it, humbly, and wish that it were not true. I surely do not relish the glaring fact that both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy proved beyond any doubt their ability — almost their anxiousness to lie.

There is a great deal of difference between an honest mistake and a deliberate lie. Men in high places who have good reasons why they do not wish to tell the truth have the absolute right — even duty to answer questions in such areas with, "No comment." Since freedom of the press became a part of our way of life no one has ever criticized a public official for refusing to comment, because it is accepted by all who have any claim to reasonableness that men in high places do often have special knowledges, as well as special responsibilities that force them to be quiet.

But the Madison Avenue husksters have attempted to create the "everready" type executive who always has the answer to every question at his tongue tip, and politicians created in this image had rather be caught stealing than to be caught without an answer. To me it seems that the first lesson of bigness in an individual is being big enough to admit that one does not have ALL the answers to ALL the questions, and asking for a few days or few weeks to find the answer is not an admission of total ignorance, but is a simple exercise in humility that neither lessens the stature of a man, nor those things for which he stands.

On the other hand one of the oldest morals handed down from the most ancient times is that of the boy who cried "wolf" once to often. For his own satisfaction he cried "wolf", and then when the wolf really did visit his flock nobody heeded the real cry of "wolf". This may be an oversimplification of an extremely complex problem, but it puts the situation in perspective for me, if for no one else.

In these days of instant communications, when great men talk into TV cameras and their words echo by Telstar across oceans it has become even more necessary than ever before that the men in high places speak with great care.

All men in high places must learn, if they do not already know that it is less dangerous in the long run for them to appear ignorant than it is for them to tell lies. Someone said a long time ago, that few of us are smart enough to be liars, because one lie breeds another, and soon, one has the almost impossible task of remembering the whole tissue of lies that has been built around the original fib. Remembering the truth is much more simple.

President Truman never in his seven years talked himself into the kind of trap that Eisenhower did with the U-2 incident and that Kennedy has done with the Bay of Pigs fiasco. History, in my view, will be very kind to Truman; not because of the great depth of his learning, nor the profoundness of his reasoning, but simply because of his blunt, and sometimes embarrassing honesty.

If either Eisenhower or Kennedy had the humility when caught in a web of falsity to say, "Well, boys, I was mistaken yesterday. I was talking when I should have been listening. I've checked up and found out that what I said was completely wrong; so now I want to give you the whole truth." There would have been no lasting damage to their integrity, but they chose to use "national security" as an excuse to tell lies.

National security can in many instances be used as an excellent reason for saying nothing, but in our society nothing, not even national security, can be sufficient excuse for outright lying. Once this principle is accepted — as I fear many accept it today — then it becomes so easy for national security to be exchanged for any other policy line of an administration.