THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1950

POLITICS AND RECREATION

AFTER months of public discussion, the Park & Recreation Commission is scheduled to make a final decision on the Latta Park recreation building site at its meeting tomorrow. At the moment it appears that the previous decision on the Winthrop Ave. site will stand.

The chronology of the long controversy begins with the original selection of a barren, stony knoll almost in the middle of the long, narrow park. Had the building been placed there, it would have faced on Romany Road at the intersection of Carlton Ave. It still appears to be the most desirable site of all because of central location, inability to use the rocky hill for anything else, and ample space for off-street parking.

Following strenuous protests from residents of that area, the Commission looked about for another site, and found a very good one in the triangle of land formed by the curve of Winthrop Ave. between the Park Ave. and Myrtle Ave. intersections. The spot satisfied most of the requirements, and the Commission voted to put the building there.

Since that time, three new Commissioners have been appointed to the Board, replacing men whose terms had expired, and a fourth has been appointed to fill a vacancy. Furthermore, a third suggestion has been made by Mayor Shaw and has since been endorsed by school officials—that the building be placed on the Dilworth School playground bordered by Berkley and Euclid Avenues. (The playground is on land owned by the Commission.)

Chairman Halberstadt has agreed to reopen the question tomorrow to give the new appointees (a majority of the Commission now) a chance to consider the matter. One new appointee, Mr. Sides, has said he will stand by the old decision. Unless there are defections, that means the choice of the Winthrop Ave. site will be reaffirmed.

The editors of THE NEWS do not profess to be experts in education and recreation and would have, at best, only an off-hand opinion about the respective merits of the various sites.

But THE NEWS does fear that the non-political status of the Park & Recreation Commission has been dangerously jeopardized by the political jockeying, both open and behind scenes, which has accompanied this controversy.

The time has come for the independent Commission to assert its independence, select the site it deems best for the use of all the people in the Dilworth area, and stand by that decision.

If the Commission is going to bend and sway with every political breeze, it might as well be abolished and public recreation placed under the more politically-conscious City Council.

KERR BILL VETO IN ORDER

PRESIDENT Truman's veto of the Kerr natural gas bill was called for because the bill was in direct conflict with the public interest.

The bill was a barefaced attempt by Senator Kerr of Oklahoma, who also is a partner in the large Kerr-McGee Oil Producing Co., to secure for a virtually non-competitive group of producers the freedom to charge all the traffic would bear for an essential commodity moving in interstate commerce.

Those supporting the bill worked mightily to pin a free-enterprise tag on it by exploiting the term "independent" producer. There are 2,300 of these "independent" producers, but three per cent of them control 70 per cent of gas sales.

If these producers had been freed from control, 85 per cent of the country's natural gas would also have been freed from control. When it is understood that consumers of gas can not shop around among producers as can coal and oil consumers, the picture becomes clearer. The price for natural gas would have rocketed sky high. Some opponents of the bill estimated that increases in gas rates would zoom to $500,000,000 a year.

With one exception—Senator Frank Graham—the members of North Carolina's Congressional delegation who voted were in favor of giving the gas producers a *carte blanche* in setting gas prices. They did so in spite of the fact that North Carolina may soon have access to natural gas.

Their names are Senator Hoey. Representatives Bonner, Carlyle, Chatham, Cooley, Dean, Jones and Kerr. (Not voting were Representatives Barden, Bulwinkle, Doughton, Durham and Redding.)

The margins by which the bill was passed in the House and in the Senate (House: 176-174; Senate: 44-38) were so narrow that Washington observers see little chance for Congress to override the veto.

If the attempt is made, however, the North Carolina legislators who voted with the gas interests of the Southwest would do well to reconsider the measure in the light of President Truman's forthright and convincing veto message.

MAJOR SMITH'S BIG ASSIGNMENT

TONY TOLAR'S charge that he was "crucified" for the Scott Administration can be dismissed as so much blather. Governorr Scott gave him an important post which carried with it a tremendous obligation, but Tolar didn't measure up to the assignment. No one impaled Tolar upon a cross. It was his own doing.

The important thing now is to forget this unhappy chapter in the history of a fine law enforcement group and concentrate on the task ahead—a reduction in our terrific highway death and injury toll.

Governor Scott acted wisely, we think, when he tapped a career man, Major James R. Smith, to take command of the Patrol. In doing so he took the top job out of politics, and left Smith free to strive for functional efficiency.

Major Smith's record is both lengthy and good. He should know by experience that the job of the State Highway Patrol is not an exciting and glamorous one, but often tedious and routine. It is to make the highways safer. And it can only be done by firmness and persistence and plain hard work.

The people of North Carolina hope that there will be no more of this aimless racing about the sirens whooping, but rather a calm and unceasing vigilance so that when they venture forth upon the public highway they may expect to return to their homes and offices safe and sound of limb.

IT'S THAT TIME AGAIN

NOW that the hot-stove league has heard the pennant song and the diamondeers of the great American game are racing about amid the sound of hickory on horsehide and now that the arcs are beginning to burn late into the night out at the old apple orchard it's time again to dish up to the ballbugs their annual lesson in baseball cliches.

To get down to basics early, an agate is a pill and a bludgeon is an ash. That's your equipment.

A sacker is a bagger, a chunker is a hurler, a backstopper is a plateman and a belter is a clouter.

The sacker never catches a baseball; he lays a glove on it or snags the sphere or picks one out of the air or swallows the pill. Some of them even glaum the globule.

The chunker never throws the ball; he delivers or gives offerings to the belter or lays it in there or uncorks one or elbows one over.

The belter, in turn, does not hit the ball; he belabors the pellet or pounds the bill or pokes the apple or slaps the sphere or cuts loose with a Ruthian clout. If he hits it hard it is not a hard hit ball; it is a sizzling liner or a scorcher or a grasscutter.

A few more useful definitions:

A diamond aggregation is a nine; a guesser is hizzoner; a portside flinger is a larboard slinger; a circuit is a loop; a blaster is a clout king; a tiff is a tilt, a skirmish is a sortie, an altercation is an affray, a melee is a mix, a ruckus is a rumpus, and a debacle is an embroilment.

And so, duty done, we can await with comfort the beginning of the flag pursuit confident that our own will cop the gonfalon after carving out many a win.

From The Christian Science Monitor

FIRST ROBINS (PLURAL)

SOMEONE reported seeing the "first robin" the other day. Someone else said he had seen the first robin more than a month ago. Still someone else pointed out that the first robin is the one that stays all Winter—and how many of these there are, who knows?

That was one debate which we frankly couldn't follow. It seemed to us that something was wrong with the premise—which was that only the first person to see a robin can assert he has seen the first robin.

There is something downright predatory in the theory that the first robin is a legal and ethical object of monopoly. It may be, we grant, an accepted doctrine of these otherwise semi-enlightened times. We recognize that it is generally applied in other fields (and gardens), as in the search for the first crocus in Britain and America, or for first violets and lilies of the valley in the Vienna Woods.

But we assail it. "Scarcity economics" we maintain—no, not contend, maintain!—has no real function in an order where there are robins enough to go around. In such an order there is either no first robin or there is a first robin for everybody—and that is the one that counts.

Psst! Give Him The Bean Ball

Tito Brightest Ray Of Hope In Darkness Of Communism

By JOSEPH ALSOP

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia

IT IS A CURIOUS thing to find almost the only sincerely hopeful, absolutely determined leaders in Europe in the very shadow of Soviet power. By some chance of history, brave men like Reuter in Berlin seem to have appeared wherever the threat was worst, the pressure most severe. In this widely assorted company the prominent figure is of course Tito of Yugoslavia.

The experience of meeting Marshal Tito has its surprises, even for an observer jaded by too numerous encounters with politicians. Here is the leader of a lengendary national resistance, chief of an iron dictatorship, former servant of the Kremlin who has defied his masters. A certain measure of theatrics seems to be in order.

Instead, you find that Tito is a brisk compact man, in hard physical training, pleasant mannered, pointed in his talk, with no trace of grandoise affectation. Incidentally, his photographs gravely belie him. There is nothing of Goering and a great deal of the partisan chieftain in Tito's face.

From such an inevitably general conversation with the heads of states, the observer obtains at best only a sort of feeling about the man and his role. Perhaps the best way to sum up the feeling produced by an hour with Marshal Tito is to say it is a feeling of hope.

This does not mean for a moment that Tito's Yugoslavia is a happy land or that the system in force here is to be admired by our standards. On the contrary, means have rarely been so ruthlessly subordinated to ends.

The dictator-state has gathered all power into its hands. The masses, the people are called upon to make the most grinding sacrifices. This is a Communist society in the first and hardest stage of its evolution. It is true that Yugoslavia, under daily attack by the Kremlin, could hardly preserve her independence without harsh use of state power. But it is also true that Tito's whole training in the international Communist underground must have imbued him with a willingness to use state power harshly, whenever necessary or expedient.

The unexpected feeling of hope that Tito inspires derives rather from the sense that this same stern training somehow failed in another respect. It evidently did not stamp out of Tito all respect for warm human values. Or it may be, he recaptured this respect for human values in his year in the woods, fighting side by side with ordinary men and women of his country.

He rejects the classical Kremlin system of making omelets without regard whatever for the number of human eggs broken in the process. Innumerable human eggs have been and are being broken here in Yugoslavia, there is no doubt about that. Yet the attitude is wholly different from the Russian attitude. There is none of that cold disinterest, that actual hinted pleasure in seeing life stamped out, that in the Soviet Union has sent whole nations into slavery or condemned them in mass to death.

Tito wants a better life for his people as soon as his system can afford it, and when life grows better, he means it to be more varied and above all more free. Furthermore, his desire to end the period of most acute sacrifice for the Yugoslav masses is about to produce a serious problem for the American government. He himself has said nothing on this subject. But unless all signs deceive, the Yugoslav government is about to ask Washington for more generous and regular aid, even sufficient to give the Yugoslav people more supplies of direly needed consumer goods.

For us, this problem will have double importance. In the first place it will be significant and valuable to discover whether Tito's Yugoslavia can genuinely evolve in the direction of greater generosity and human freedom, as Tito and his comrades certainly desire. In the second place, there is a hard American self-interest in the two other themes, besides betterment of his peoples lives, which also dominate Tito's discussion of his plans and hopes. One of these themes is Tito's absolute determination to maintain Yugoslavia's independence in the face of the Kremlin's worst threat. The other is the possibility of ending the cold war, if Yugoslavia's example can induce the Communist parties of Western Europe and the Communist governments of Eastern Europe to cast off their slavish subjection to Soviet imperialism.

In this dangerous and perhaps doomed world of the era after the second World War, the only salvation is to face plain facts plainly. One of these plain facts that must be faced is the vast strategic importance of Yugoslavia to the whole confederation opposing Soviet aggression. And the lesson of Tito is that this new Yugoslavia, whatever else it may be, is a good strategic and political investment for those who want cold war victory.

It's Used Freely Now

'Liar' No Longer A Fighting Word

By JOHN F. DAY
(In The Louisville Courier-Journal)

WASHINGTON

THERE was a time when a man who called another a liar automatically reached toward his hip pocket.

As a matter of fact, I wouldn't want to shout "liar" at one of my fellow Kentuckians today without being prepared to stand back of the epithet with at least my fists.

But it's gotten so around these parts a fellow can call another a liar and keep the respect impunity. He can do it without smiling. He can just roll it out without batting an eyelash, just as though he were passing the time of day.

In all truth, matters have got to a point where the simple, four-letter word "liar" is a weak and spineless thing. Any more a guy—or a woman either—has got to add some fancy modifiers if he expects more than a shrug out of the person spoken of and so much as a paragraph or two on the news wires.

Now recently a certain Senator from Wisconsin, whom we shall call Joe McCarthy, has been called "an unmitigated liar", "a contemptible liar" and a few other brands. But what did that husky ex-Marine do about it? He just turned around and called one of his Senate colleagues a liar. In fact, he put it real nice-like. Senator Tydings, he said, "either hasn't seen the FBI files or he's lying."

And what did Mr. Tydings do? With the disdain he can muster so well, he replied quietly, "I stand on my reputation for accuracy."

How To Say It Sweetly

WONDERING about the sorry state of the once-pungent word, I have turned to that amazing source book, The Congressional Record, to run down some of the phrases that have been employed to suggest that a man's veracity is not all it should be.

I don't mean to imply that members of Congress have any corner on methods of hurling the lie. But they are sufficiently adept that I'll bet they've used all that have been invented to date.

One finds there are gradations in impugning integrity, and the particular grade used depends upon (A) the speaker, (B) the state of his temper, and (C) the object of his ire.

First we have the indirect method. A person using it can easily declare later that it was not his intention to call anyone a liar. For instance, "The gentleman's statement is misleading and, I might say, inaccurate." Or, "That is mere hearsay." Or, "The facts are quite the contrary." Or, "That is grossly erroneous." Or, "The statement has no foundation in fact." Or, "There is not a scintilla of truth in what the gentleman said."

Or, To Put It Bluntly . . .

THEN we have a more direct method which does not employ the word "liar" itself. The best example is, "This man's charges are out of the whole cloth. Most everybody knows that means "the man is lying" but it's a safe bet very few people know where the expression came from and how "out of the whole cloth" came to be synonymous with lying.

This colloquialism can be traced back as far as writings of the 16th century, but apparently no one knows who first used it. It implies patched, or shoddy, practice—something taken from the whole piece of fabric. Tom Paine used it like this: "It is a lie out of whole cloth without a thread of truth running through."

Other expressions falling in the second category include: "That's a falsehood", "it shows an utter lack of regard for truth", . . . emitting gratuitous falsehoods", "vile insinuator".

And finally we have method Number 3, which really gets down to cases. When one operates in this category, he not only uses "liar" but searches valiantly for potent and expressive modifiers. This classification has grown so big, we can subdivide it.

Who You Calling A Liar?

FIRST, there are expressions that demand profanity: "Damnedest liar that ever lived."

Second, phrases that go into genetics: "Natural-born liar", "congenital liar", "pathological liar".

Third, phrases that express size: "Biggest liar on the face of the earth", "colossal liar", "monstrous liar".

Fourth, expressions that express petty lying: "Pusillanimous liar", "peewee liar", "low down liar", "degrading liar" "cowardly liar", "puerile liar".

Fifth, picturesque expressions: "Liar by the clock" "revolting liar", "double-barreled liar".

Sixth, miscellaneous: "Diabolical liar", "bare-faced liar", "notorious liar", "venomous liar", "deliberate and malicious liar", "mendacious liar" (that's redundant, since mendacious means lying, thus "lying liar"), "liar by choice", "audacious liar".

Then you which a few of them together and you have something like this (from a Senator's tirade against a columnist): "He is just an ignorant liar, a pusillanimous liar, a peewee liar, and he is a paid liar. . . I say that that statement is a wilful, deliberate, malicious, dishonest, intensely cowardly, low, degrading, filthy lie, out of the whole cloth."

Quote, Unquote

In Same Boat

(Warren Record)

A story I heard the other day is too good to keep. A special delivery letter through the Norlina Post Office was addressed to an old colored woman in this vicinity. She had come along at a time when educational opportunities for both colored and white were very limited in this section. One of the clerks took the letter out and when she had delivered it, handed her the receipt and making a cross mark on the dotted line said, "Aunty, just sign here." The old woman looked up, with a smile, into the clerk's face and said: "Law, Miss So and So, you has to sign your name with a cross mark just like I do, don't you?"

That's Tellin' 'Em

(Beatrice Cobb, Morganton News-Herald)

I shall likely go on talking and writing from time to time about things to eat, and those who don't enjoy eating have the privilege of skipping this little part of the paper.

Sudden Stops On Red

(Waynesville Mountaineer)

One of these freight-car long moving vans stopped for the Haywood Street red light, and people in the vicinity giggled as they read the sign on the side of the cab:

"This truck stops for crossroads, railroads, blondes and brunettes. For redheads it will back up 50 feet."

Students Are Individuals, Not Same As Peas In A Pod

By HENRY C. MCFADYEN

ONCE THERE WERE a mother and a father who had three daughters. Early in the game they decided that they would take great care to treat them all alike. They wanted no jealousy and bickering in their family.

When one child got a sucker, the other two got suckers too. As long as the children were small there was not much else the parents could do. As each girl reached the age of 10 she was given a bicycle. Each girl got a wrist watch when she graduated from high school—same kind of watches, of course. For not smoking until they were 18 each one got a diamond ring. Each one got exactly the same amount of money to go to college. When each one graduated from college she received another wrist watch, this one studded with diamonds. In the course of time each girl got married. Of course they couldn't all have husbands exactly alike, but the same amount of money was appropriated for each wedding.

No playing favorites in that family. What could have been fairer? Yet the three girls grew up as jealous as cats of each other. You might even say that in their attitude toward each other they never quite got at all. They were still in the sucker stage. There is not a piece of furniture or silver in the old home that is not already spoken for. What a squabble there is going to be if the will does not divide everything up in equal parts! NOT ALL ALIKE

Where these parents made their mistake, I think, was in treating three people alike when they were not alike at all. A child growing up in a family with other children does not need to get exactly what the others get. He should get what he himself needs within the limits of his family's ability to provide it for him. The only way parents need to treat all children alike is to love them all the same.

More than almost anything else a child needs to be treated—in home and in school—as an individual human being. Teachers who can somehow remember this in their dealings with hundreds of children are most successful teachers. Here is a child who works better when you praise him. Well, brag on him. The next one won't do anything unless you stay right on his neck all the time. Stay on it. He won't get mad. In his own way he will appreciate the fact that you are treating him in the individual manner that he needs. Just smiling and speaking to students can do more to make a happy orderly classroom than anything I know. How can a student do much meanness to a teacher who he knows likes him? Kids just don't cause any bad trouble to people who are good to them.

And when they do get out of line you can punish them without their resenting it. They accept correction or punishment gracefully only from people they feel are their friends.

This may seem to have gotten a long way from my story about the three daughters, but I don't think so. In the home and in the school every child is different from every other child. The more parents and teachers remember this, the better job they are likely to do.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Iran Veering Toward Russian Interest

WASHINGTON

DESPITE the red carpet rolled out for the likable young Shah of Iran during his lengthy visit to the USA, alarming diplomatic dispatches from the Near East indicate that Russia is getting closer to taking over his vital, oil-rich country.

Able U. S. Ambassador John Wiley has been cabling the State Dept. for weeks that Moscow is making tremendous progress in Iran. Its weapons are largely beyond control of the United States — political and economic turmoil growing out of the Shah's distinct lack of stability and government graft. These are bringing new members to the noisy Tudeh or pro-Communist Party, which is being egged on by Russian radio transmitters across the border.

The Shah, who made a big hit during his American visit, returned to announce "a holy war against corruption". However, this got him in wrong with wily politicians around the throne who now would be glad to dump him and play ball with Russia—provided they weren't afraid of being purged later by the Communists. Meanwhile, secret talks are taking place in Moscow on economic aid to Iran.

The crisis is moving so rapidly that diplomatic cables indicate the Shah has prepared a proclamation dissolving Parliament and revamping his government.

Presidential Poker

WHEN Government notables slip into the White House or aboard the Presidential yacht Williamsburg after dark, it isn't always to discuss problems of state but more often to play poker.

In fact, few White House sessions are more secret than the President's poker parties. He invites only the most intimate friends to sit at his poker table, usually eight at a time. There they see Truman's most sociable side, for he is full of mischief during a poker evening.

The President deals left-handed, loves to taunt anyone needing a particular card. When dealing, if he has dropped out of play, he will peek mischievously at the card before dealing, then slap it down and chuckle gleefully, if it's the wrong card. Sometimes he takes a pull of what his guests want to play, then deals something else.

aTruman enjoys playing with wild cards, particularly with the low hole-card wild. He is also fond of a game called "Papa Vinson", named in honor of Chief Justice Fred Vinson. This is ordinary stud, played with an extra draw. Another Truman favorite is regular seven-card stud, which he has dubbed "Jack Garner" in honor of the former Vice-President who made a fortune playing poker.

Fair Deal For Losers

THE President likes to play for fun, gets no kick out of letting the stakes run high and the game get grim. Sometimes at Key West recently the stakes were around $400. To take care of losers, Truman taxes 5 to 10 per cent of each stake which is paid into a special kitty; and when a losing player goes broke, he is entitled to a loan grant from the kitty. At the end of the game, the kitty is divided equally among all players.

Most Presidential poker sessions are held on the Williamsburg after dark. The President doesn't let them drag much past midnight, however, because he is an early riser.

When the poker chips are flying and the Presidential bourbon is flowing, the President forgets his burdens, and for a few hours becomes just plain Harry again.

NOTE—The three friends most frequently called up for Presidential poker games are Chief Justice Vinson; Clark Clifford, the ex-White House aide, and George Allen, the ex-White House jester. The President takes particular delight in beating Allen, chuckles merrily at Allen's poker luck.

Chilean Communism Vs. Copper

CHIEF stumbling-block in the path of friend-of-the-USA President Gonzales Videla of Chile during his trip to the United States is a quiet, efficient Senator from Arizona, Carl Hayden.

The highly respected Hayden works hard, speaks little, generally votes for the little fellow. But he also represents the great copper state of Arizona, where one company is especially anxious to have the 2-cents-per-pound excise tax on copper imports reinstated. This tax, amounting to a tariff against Chilean copper, will automatically go into effect June 30 unless Congress rules otherwise, and Senator Hayden probably has the power to say yes or no.

Other big copper companies—Anaconda and Kennecott—are less interested in the excise tax because they import from Chile as well as mining copper in the U. S. But Phelps-Dodge mines in the U. S.

This indirectly involves the State Dept.'s No. 1 ambassador, Lewis Douglas, envoy to London, whose Canadian family founded Phelps-Dodge. It also raises the question as to whether the State Dept could work a triple play—Douglas to Phelps-Dodge to Senator Hayden—in order to head off the copper tax against Chile.

Anyway, one point both the State Dept. and President Gonzales Videla agree on is that Communism is going to be a lot more difficult to suppress in Chile if copper exports to the U. S. are curtailed because of work stoppages. As in Iran, there is nothing that breeds Communism like unemployment.

NOTE — Ex-Sen. John Danaher of Connecticut, key hatchet man for the Republican National Committee, was once a relentless high-tariff man, but now is on the other side of the fence. He opposes Senator Hayden of Arizona and wants untaxed Chilean copper. Reason: Connecticut industries using copper retained him to lobby against the copper excise tax.

New Democrats

THE Democratic Party is busy doing missionary work among the 137,000 former aliens who have been sworn in as citizens since the last election and will vote for the first time this year.

Word has been sent to all Democrat state chairmen to compile a list of these naturalized citizens and make Democrats of them before November.

In many Congressional districts they might easily become the balance of power. For example, New York has 46,500 newly naturalized citizens; California, 18,500; Massachusetts, 8,500; New Jersey, 7,500; Michigan, 7,000; Illinois, 6,500; Pennsylvania, 5,500; and Ohio, 4,000. Even little Connecticut has 4,000 and Florida 2,000 former aliens who can now vote. What makes their votes count is that they are concentrated in one or two Congressional districts in each state.

This is the reason the Democratic Party is working so hard to convert them.