THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 30, 1951

'OPEN COVENANTS . . . OPENLY ARRIVED AT'

REPORTERS and spectators at yesterday's City Council session witnessed a new and pleasing procedure. At 3:20 P. M., when the Council was scheduled to retire to the Mayor's office for its customary private "executive" session, the members filed into the regular Council chamber, took their seats, and began talking informally about the taxicab ordinance that was to come up later.

For an hour they talked among themselves and listened to representatives of the taxi companies, while reporters took full notes. Promptly at 4:30 P. M., Mayor Shaw banged the gavel and the informal meeting became formal.

The event signified the temporary end of the regular private Council sessions which have been much in the news of late. They were ended on motion of Councilman Boyd. Let us hope they will never be resumed.

There are several reasons why star chamber proceedings have no place in Charlotte's City Government.

1. The Council handles the people's business, and ought to handle it in full view the people.

2. Debate and argument, a traditional part of the American legislative process, are sometimes more important and more revealing than the final voting. When questions are debated and decisions reached behind closed doors and merely rubber-stamped in public session, the people have an incomplete understanding of the legislation.

2. Furthermore, the people have no way to size up individual office holders when they transact all their business behind a curtain of secrecy and limit their public utterances to "yea" or "nay".

If those reasons are not enough for the Council to discard forever the much-abused private session, there is still another. Private sessions are illegal. The North Carolina law on the subject is quite clear. It says:

"The city governing body shall from time to time establish rules for its proceedings. Regular and special meetings shall be held at a time and place fixed by ordinance. All legislative sessions shall be open to the public, and every matter shall be put to a vote, the result of which shall be duly recorded. The governing body shall not by executive session or otherwise consider or vote on any question in private session. A full and accurate journal of the proceedings shall be kept, and shall be open to the inspection of any qualified registered voter of the city."

The members of the Council showed due regard for the written law and the unwritten rights of the people when they abandoned the private session. Now the sessions have been brought out in the open where spectators may hear every word and newspapers may report the proceedings in full for the thousands of citizens who cannot attend Council meetings in person. That's where they belong.

TEEN-AGERS AND MARIJUANA

IT would be just as incorrect, we believe, to say that the use of marijuana by teen-agers in Charlotte is extensive as it would be to say that it is nonexistent.

In calling for a sweeping investigation of narcotics traffic in Charlotte yesterday, Superior Court Judge H. Hoyle Sink may have caused some Charlottians to think that every youngsters who sneaks out of high school to smoke a cigarette is really inhaling a "reefer"—or marijuana cigarette.

Of course that was not Judge Sink's intent. The Judge realizes, obviously, that even 100 marijuana addicts among Charlotte's several thousand teen-agers are too many; if there were only a dozen, an investigation would be called for.

Neither Judge Sink nor Juvenile Officer Neal Forney can estimate how many Charlotte youngsters use marijuana regularly, but Judge Sink has revealed that there are "more than 40" sources of marijuana supply in the city. Someone, obviously, is buying the merchandise.

In any consideration of narcotics use by teen-agers we must guard against emotional attitudes that will give rise to unjustifiable fear. The narcotic habit is bad enough for an adult; with young people it approaches the tragic. Nonetheless, use of marijuana itself is more a social evil than a physical evil; there have even been those specialists on the subject who declare that marijuana isn't habit forming. The weed, which can be grown in almost any backyard, is to be feared most for its threat as a stepping stone—usually to heroin, a more potent narcotic that *is* habit forming.

Once the step from marijuana to heroin is taken, the road back to physical freedom becomes harder and harder. And, almost inevitably if the use of marijuana is continued, heroin (or, to be precise, diamorphine) is the next step—the marijuana peddler guarantees that.

There's not much profit in marijuana. In normal times you could buy a "reefer" for as low as 25 cents. Furthermore, the fact that "reefers" are probably not habit forming makes their sale a sporadic and unprofitable matter; the marijuana peddlers count heavily on switching the addict from marijuana to heroin. Heroin is relatively expensive; and, to make it worse, a tolerance for heroin is built up rapidly, requiring larger and larger quantities of the drug.

Doubtless marijuana has been obtainable in Charlotte for many years, but it is probable that the conditions noted by Judge Sink and Special Officer Forney are a local response to a post-war trend noticed throughout the nation.

So long as you are dealing with marijuana addicts the job of apprehension and rehabilitation is comparatively easy. Now is the time for vigorous investigation and action. A year's delay might make the problem one impossible of solution.

Judge Sink and Special Officer Forney are to be commended for putting the spotlight so squarely on the narcotics menace. We are sure that the city and county law enforcement agencies will be equally efficient and cognizant of the public welfare in their investigation. And we trust that Charlotte parents, having been alerted, will keep a closer watch over their young charges.

THE REDS TAKE ANOTHER BEATING

ONCE again, encouraging news from a far away land for the faint-hearted ones who doubt we can defeat Communism except by bullets.

In Italy, returns from city and provincial elections showed the Communists took their worst licking in five years. Prime Minister Alcide de Gasperi's Christian Democrat Party and its allies took over in Milan, Italy's second largest city, which has been governed by a Socialist regime. The Alcide bloc led in the Communist-run ports of Genoa and Venice, and struck the hardest blow of all by leading in Bologna, center of Italian Communist strength.

In the provincial councils, the Red membership was cut down to one-third, and the Reds lost heavily in the 1,170 town councils they have controlled since 1946.

The story in Italy is thus a repeat and a re-emphasis of the 1948 general elections when Marshall Plan aid turned the tables on the Communist agitators. And coming just before Congress is to take up an extension of the several foreign aid programs, it serves to remind us that Western Europe has been kept out of Moscow's clutches mainly by the intelligent use of our economic power to help our impoverished allies to their feet.

The kind of victory we have achieved over Communism in Western Europe is cheaper than a military victory, and it is more permanent. Let us hope the Congress remembers that in evaluating our financial ability to continue the foreign economic aid programs.

TAKE A BOW, MR. POST

HAVING just attended a Chapel Hill conference at which the editorial page of THE NEWS was dissected by an able and acerbic critic, the editors of this newspaper are acutely aware of their own shortcomings and properly respectful of the quality of other pages.

Thus it is with considerable admiration for its editorial page that we note the tenth anniversary of *The Cleveland Times*, a bi-weekly published in Shelby and edited by young Ed Post Jr.

The Times has many things to crow about. Its news coverage is good, its typography impressive, and it is quite obvious that a great deal of care and devotion is lavished upon its editorial page which, for courage of convictions, forthrightness, and sheer literary quality, often excels many of the larger newspapers in the daily field.

The Shelby paper is not the only Tar Heel non-daily that can pride itself on its editorial page. Weimar Jones' *Franklin Press*, Mrs. James Boyd's *Southern Pines Pilot*, Louis Graves *Chapel Hill Weekly*, Tom Lassiter's *Smithfield Herald*, to name but a few, need bow to none of the bigger papers for excellence and readability.

As we make our manners to *The Cleveland Times* on its anniversary, we voice the hope that as it grows older it will lose none of the youthful vigor displayed on its editorial page in the first decade of its useful public service.

The instability of fame is illustrated by the headline of the New Orleans Item on the MacArthur dismissal. With front page pictures of Truman and the General, the paper said, "Yesterday, A Medal; Today, A Tin Can."—*Greenville (S. C.) Piedmont.*

News from Virginia: From Buena Vista it is reported we won't have war with Russia if Stalin does not criticize Margaret's singing.—*Grenada County (Miss.) Weekly.*

What good is it going to do the long-suffering consumer for prices to "level off" if they level off at prices higher than he can ever hope to be able to pay?—*Sparks (Ga.) Eagle.*

There is a story of a Kentuckian who called for a doctor and a stomach pump. While taking a bath he accidentally swallowed a mouthful of water.—*Kingsport (Tenn). Times.*

'Let's Not Underestimate The Danger Of Aggression!'

The Clarendon County Case

Background On Segregation Suit

An Editorial From The Greenville (S. C.) Piedmont

AS the suit of a group of Negro citizens against certain school authorities in Clarendon County goes to trial before a special three-judge United States court in Charleston, the NAACP attorneys, representing the plaintiffs, will attempt to prove conclusively more than the fact that facilities for Negro pupils in Clarendon County are generally inferior to those for white pupils. They will have no trouble proving that lamentable fact.

More important, they will attempt to persuade the court, as they will the United States Supreme Court when the case reaches that body, that the 58-year-old Supreme Court doctrine of "separate but equal" facilities is false. They will contend that the fact of segregation of the races in schools is of itself discrimination, that segregated schools cannot be in fact equal, and that the segregation practice of South Carolina and sixteen other states having laws on the subject is in violation of the United States Constitution.

The State's attorneys will not contend that the separate facilities provided for the races in South Carolina are equal. They would not be so foolish. They will, instead, submit that the "separate but equal" doctrine established as a precedent in such cases in 1896 is still valid. They will admit that the valuation of school property set aside for Negroes in South Carolina is about $11 million, while that for whites is in excess of $70 million.

But they probably will show that, while Negro facilities have lagged behind, as has the tax-paying ability of Negro citizens, the State has made considerable progress in education for Negroes. They can show that, in some instances, certain schools for Negroes are superior to the average white schools and that still others are equal to or superior to the best, at least in their respective counties.

* * *

THEIR strongest argument may be the intentions of South Carolina to establish equality of educational opportunity as shown by the school program enacted at the recent session of the State Legislature. Because theirs is the greatest need, the Negro schools probably will, for a time at least, receive priority in the school construction program. Negro children in rural areas, for the first time, will be transported to and from school under the new state-wide school transportation program.

Already, Negro teachers are classified and paid according to the same schedule of qualifications as are the white teachers under the State teacher certification program.

The attorneys will have to admit that this program has been delayed. They will have to admit that it took the leadership of a James F. Byrnes to convince South Carolina that it must set about equalizing educational opportunities for the races, not only because it is expedient, but "because it is right."

They will have to ask that the "separate but equal" doctrine be upheld in order that the State may have time to put these plans into effect. And it will have to be admitted that some years will be required, especially in view of the tense national and international situation.

Over against this promise of better things to come in education for Negroes, the attorneys will paint a picture of the consequences of a court decision and order outlawing segregation and directing integration of the races in the public schools. They will point to the impossibility of changing modes of living, bias and prejudice—and, by the same token, the hastening of the uplifting of ignorant masses—by legislative enactment or court order. They will cite the reasoning of the United States Supreme Court on this subject in the case of Plessy vs. Ferguson in 1896.

* * *

IT does no good, of course, to say that South Carolina should have prepared to meet this problem years ago (five years would have helped) and that it should have foreseen the developments. But that is the truth of the matter. The warnings were loud and clear.

Unfortunately, these warnings, which take the form of United States Supreme Court decisions setting up standards by which NO school could be considered the equal of another, tend to indicate a trend.

However, it is a policy of the Supreme Court to avoid ruling on questions the deciding of which is not necessary to the disposal of a particular case. It is also a policy of the Court to decide only one case at a time, on its own merits, and to avoid decisions which have blanket effect.

This is why the Court evaded the segregation issue in deciding the Texas and Oklahoma cases involving Negroes seeking entrance to state-supported graduate schools formerly maintained exclusively for white students. It also is why the decisions in the Texas and Oklahoma cases did not, at one and the same time, order the admission of Negroes to the University of South Carolina and Clemson College.

However, the reasoning of the Supreme Court in these cases and in the opinion written by Judge Soper of the Appellate Court in the recent North Carolina case, is significant.

In the Texas case, a Negro named Herman Marion Sweatt asked admission to the law school of the University of Texas. He stated that he would not enter the Negro law school maintained by the State of Texas even if the facilities were identical. He was aided in his suit not only by the NAACP, but by Solicitor General Philip Perlman and Attorney General J. Howard McGrath of the Department of Justice, which intervened in the name of the United States Government, and by the CIO, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and other organizations.

The plaintiffs, including the intervening Government officials, asked that the segregation principle be set aside. But the court held it did not have to rule on this question.

Even so, in deciding that Sweatt had to be admitted on grounds that the school for Negroes was not "equal," the Court set up such standards for measuring equality that the "separate but equal" doctrine was seriously undermined, so seriously that its outright overthrow would be a comparatively easy step for a politically-minded court.

* * *

A SINGLE excerpt from the opinion, written by Chief Justice Vinson, serves to illustrate this point. It is this:

"The University of Texas Law School (the white school) possesses to a far greater degree those qualities which are incapable of measurement but which make for greatness in a law school. Such qualities, to name but a few, include reputation of the faculty, experience of the administration, position and influence of the alumni, standing in the community, traditions and prestige."

This same decision, or related ones, went on to maintain that to deny Negro law students the opportunity to study with and associate with the white students, who would be the leading lawyers and judges of the future, was to deny them equality of opportunity.

The tenor of these decisions, and that of the recent North Carolina case, tends to indicate that the courts may now, once and for all, overthrow the separation doctrine and order integration.

However, one plea in the Clarendon suit may afford the chance for the Court to once more sidestep the segregation issue in the interest of realism and the practical if gradual solution of the race problem in the South and elsewhere in the nation. It is the plea which argues that the facilities in Clarendon County for Negroes are inferior to those for whites. The Court could seize upon this as the cr of the case and order the authorities concerned to equalize educational facilities for Negroes —or else.

No one can predict a decision of the United States Supreme Court, but the thinking citizens of South Carolina, white and Negro, hope that the "separate but equal" doctrine will be upheld—and that the word "equal" will become a reality.

India Importance Heightened By Communist Acts In Tibet

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

THAT FARTHEST away of all places, Tibet, is once again in the news. If the Chinese Communist radio can be believed, and there is good reason to think that this time it is telling approximately the truth, this remote "roof of the world" is now behind the Iron Curtain.

The news recalls an evening in New Delhi, India, last October. In a sitting room in the huge official residence in which he lives, Prime Minister Nehru was talking about Communist China. With the eloquence and the brilliance that are so much a part of this complicated figure, who stands symbolically torn between East and West, Nehru expressed his belief that the regime in Peiping would necessarily be preoccupied with the overwhelming task of reconstruction inside China.

The first hints had begun to appear in the press that Chinese Communist troops were about to march on Tibet. I had suggested to Nehru that a regime bedeviled with problems inside the country might seek to distract attention by military adventures beyond the borders. Military conquerors have always found it difficult to stop and consolidate their gains once they have achieved their initial goal.

Furthermore, behind the crude boasting and the noisy claims made by the brash, raw regime in Peiping was, it seemed to me, an element of deep insecurity. Having come to power through war and revolution, Mao Tse-Tung and the men around him were fearful that they would be driven out again by force and violence. Just as Russia has felt compelled to surround herself by satellites to try to secure her own borders, so the Communist Chinese are compelled to continue their conquests.

But Nehru, speaking in that beautifully modulated voice with the accent that is neither Cambridge nor Anglo-Indian, rejected any such notion. The Chinese had to overcome the ravages of 30 years of almost constant upheaval. They had so much to do at home that it was inconceivable they would deliberately seek foreign adventure.

Strangely enough at the same time Nehru had been talking about the threat of Communist Chinese intervention in the war in Korea as the United Nations armies moved across the 38th Parallel. He had passed the warning on to London and Washington and it had been received in Washington at least, with considerable skepticism. But the Prime Minister continued to believe that the Chinese would in some way make good on their threat if United States troops continued their advance into North Korea.

He was right about that. He was wrong about Tibet. That fastness in the high Himalayas with all its strategic importance looking down on India and Pakistan and menacing the border areas where the Communist peril is already greatest, will now be closed to the non-Communist world.

This is a serious loss and there is no reason to minimize it. How it might have been prevented, given the difficulties of distance and the primitive nature of the country, is something else again.

Nehru talked on through the stillness of the Indian night and it seemed to me that as he discussed the grave internal problems of the Chinese Government in Peiping he was in reality speaking of his own fantastically difficult task. He is trying to make a modern democratic state out of India with the odds heavily against success.

His vacillation, his uncertainty in turning first one way and then another, can be explained in part by the burden he carries in a country with almost as many internal problems, growing out of war and revolutionary upheaval, as in China. Nehru has shown in recent months a remarkable facility for making confused and confusing statements on foreign policy. These statements have angered many in Washington and they contributed to the delay in passage of the loan under which India will be able to obtain urgently needed grain.

That loan now seems on the way to approval and without the hampering restrictions that would have made it unacceptable to the Indian Government. A House majority, including both Republicans and Democrats, acted with maturity and understanding in the face of provocative statements from those who were determined to kill the loan-to-India bill if not by direction then by indirection.

In spite of the sometimes baffling behavior of Nehru, it is vital to try to help India through this difficult period. There are very definite limitations on what America can do. But everything should be done that is reasonably possible within those limits. This becomes all the more important in view of what has happened in Tibet.

New Wage Rises In Prospect As Management Okays Boost

(Editorial Research Reports)

WASHINGTON

New wage rises for hundreds of thousands of workers are indicated as a result of a revision of basic wage policy which the reconstituted eighteen-man Wage Stabilization Board is to initiate on Thursday. One result could be a new regulation replacing the current standard allowing raises of 10 per cent on wages in effect as of January 15, 1950. More probable is the establishment of a flexible wage ceiling.

Both labor and management appear to be in favor of readjustment upward. According to the U. S. Bureau of Labor's Monthly Labor Review, "pressure for wage increases" comes from both groups. "Some employers expressed the need for adequate wage levels in order to attract or hold their labor force."

The willingness of management to grant wage increases reflects the growing shortage of labor. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that a 2.3 million expansion of the nation's labor force by December 1951 will be necessary to meet the increased demands of defense industry. Unemployment was down to 1.7 million in April.

Part of the impetus for the drive toward higher wage levels is attributed to the WSB Regulation 8, which approves — until June 30 — escalator contracts signed before Jan. 25, 1951. Almost three million workers are now covered by such agreements.

These call for periodic wage adjustments in relation to changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumers' Price Index or in other cost-of-living yardsticks. The number of workers covered by escalator contracts has increased by more than five times in the last twelve months. More than a million employees are under such contracts signed since Jan. 25, 1951, and hence not yet specifically approved by Regulation 6.

The present limit on wage increases was established by the WSB Regulation 6, effective Feb. 27. Under that ruling, wage rises were allowed up to 10 per cent of wages paid during "the first regular pay roll period for each appropriate employee unit ending on or after Jan. 15, 1950."

That formula has already been cracked on several occasions, in addition to Regulation 8. The Defense Production Act of 1950, which provides the authority under which the WSB was formed, exempts certain kinds of work from wage ceilings.

On April 25 Economic Stabilization Director Johnston approved a six-cents-an-hour increase, which increase for more than a million nonoperating railroad workers. The raise was 3 1-2 cents above the WSB 10 per cent ceiling. On May 18 an increase of nine cents an hour was allowed for some 225,000 packinghouse employees. Johnston is expected to approve the wage increase agreements reached by the railroads on May 25 with the trainmen, and similar agreements on the horizon with the other operating rail workers.

Among collateral problems facing the new WSB, the major items are tandem wage adjustments, new escalator arrangements, wage rates in new plants, productivity clauses, fringe benefits, hardship and inequity cases.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Honest Meat Dealers Are Forgotten Men

WASHINGTON

MOST housewives don't realize it, but the honest dealers are the forgotten men in the big squabble over the price of beef. These wholesale and retail meat men are caught between two of the most powerful and vocal groups in the nation—the organized meat packers and the angry, unorganized housewife.

Hundreds of these wholesalers and retailers have been taking their beating in silence because, if they protest, they fear they'll be black-balled by the big packers. And they have good reason to fear the packers' wrath. For the few wholesalers who have had the temerity to protest about price-gouging packers were immediately cut off from their meat supply and forced out of business.

Sally Rand, the famous fan dancer, filed a complaint to the OPS, and the packers find out about it, I'll never be able to buy another pound of meat. I'd have to leave the meat business and become a wholesaler for vegetarians."

Here is what the meat middlemen are up against:

When the Government freeze was imposed last January, choice beef in carload lots was selling for a top price of 53 cents a pound. Despite the freeze, and in direct violation of the Government's order, the price of exactly the same carload of beef continued to mount. By April the price had moved up to 57 cents, was even quoted openly at this figure in the trade journals.

Grocer Gets Squeezed

THIS four-cent rise at the wholesale level meant about a ten-cent rise per pound to the housewife—if the local grocer passed on the illegal increase. But if he didn't pass it on, he had to pocket the loss and thereby risked going bankrupt.

More recently OPS has adopted a new pricing formula, whereby each cut of beef is given a specific price, and the price must be posted for the housewife's inspection.

This new scheme is aimed at showing up the price gouger and bringing an end to the black market. But, to get around the law, some packers—including some of the biggest names in the industry—have now come up with a new wrinkle. They're forcing their customers to accept tie-in sales, to buy unwanted cuts of meat in order to get the most salable cuts. One wholesaler, for example, was recently forced to buy 4,000 pounds of highly perishable sausage he couldn't possibly sell. Nevertheless the packer required him to buy the sausage before he could purchase a single carload of beef.

Net result of this price gouging by the meat packers is an intolerable squeeze on the wholesaler and retailer. He's frequently forced either to sell above ceiling price or go out of business.

Friend Of Big Business

GOP CONGRESSMAN Kenneth Keating of New York has emerged as the newest Congressional champion of big business.

Keating's district, Rochester, N. Y., is a long way from California; yet it was he who pulled chestnuts out of the fire for Pacific Gas and Electric in California and sponsored the amendment killing urgently needed Government power lines.

Colleagues who wondered what the Rochester, N. Y., Republican was doing meddling in California affairs also were astonished when he popped up as sponsor of another project of the big-business lobbies—aimed at crippling the anti-trust laws.

His amendment would undercut a plan proposed by another Republican, Herbert Hoover, who, when President, urged that the Clayton anti-trust act be strengthened in order to prevent the acquisition of "assets such as factories and equipment in mergers that created unfair trade competition.

Presidents Roosevelt and Truman both followed up Hoover's recommendation and finally this important addition to the Clayton anti-trust law was passed by Congress last December. One of those who voted for it was Rep. Keating of New York.

However, when it came time to appropriate funds by which the Federal Trade Commission could put the new law into operation, Keating had a mysterious change of heart.

He calmly rose on the House floor and sabotaged the measure he had once championed by offering an amendment cancelling $245,000 of enforcement funds needed by the Trade Commission. The amendment carried by a vote of 73 to 49. And since a law is no good without funds to enforce it, the law Keating originally voted for now becomes just so much printed paper.