THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1949

CIVIL RIGHTS AND HOUSING

IT MAY REQUIRE weeks or even months to find out the precise meaning and the ultimate effect of a new rule denying Federal Housing Administration financing to "racially restricted" homes and apartments.

Less than 24 hours after the original announcement was made in New York, a top FHA official had already begun "interpreting" the ruling in a manner which would sharply limit its application. He said it would not apply to property which was under restrictions prior to the effective date of the ruling. That would cover a great majority of residential property in the entire nation, not merely the South.

We will have to await further developments to find out whether this newest Fair Deal move is substantially more than a headline-grabbing gesture. This much is obvious, however:

1. The ruling, legal or not, clearly conflicts with the expressed will of the Congress. Just this year an effort to ban discrimination in the use of public housing funds failed in a lop-sided Congressional vote. The Congress has put itself on record as opposing the use of Federal housing funds as a civil rights weapon.

2. The move is a bid for minority votes in the 1950 Congressional elections. Democratic control of the House and Senate may very likely hinge on the voting in a few large states where minority groups wield considerable power.

3. It is a warning to the proponents of Federal aid to education that similar administrative processes will be tried in an effort to destroy segregation in public schools once the schools become dependent on Federal hand-outs.

The President is an obstinate man. He has made up his mind to put across his Civil Rights program in one way or another. His convictions may be laudable, but his tactics can only cause distress to many sincere proponents of Civil Rights who know full well that men must be persuaded, not coerced, if they are to change their way of thinking.

THE SUBMARINE MENACE

THROUGHOUT the bitter Unification hearings, the question of air power and its effectiveness got the most public attention. The main dispute lay between the Navy and the Air Force, each of which had very definite, but conflicting, views about the best way to get bombs to the probable target—Russia.

The basic function of the Navy—controlling the seas—was subordinated to this more dramatic and spectacular quarrel. No one insisted on an answer to this question: How is the Navy to guarantee the safe operation of its beloved carriers, not to mention other warships and transports, if it can not assure the elimination of the Russian submarine menace?

Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, the new Chief of Naval Operations, seems alert to this problem. In his first major address since taking over Admiral Denfeld's post, Sherman told a Naval Academy audience that the Russian submarine force is larger than America's. This, he said, "is a potent argument for the United States to possess, not an equal number of submarines, but anti-submarine naval elements of greater effectiveness."

He outlined some of the modern weapons against submarines: (1) fast carriers and submarine guided missile ships for hitting at submarine bases; (2) special amphibious units for raiding and destroying such bases; (3) hunter-killer teams of submarines, surface ships, airplanes and dirigibles; (4) strong convoy escorts and powerful coastal defenses.

The objective of these weapons is the deadly Russian schnorkel submarines which can move at high speed for long periods beneath the surface. Only the small breathing apparatus for the motors protrudes. Since radar waves are deflected by water, the only thing that can be spotted by radar is this air intake and exhaust, and it is an infinitesimal mark on a radar screen.

We have surface control of the seas, even after the moth-balling of much of our fleet. No power or combination of powers could seriously challenge us on top of the water. But all indications point to a speeded-up Russian program of submarine construction utilizing the knowledge of German scientists and the skill of German workers.

Admiral Sherman is entirely correct in giving first priority to the development of a method of combating the Soviet submarine menace. Once he solves that problem, there will be ample time to argue about some of the other naval functions.

NALLE FOUNDATION

IN THE PAST two years a worthwhile charitable foundation has been established and has flourished in Charlotte with the knowledge of only a few of the city's residents: the Nalle Clinic Foundation.

Established Nov. 12, 1947, the Foundation was set up "to receive gifts from the Staff of the Nalle Clinic and from friends of the Foundation and to distribute funds at its disposal for the general purposes of medical education, medical research and medical charity."

Six separate funds have been classified by the Foundation—the General Fund, for all contributions not specifically earmarked for some particular purpose; the Brodie C. Nalle Fund, with income from this fund to be devoted to the advancement of the specialty of obstetrics and gynecology; the Pediatrics Fund, with both principal and income to be used for any pediatrics project approved by the Foundation's Board of Control; the Physicians' Training Fund, established by contributions of the staff of the Nalle Clinic; the Hospital Fund, established by a gift of $3,000 by Dr. Allan Tuggle; and the Gage Fund, set up by friends and patients of Dr. Lucius G. Gage for any purpose selected by Dr. Gage.

Some concrete examples of the use of funds through the Foundation: disbursements to the Mercy Hospital Building Fund, the Mecklenburg County Sanatorium's streptomycin fund, the Charlotte Memorial Hospital; establishment of a program whereby a young physician who wishes to do general practice in North or South Carolina will be paid a monthly stipend of $200 while training under the specialists at the Nalle Clinic; plans for presentation in April, 1950, of a lecture by Dr. Emil Novak of Baltimore, an eminent obstetrician and gynecologist.

After two years, the Foundation is still small, but the plan and motive behind it is a large one. The establishment of the Nalle Clinic Foundation has proved to be of considerable value in Charlotte.

ESSAY ON PASSING

OF ALL the hazards on the public highways today, the most irritating and potentially the most dangerous is the driver who attempts to pass another car when he has neither the time nor space to get around safely.

You don't have to drive more than a few miles at a normal rate of speed on any busy thoroughfare before you run across one of these dare-devils.

He may come up from behind. You eye him through the rear view mirror. Up front is another car or a big bus rushing toward you. There isn't room for passing. Yet the guy behind you pulls out, generally without honking his horn, and starts around. Concerned over your own safety, you apply the brakes, pull toward the shoulder, and give him that extra few yards he needs to whip around and back in the right lane. He zooms off, and you mutter to yourself.

He may come toward you. You see the line of traffic approaching you. Suddenly, a car pulls out and starts around another. You quickly estimate his speed and yours, gauge the narrowing distance, and decide he can't make it without piling into you. So once again, you apply your brakes, pull to the right, and give him those precious yards. He gets around, whips by your left front fender, and is off. And you mutter again.

Many things enter into passing, not the least of which is momentum. Some drivers have no perception of distance or awareness of speed. Some don't realize that it takes much longer to pass a car traveling at their own speed than it does to pass one which is moving much slower than they are when they come up behind it.

Others just don't seem to give a hoot. They're in a hurry, they're impatient and they leave it up to the car they're passing and the one coming toward them to avoid the inevitable conflict.

A safe driver who follows all the rules, gives all the correct signals, and passes only when he has a comfortable margin, is still in jeopardy when he ventures forth upon the public roads. It is not enough that he is careful. He must also make allowance for the other fellow if he hopes to end his journey with a whole skin.

How long would the Department of Justice wait to act if one single mine operator controlled the mining of coal as completely as does John L. Lewis through his union? —*Greenville (S. C.) Piedmont.*

If we Southerners would spend half the time and energy improving the South that we do defending it, the time would soon come when the South would need no defense.—*Franklin (N. C.) Press.*

Officials at Crawfordsville, Ind., found a $2.50 gold piece in a parking meter. What some of these new car owners won't do to show off.—*Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press.*

A vexing problem: Why is it that ham never tastes as good as it smells through somebody else's kitchen window? —*Pelham (Ga.) Jonrnal.*

The cost of being undertook after death or some other reason, makes us want to just keep on.—*Pelham (Ga.) Journal.*

'How Would You Like An Airplane For Those Trips?'

Joseph And Stewart Alsop

'Bandits Of The Pen'

WASHINGTON

PERHAPS Andrei Vishinsky was showing unusual knowledge of American criminal history when he denounced these correspondents as "congenital murderers" at the United Nations last week. A century or so ago poor Dr. Webster undeniably dismembered rich Professor Parkman, and stuffed the pieces into the Harvard physics laboratory furnace. And poor Dr. Webster was undeniably the great-great-great-uncle, or first cousin nine times removed, or some such relation, of these correspondents.

Once this rather moldy old fact is known, everything naturally follows from it. Has not the great academician Lysenko already announced the sacred theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics? And is not the inheritance of a great-great-great-uncle's genes and chromosomes a mere minor miracle, by the standards of Soviet science? The case is proved, beyond a doubt.

In short, there is no use arguing the major charge of the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs. Mr. Vishinsky went on, however, to describe these correspondents as "bandits of the pen"—a phrase borrowed from the pages of "Pravda", which probably means the same thing as such epithets as "alarmist", "interventionist" and "war-monger", as used by many worthy persons in this country. It may thus be permissible for these correspondents to forget, momentarily, the normal rules of the reporter's trade, and to explain why they write in a way to get themselves called such hard names.

• • •

EVERY reporter has, after all, an inner picture of the world, which makes the day's events seem important or unimportant, serious or comic. One reporter, with one kind of inner picture, will be solemn about the curious charge of Guy Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, that President Truman was trying to steal the headlines from the dim little Republican farm conference by announcing the Soviet atomic bomb. Another reporter, with another inner picture, will be equally solemn about the worst maunderings of Henry A. Wallace.

The views of these particular reporters lie somewhere between these two extremes, and more to the left than to the right. Once this has been said, however, it is then necessary to inquire how seriously a reporter takes the processes of history; and, if he is an American, what role he gives America in the historic process.

In the case of these particular reporters, the answers to these questions are simple. It would be pleasant to pretend that we are living in the secure and happy world of our grandparents. It would be soothing to believe that the remorseless advances of science and technology are not, by indirect effect, constantly increasing the importance and extending the frontiers of state power in society. But these are aspects of the historic process which cannot be wished away.

In this new world of increasing state power, it would also be far more agreeable if two sharply different forms of society had not emerged. But this is also an aspect of the historic process that must be faced. In the free world, with all its multiformity and all its faults, the total power of the state may grow and does grow with every month and year. But the rule of the free world is that, no matter how much state power may grow, the state is there to serve the individual, the citizen, the man in the street. And in the slave world, on the other hand, the man in the street is the mere serf of the impersonal machinery of the state.

• • •

IN this difference, moreover, lies the seed of an irremediable struggle between the free world and the slave. It was the struggle that was waged against Adolf Hitler and which culminated in war only because the free world was weak. It is the struggle that is being waged against the Soviet Union. And in this titanic convulsion, the after-effects of the second world war have forced upon the United States the role of indispensable leader of the free world.

Finally, it is necessary to inquire how you believe this country should exercise its leadership. Proudly, confidently, with untiring effort, and with certainty of victory, would be the answer of these reporters. Nothing is more sure than victory, in this great struggle between slave world and free, if this nation will but bear its leader's part with boldness, with generosity, and with wisdom. Nothing is more certain than the power of our people, if they are but told the honest truth.

On the other hand, nothing is more sure than defeat if this country falters, or weakens, or wanders into self-indulgence. And nothing is more certain to promote such folly than any attempt, by political leaders or business leaders or ordinary reporters or others having some responsibility, to gild the harsh colors and often the grim outlines of the facts of our time. In short, if plain reporting of plain facts makes you a "bandit of the pen", these reporters take it as a title of honor.

Quote, Unquote

Pome In Which Attention Is Called To The Brilliantly Colored Leaves To Be Seen Hereabouts During the Eleventh Month Of The Year:

Nature shows its treasure trove
In the vibrant month of Nov.
—Atlanta (Ga.) Journal.

Speaking of Senator Eastland's proposed disaster area, Editor Edgar Harris is sure in his West Point Times Leader that "it should not include the farm of the Oktibbeha man who produced five bales of cotton on a single acre." —Eupora (Miss.) Webster Progress.

A Washington radio announcer and agent of hillbilly bands says James C. Petrillo and his musicians' union are trying to "drive the hillbilly musician back into the hills." If we were a hill, we'd seek a restraining order. —Charleston (S. C.) News & Courier.

If you don't believe in transformation, marry an angel, then watch her shed her wings and take over your car. —Pelham (Ga.) Journal.

Now that coffee has gone up to a dime a cup we expect the state to add just enough tax to make us start looking for a substitute. —Omega (Ga.) News.

A famous doctor says, if you educate a man, you educate an individual; if you educate a woman, you educate a family. —Pittsburg (Tex.) Gazette.

Marquis Childs

The British Poll

LONDON

EVEN the passing observer can find certain striking parallels between the political scene in Britain and politics back home in the United States. On the one side it is pointed up by the current visit of American trade union leaders here to form a world federation of free trade unions.

Such a politically conscious trade union leader as Walter Reuther, head of the United Auto Workers and chief of the CIO delegation now in London, talks the same language as the leaders of Britain's Labor Party. While members of the AFL delegation, headed by William Green, are far more conservative in their outlook, nevertheless the trend in the older and more traditionally-minded organization is toward the goal of direct and active participation by labor in politics.

But it is on the other side of the political fence, in the Conservative Party, that the parallel is most evident. Ever since the defeat of 1945, which surprised and dismayed them in somewhat the same degree as the Republicans were surprised and overwhelmed by their defeat in 1948, the Conservatives have been divided and dispirited.

They are preparing to face an election early next year with a great outward show of confidence. The Labor Party is already charging that the Conservatives have a war chest for propaganda of millions of dollars provided by big industrialists. And that will sound familiar to American readers, too.

Beneath the surface, however, the confidence is not quite so great. There is even the suspicion that the Conservatives, or important elements among them, do not really want to win.

To win would be to assume responsibility with all its risks in this era of Britain's prolonged crisis. It would mean that Winston Churchill would once again become Prime Minister. And with all his daring, his romantic dash, Churchill could precipitate the kind of showdown with organized labor that many industrialists fear.

The parallel should not, of course, be pushed too far. But the Conservatives even have their Colonel McCormick in Lord Beaverbrook, who is for Empire first, last and always.

The visitor might easily come away with the impression that a Labor victory in February or March is a foregone conclusion. In view of what happened in the United States on Nov. 2, 1948, caution is in order. Here, then, are two views of what is likely to happen at the forthcoming election.

Majority view: The word should be overwhelming rather than majority. Except for conscious expression of party confidence by party leaders, there is little dissent to the belief that the Labor Party will win by a reduced majority but with sufficient seats in the House of Commons to form a government.

This belief is based on conclusions that will sound familiar to Americans who will substitute Democrat for Labor and Republican for Conservative. The Labor Party, so the argument runs, has passed out so many benefits to so many people that inevitably the beneficiaries must add up to a majority.

NO POSITIVE PROGRAM

The other face of the argument is that the Conservative Party has no positive program to offer. Their policies might mean unemployment or they are merely saying that they can pass out the benefits more efficiently.

Minority view: This is expressed by several highly informed editors who, far from wanting a Conservative victory, believe it might be a calamity. They base their belief in part on a secret poll recently taken, showing that whereas Labor won nearly 48 per cent of the vote in 1945 and the Conservatives 40 per cent, with the balance going to the Liberals and scattering independent parties, that ratio now has been almost exactly reversed.

By the poll the Conservatives are shown to have 49 per cent, Labor 39 and the independents 12. The margin is so great, it is argued, that even the crude measurement of a poll cannot this time be wrong.

For those holding the minority view, the polls confirm a growing intuition that a considerable segment of the British public has revolted against regimentation and bungling on the part of the struggling Labor Government. This is held to be particularly true of housewives and the middle class.

As is readily acknowledged in both camps, a great deal can happen in politics in three months. And here again American experience will be recalled—in that ancient phrase, "You pays your money and you takes your choice," calmly ignoring the prophets and the prognosticators.

Robert C. Ruark

Easier On Everybody

SAN FRANCISCO

WE have had a sweeping scrutiny of the inner turmoils and frustrations that led a Los Angeles man named Fred Stroble to criminally attack and finally to kill little Linda Joyce Glucoft. All except possibly the parents of the dead girl, are near about to weep for Mr. Stroble's twisted soul.

Psychiatrist Marcus Crahan, the psyche-feeler who serves as special consultant to the DA's office, says that fear, not sexual madness, drove the man to the murder and that "he loved Linda Joyce more than anything in the world."

"That is the key to the man's personality," said Dr. Crahan. "A twisted sort of love that led to the death of the loved one. He misses her now," the Doc added wistfully.

The psychiatrist went on to say that poor Mr. Stroble's whims of the libido were aggravated by a senility which weakened his inhibitions. He also appears to have been an exhibitionist too timid to be aggressive with adult women. His latent tendencies reared when his marriage broke up and "he had too much time on his hands."

This is all very reasonable and even interesting, except, again, to the parents of the little dead girl and the little dead girl herself. Unfortunately it does not alter the fact that none of Mr. Stroble's bizarre psychic conflicts were the fault of Linda Joyce Glucoft, age 6.

Nor is Mr. Stroble's desire to hack the child to pieces because of loneliness apt to be of much comfort to the parents. You might even say that the slain baby is just as dead because of being killed because Stroble loved her as she would be if he had killed her because he disliked her.

The sad fact is that from the day Stroble touched his first child he was a mortal cinch to succumb to panic and kill some waif. The sadder fact is that he was a fugitive on jumped bail from a morals arrest and the law didn't care enough about it to make the effort to retrieve him. These are the interesting revelations of Stroble's piteous plight that most interest the parents of the dead girl—that and whether this nasty old man is either confined permanently to his well of loneliness by the law or executed as summarily as a gunman who scrags the teller in a bank stickup.

There are innumerable bumps and stone bruises on the souls of all criminals, since that is what leads them to rob or shoot or set fire to old ladies for fun, and if even an amateur psychologist talks long enough he can find enough excuses to dampen every eye in the house. Most crooks being hams anyhow, once caught they are not averse to helping out the investigation with a few extra frills in the way of soul symptoms.

THEORIES, THEORIES

That this society is so knotty some people can't conform to it is lamentable, indeed. I also have heard that there are no bad children, only bad parents, and that the sins of the man rest firmly on the foundation of his unhappy childhood. There also is a saying that criminals are not bad; they are only sick.

I am prepared to go along with this as a theory and to moan and commiserate with the collared crook until my eyes are puffy, but in actual practice I am not inclined to feel as sorry for the killer as the killed, the robber as the robbed.

I may have said once before that the modern tendency is to ignore the corpse and weep for the soul delinquent who sped him on his way. The idea is to forget that the corpse didn't ask for it and probably was not even indirectly responsible for the lamentable state of the slayer's soul or digestion.

In the case of the wanton attackers of children it seems unimportant to speculate on the causes that underlie the deed. It seems more important to make second offenses in sex crimes punishable by life imprisonment, because it will just save the trouble of electrocuting the guy later on, when he blows his top and stuffs some kiddie in a culvert.

And it would be much easier on the kids.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Senators Take Big Holiday In Spain

WASHINGTON

HERE is a contrast between what two groups of Americans have done to influence their country's standing abroad. One is the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Texas. The other is the half-inebriated Senate appropriations subcommittee traveling through Spain.

First, the antics of the Senators.

The subcommittee, headed by Sen. Elmer Thomas of Oklahoma, traveled in a special Air Force plane, including six crew members, two stenographers, three clerks, three wives and a doctor—Dr. William E. Lovelace of Albuquerque—to look after the health of New Mexico's Sen. Dennis Chavez.

"They call this a junket," carefully explained Senator Thomas to newsmen, "but that's a misnomer. The country's spending seven billions of the taxpayers' money, and the taxpayer is entitled to know how the money is being spent. That's what we're looking after."

But the Senator glossed over the fact that the USA is spending not one cent of money in Spain. "One of the Senators had a relative in Spain he wanted us to meet," Thomas explained, presumably referring to Senator Chavez.

Arriving in Madrid at 3:30 P. M. Saturday, the committee was received by Foreign Minister Martín Artajo, then attended a reception at the American embassy, then drove the next day to Toledo, attended a fiesta, witnessed the training maneuvers of some young bulls for a bull-fight and saw a gypsy "flamenca" dance.

During the latter part of this fast-moving entertainment, several of the Senators obviously were in no condition to report intelligently on what they were seeing.

Bibulous Senators

THIS column is not interested in whether a public official drinks or doesn't drink. We have no great concern even if he gets blotto—as long as it's in private. But when a group of U. S. Senators spend the taxpayers' money on an official mission where they represent the United States Government, then they have an obligation to keep sober—at least in public.

The United States has great prestige in Spain. Americans are considered sober, hard-working people. Therefore, it does not help us as a nation when a group of Senators act as if they were on a week-end binge.

Senators Maybank of South Carolina and Robertson of Virginia were abstentious. But, in varying degrees, their colleagues were not.

As the festivities wore on at Toledo, the Spanish hosts tried hard to get food into their friend, Senator Chaves of New Mexico, who kept on mumbling:

"I'm a Catholic, a Spaniard and a Yankee gentleman, and I don't give a ——— who knows it."

Finally, Senator Thomas, whom the Spanish press referred to as "Cotton" Thomas, corralled most of his committee plus the Spanish hosts around a table as if he were presiding over his Senate Agriculture Committee back in Washington, and tried to hold a hearing. But everybody wanted to talk at once. Finally, the Senator from Oklahoma concluded:

"I move that the foreign minister convey this information to this young man, the ambassador." He pointed to charge d'affaires Paul Culbertson, who is not an ambassador, due to the fact that the UN, in a very important debate, has voted against ambassadors to Spain. "He," continued Thomas, "will then convey it to the State Dept. which always keeps the Senate well-informed."

Maybe The Swedes Were Right

IN other words, if the Senators were going to get their report from the State Dept. anyway, they might just as well have saved the taxpayers' money and stayed at home.

Finally, one American asked Senator Thye of Minnesota: "Why did you come here at all? It's obvious that you can't see anything during this brief week-end."

"Well," replied Thye, who at home is a serious, hard-working Senator, "we have a military attache here. And we have a naval attache here. And we have consulates. And it's our duty to see that they are properly representing the United States."

"But you arrived on a Saturday afternoon when these offices aren't open," remonstrated the American, "and you leave Monday morning before they open."

"You've seen a fiesta, you've had a siesta, and you've danced a flamenca," added an American lady, "but what have you seen of Spain?"

Undaunted, the Senators flew to Paris in their special Air Force plane Monday morning. And out of their vast fund of week-end knowledge about Spain, they announced that Dictator Franco should receive an American loan of $100,000,000.

NOTE—Maybe the Swedes were wise in not rolling out the red carpet for the Thomas committee.

Texas Diplomats

IN contrast, here is what the Junior Chamber of Commerce is doing in Texas:

The Jaycees' program is called "universal understanding", and since they have no Air Force airplane and can't use the taxpayers' money to tour Europe, their plans are not so ambitious as the Senators', though probably more effective.

What they are doing is forming contacts by mail with groups of young men in Europe in order to exchange letters and get better acquainted. The Jaycees of Amarillo, Texas, for instance, are writing to young men in Salzburg, Austria, which is about a two-hour drive from the Iron Curtain.

In Salzburg, Austrian youth at first formed the Austrian-American Youth Bridge in order to learn more about the USA, later wanted to set up a Junior Chamber of Commerce of their own. Next year the Amarillo Jaycees are sending a Texan to Austria so they can all get better acquainted.

This unspectacular, people-to-people friendship by a lot of American groups all over the country is doing more to plant a solid foundation for peace than all the junketing Senators combined. Eventually, and if practiced widely enough, it may build a more solid understanding than the Marshall Plan.

NOTE—When the Salzburg youngsters wanted to set up a Junior Chamber of Commerce, Eric Geiger of Salzburg wrote the Amarillo Jaycees about their problem in getting permission from the Government to change their constitution. Imagine the Elks, the Lions clubs, Rotary or the Knights of Columbus having to get permission from the Government every time they wanted to change their constitution!