

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

PROFIT, PERHAPS, FROM WISCONSIN DEFEAT

WEST central Wisconsin is dairy country. It's also 'Progressive' country. In the fine, old sense of the word that the fighting LaFollettes imparted when they dominated the Wisconsin political scene. Both Democratic victory and Republican loser in Tuesday's Congressional election there were former Progressives. Wisconsin's more recent political contribution to the nation, 'McCarthyism', was not figure substantially in the campaign. It was fought on clear-cut party lines, between a liberal Republican, who asked to be on the team, and a liberal Democrat, who asked to be on the team. The first Democrat to win in a district that had never sent a Democratic Congressman to Washington, a district that only last November gave President Eisenhower a thumping majority of almost two to one. But he did, handsily, with about 6,000 votes to spare out of a total of some 51,000 cast.

TWO MEASUREMENTS OF CHARLOTTE WEALTH

JUST A MINUTE. Don't throw that big party yet. Don't give your relatives down to get rich in Charlotte, just because that article in Look has the Queen City leading Southeastern cities in average family income. Let's take a close look at Look's figures.

In the first place, they are from the 1950 census, based upon 1949 income. Maybe the relative standings of Southeastern cities have changed since 1949. Secondly, only 12 of the cities in the seven Southeastern states are listed in the survey. While Charlotte led the field, with an average annual family income of \$3,346, Baton Rouge, just outside the Southeastern area, had an API of \$3,593.

This matter of 'average' is also misleading. To arrive at an average you of course add the income of all the families and divide by the number of families. But another statistical term, the 'median', puts another in a different light. The median is the amount so chosen that half the families make less than the amount, and the other half make more. We can't locate any statistics on the median family income in 1949, but that year the median individual income was only \$1,876.

AND THE CHANGE GOES ON IN WASHINGTON

SOMETHING has got to be done about the Weather Bureau.

And as for the National War College, its days are numbered.

In fact, it's plain to see that the whole federal government is in for a shake-up. Here are the meaningful signs:

The other day Drew Pearson turned his gaze from Charlotte long enough to take his readers behind the closed doors of the Joint Congressional Committee on Taxation. There traceable Chairman Dan Reed had the nation's No. 1 tax collector, T. Coleman Andrews, on the griddle.

Why, snorted the Congressman, has the name of the Bureau of Internal Revenue been changed to 'Internal Revenue Service'?

Well, said Mr. Andrews, "All we did was to give it its right name. Frankly, from the standpoint of calling as important an activity as tax collection a 'bureau', with all of the opprobrium that attaches to that name, I think it was a good thing."

Now if Mr. Andrews alone had sought to dress up governmental nomenclature we would pass it off as merely the whim of a stubborn Virginian. But his colleagues have joined him. Agriculture Secretary Benson shuns the word "surplus," uses "excess reserves." "Foreign aid" is no longer in Harold Stassen's vocabulary—the affairs of his agency are labeled "mutual security."

And the other day Oleta Culp Hobby explained how the name she proposed for her bill, "Department of General



Difficulties Of Repatriation

The 23,000 Panmunjom Pawns

BY JOSEPH ALSOP

IF we continue the Korean War for many years, costly months in order to avoid international repatriation of its prisoners, only to be confronted with something like forcible repatriation at the bitter end?

The question is very insistent here in Panmunjom, among the black brown hills where the 23,000 prisoners near their fears behind barbed wire while the Indian guards march slowly to and fro and the neutral nations repatriation commission elaborately and politely debates technicalities. It is harder, it seems, to find a free choice of men than one would have thought. It can even be a cruel business, deadly to some of those who must be repatriated.

U. S. 'Psy-Warriors' Blamed

PARTLY, one must add, the trouble also comes from the fact that the United States has no good way to handle the prisoners for their repatriation. We had to persuade them, in fact, to come to Panmunjom from their former camps without compensation. But it can be that the Army's free wheeling psychological warriors have helped to inflame the situation. The United States has been blamed for the Korean fighting, but as full fledged neutrals hardly differing from the Swiss and the Swedes. Hence, the neutrals that gave the prisoner lists to the Communists.

Hints Of Reprisal

HAVE the rosters of the prisoners, given to the Indian custodial force at the time of the prisoner turnover, now been handed on to the repatriation commission as a whole? Yes, says the general, surely this was normal procedure. (So the repeated warning of the U.N. commission before the Communist "explanations," the prisoners can be threatened with hints of reprisal to their families if they do not change their minds.) And how about this business of the "explanations" being compulsory, and the rules of the commission requiring the prisoners to attend several "explanations"? Here the general is not clear about his own rules. At first he says, of course explanations are compulsory. But then he says, "The prisoners have at least not in the end of the wedge for something a bit like brain washing."

People's Platform

BOYD A 'Poor Man's McCarthy'

Editors, THE NEWS:

IF Drew Pearson has done nothing else in Charlotte, he has accomplished this: He has given the people a platform on which to stand. He has done this by using every word and phrase he has rehearsed in his years of attempting to catch the public eye. He has done this by using every word and phrase he has rehearsed in his years of attempting to catch the public eye. He has done this by using every word and phrase he has rehearsed in his years of attempting to catch the public eye.

Liked News Pictorials

Editors, THE NEWS:

CHIEF of the "News Pictorials," they were called, the best features on safety that I've ever seen. And the pictures are so clear.

If you boys should read out of ideas how you should let the public suggest ideas and see them named?

DOROTHY KNOX

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

HOUSE Speaker Joe Martin not only preaches economy, but practices it.

He's sailing today on the SS America, his private "look see" through Europe, Germany, Italy and France; and, as top man in the House of Representatives, he could have found a dozen easy excuses for the trip "official," thus have the taxpayers foot the bill. But he didn't.

A lone rider on the "happened on the way" day," Martin told friends. "I got a call from the State Department. They'd heard about my trip to Europe and asked me to ask me to do a couple of special favors for them over there."

They told me what they wanted and I agreed to help them. They said they'd follow at the State Department. They'd heard about my trip to Europe and asked me to ask me to do a couple of special favors for them over there."

Fifth Amendment Controversy Poses Dilemma For Government

By JAMES MARLOW WASHINGTON

ATTY. GEN. Brownell illustrates the dilemma in trying to make witnesses before Congressional committees answer questions about any Communist connections they might have.

He said yesterday he will back, with changes, a bill being considered by Congress to force such witnesses to answer. Should Congress pass it, the measure would be tested by the first black witness. That could mean a long court fight.

The dilemma already has a long history. Witnesses wanting to duck questions about communism have taken refuge behind the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution. Their main reliance now is on the fifth, not the first.

Several years ago a committee and 10 Hollywood writers about Communist ties. Some of them said that under the First Amendment which guarantees freedom of speech, they didn't have to answer.

They interpreted the guarantee of freedom of speech to mean also freedom of political belief. They argued the committee question was asking them to reveal their political beliefs, and that under the First Amendment they didn't have to answer.

Was this excuse valid? Or was being contemptuous of Congress? Anyone cited by Congress for contempt and then convicted of federal court can be jailed for a year and fined \$10,000.

Congress cited them for contempt and they were convicted. The higher courts upheld the conviction, ruling the First Amendment did not protect them from having to answer about Communist party membership.

Later witnesses turned to the Fifth Amendment to escape answering questions about communism with this argument: That anything they said might incriminate them. The Fifth Amendment cannot be compelled to testify against himself.

Look, they have been getting away with it without being cited for contempt. How come? They could have said, if they admitted a Communist membership, for instance, they might find themselves eventually prosecuted under the espionage laws.

That act, passed in 1950, makes it a crime to teach conspiracy to overthrow the government. The government has convicted a number of top Communist leaders under the Smith Act.

But there is a law which says that what a man tells a congressional committee can't be used against him.

Instead of giving the committee power to grant immunity to witnesses, Brownell says, he wants the government to decide whether to grant it.

If such a law were passed, the government would have to decide whether or not it was constitutional.

Churchill Voices Convincingly Western Europe's Great Desire

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

LIKE the green bay tree, Sir Winston Churchill flourishes before the expectations of friends and foe. His first speech since his illness contained little that was new, but the tenderness and warmth he wrote it off as more of the same.

But even though he is going on 75, even though he has suffered an illness that would have removed most men of his age from the scene, he cannot be discounted. And the world cannot be so easily lulled by a man who speaks out of a whole heart in which one overwhelming desire is dominant: the desire to see the world at peace, to break the fearful stalemate between East and West and to take at least a step toward permanent peace. There is a parallel between the voice of Churchill in 1940 and the voice of Churchill in 1953. Just as he did in that other and more acute crisis, so today he speaks the hopes, the passion of millions of men in the West who regard with dread and horror the abyss of atomic warfare.

DILLES DOUBTS

There is a cold reason, the negotiation of a pact with the Soviet Union to guarantee the peace may be as unpalatable an approach as policy-makers here consider it to be. The advantage of a get-together of the states in a great Big Four may rest, as Secretary of State John Foster Dulles believes, with Moscow. Russia has long been convinced that such a meeting would be exploited by the Kremlin to incite the Russian to attack the satellites in the Communist empire.

But when that has been said, the great central fact of the prevailing dread throughout Western Europe for such an effort remains. One is scrutinized for violation of section 254 of the criminal code is a former assistant attorney general who, according to an investigation of the committee, later represented some of the committee's proceedings while in the government.

On the other hand, Democratic Senators are also expressing their disapproval of the Justice Department's handling of the case. They are questioning the failure to act on the Maryland case, the imprisonment of the Oklahoma and Hennings of Missouri, and the fact that the Senate has not yet acted on the case.

Some Democratic Senators are disapproving enough to ask questions about the case. They are asking questions about the case. They are asking questions about the case. They are asking questions about the case.

Forged Letter On Nixon

THE Justice Department has reason to believe that the letter is a forgery and is not a forgery. The Justice Department has reason to believe that the letter is a forgery and is not a forgery. The Justice Department has reason to believe that the letter is a forgery and is not a forgery. The Justice Department has reason to believe that the letter is a forgery and is not a forgery.