

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher; J. E. DOWD, General Manager; R. S. GREFFITH, Executive Editor; C. A. MCNEIGHT, Editor

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1953

Lots Of Activity In The Wrong Ring

NO. 10. MR. TRUMAN - THE FIGHT'S OVER HERE!



Political Advantage From White Battle Is Not Clear

By STEWART ALSOP

IN PLAIN, hard, practical political terms, who has won the grisly battle over the future of Harry Dexter White? This is the question which the politicians of both parties are asking themselves most anxiously. As of the moment at least, the best answer appears to be "no one."

Not even the most ardent partisans of the former President argue that Truman, his administration or his party have emerged unscathed. Indeed, if Attorney General Brownell's latest proposals to limit, if limited to simply "laxity," most Democrats will admit in private that he has proved it down to the ground.

If Truman actually had no notion of the evidence against White until it was too late to stop its confirmation, the staff work in the White House at the time must indeed have been "incredible," to use a favorite Brownell adjective. Moreover, it is clear at least by now that Truman chose the worst of the three alternative methods of dealing with White which were proposed to him by his subordinates.

NO FOLLOW-UP It is also clear that when this alternative was chosen, the FBI could follow-up at all Truman's oft-quoted statements on the matter have been "incredible," to use a favorite Brownell adjective. Moreover, it is clear at least by now that Truman chose the worst of the three alternative methods of dealing with White which were proposed to him by his subordinates.

Finally, the whole episode has served to remind the world of Truman's penchant for second thoughts and his habit of making such inexcusable appointments as that of Velde's idiotic attorney. All this would seem to add up to a brilliant political victory for Brownell, the Eisenhower administration, and the Republican party.

Some Republicans claim that it is White, not Truman, who is to blame. But others are more sure. As one observer has remarked, "Brownell made the mistake of charging at the wrong place at the wrong time."

The victory might indeed have been brilliant if Brownell had chosen to prove, at an appropriate place and in a serious purpose, that the Truman administration, particularly in its first year, had been a disaster. He, however, merely whined about Communist espionage.

Brownell made his accusation against Truman on a political occasion, just after the New York Republican defeat and just before the California election. He thus threw himself wide open to a counter-charge of playing an unscrupulous game.

Moreover, Brownell did not content himself with charging simple "laxity." What really created the tremendous stir was Brownell's assertion that "Truman promoted a man who knew it" as the "New York Times" headline put it.

It is obviously silly to hold that a Chief Executive who knowingly promotes Russian spies is merely "lax"—this is like claiming that a man who cheats his wife is merely absent-minded. Moreover, Brownell has failed to prove this imputation. He has merely offered a KEY STATEMENT OMITTED

This failure is underscored by Brownell's reported omission of a key statement—allowing that the FBI could not "prove or disprove" the charges against White. The omission is especially significant inasmuch as it is summarized in such detail. Truman did not "know" that White was a spy. As a result, no improved charges cannot legitimately be equated with knowledge of guilt.

The Democrats claim to believe that Brownell's overstatement of the case will be regarded, not merely because of the President of the United States is involved, but also because it is simply impossible to imagine Harry S. Truman in the role of condoner of treason. They also believe that Rep. Harold Velde's idiotic attempt to depose the former President has left a particularly bad taste in the mouths of many Democrats.

Preliminary soundings do indicate that most voters are writing in their minds a "yes" to "white politics." If so, Brownell and the Republicans do not appear to be in a position to win the battle, any more than Truman and the Democrats.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS ARE OUT OF ORDER

REGARDLESS of City Manager Yancey's understanding of the purpose of Wednesday's joint meeting of the City Council and County Commission, it is clear that he erred in notifying the League of Women Voters that their members "would not be welcome" at the meeting.

A League spokesman said they were informed "by the Mayor's office" that it was "an executive session and we would not be welcome."

Mr. Yancey confirms this, explaining that the meeting was called at the request of the elections board. He says that there was a "meeting of the minds" at the joint session. But Councilman Boyd's motion at the later public session of the Council ratified what he expressly called "the joint vote" at the joint meeting.

Furthermore, at the joint session, the City Councilmen voted five to two in favor of buying voting machines. At the public session, they voted unanimously in favor of Mr. Boyd's motion to record the earlier vote on the council minutes.

By custom, the City Council meets an hour prior to the public session in what is called an "informal" session. Originally, this session was devoted to give Councilmembers a chance to discuss informally anything that might be on their minds, and to give the City Manager an opportunity to make routine reports that do not need to be a part of the public record. In theory, any citizen may sit in on the

informal meeting; in practice, private citizens seldom do so. Newspaper reporters are present and are permitted to report whatever takes place if they think it newsworthy.

In recent months, the Council has slipped into the habit of deciding major issues by an "informal" vote or tally of hands, after which the decisions are rubber-stamped in public session. This is what happened at Wednesday's joint session.

The North Carolina statutes explicitly state that meetings of municipal governing bodies and meetings of boards of county commissioners must be open to the public.

Section 153.8 of the General Statutes, relating to meetings of the board of county commissioners, says plainly that "Every meeting shall be open to all persons." It also says that when special meetings are called, public notice must be posted not less than six days in advance.

Section 400-269, governing municipal bodies, says plainly "All legislative sessions shall be open to the public. . . . The governing body shall not by executive session or otherwise consider or vote on any question of a private or confidential nature." A request from a citizen to attend last Wednesday's meeting was turned down. An important matter of public business was discussed and voted upon. If this was a misunderstanding, it must not happen again.

In the Truman wing of the party, will conclude that Director Hoover gave aid and comfort to a Republican Party in its continuing campaign to discredit not only a former president but a whole previous Democratic administration.

Brownell and Hoover must have discussed the matter prior to the attorney general's speech in Chicago in which he first charged that Harry Dexter White was "known to be a communist spy by a very large number of persons who are the most sensitive and important post he ever held in government service." Brownell undoubtedly knew he would be called upon to document his grave allegation, and that he might have to depend upon Hoover for confirmation.

If it was a calculated risk, it was a very dangerous one. Rehashing an old story about an alleged spy who is now dead in order to discredit a former president who is dead politically may offer a short-term political gain, but at a terrible sacrifice if it impairs the FBI's traditional aloofness from politics.

gressmen are using the pessimistic, and not the most successful approach, to juvenile delinquency. The Optimists take a different attitude. They see the crime as the result of their own commit. In other words, they see the doughnut instead of the hole.

The success of this positive optimistic approach is attested by the record established at the Optimists Boys Club on N. Brevard St. here in Charlotte. There are about 200 boys in the Junior Optimist Club there. And, according to local Optimist officers, not one of the boys who has belonged to the club, since it was formed eight years ago, has appeared in the Domestic Relations & Juvenile Court.

THE FBI AND PARTISAN POLITICS

ONE OF THE MOST disturbing aspects of the Harry Dexter White case has been the injection of the Federal Bureau of Investigation into a partisan battle.

From the time he became director of the FBI in 1924 until this week, John Edgar Hoover had managed to keep his bureau out of partisan politics. He served under Presidents Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower without once showing any trace of partisanship.

As a result, the FBI came to be respected by all Americans as a dispassionate and objective fact-finding agency. Mr. Hoover's decision to appear personally with Attorney General Brownell at last Tuesday's Senate subcommittee hearing falls into the calculated risk category. The FBI director obviously felt strongly about the White case, so strongly that he was willing to go beyond the record in the FBI files and explain in forceful language his personal criticism of a major decision by higher authority. It is inevitable that many Democrats, especially

BE A FRIEND OF THE BOY

THERE are varying views of optimism and pessimism, pessimism and pessimists.

Voltaire said "optimism is the madness of containing in a glass everything is right when it is wrong."

Some say that while a pessimist wears both pants and suspenders, an optimist wears neither.

Poet Melancthon Wilson wrote:

"Twixt the optimist and pessimist there is difference in the way they look at the doughnut. The optimist sees the doughnut. But the pessimist sees the hole."

Which is somewhat like saying the pessimist's glass is half empty, the optimist's glass half full. We are now in the midst of a mauling over these definitions of optimism this week when, coincidentally, a congressional investigation of juvenile delinquency started during Optimist Week.

Both the congressmen and the Optimists are concerned with boys. The congressmen hope, through their investigation, through pointing up how bad some boys—and girls are—to improve the juvenile delinquency problem.

Somehow, though, we feel that the congressmen are using the pessimistic, and not the most successful approach, to juvenile delinquency.

The Optimists take a different attitude. They see the crime as the result of their own commit. In other words, they see the doughnut instead of the hole.

The success of this positive optimistic approach is attested by the record established at the Optimists Boys Club on N. Brevard St. here in Charlotte. There are about 200 boys in the Junior Optimist Club there. And, according to local Optimist officers, not one of the boys who has belonged to the club, since it was formed eight years ago, has appeared in the Domestic Relations & Juvenile Court.

WHAT GOOD SENATORS DON'T DO

A PROMINENT member of the United States Senate is fond of saying, as he bid to a New Jersey audience recently, "You don't go skunking in striped trousers and a tall hat while wearing a lace handkerchief." This picturesque and typically irrelevant remark may or may not raise some questions in your mind about other things you don't—or shouldn't—do.

You don't trifle with your country's security for purposes of self-glorification. You don't ignore the Constitution, specifically the First Amendment, in order to intimidate your opponents. You don't attempt to destroy reputations with groundless insinuations to score a political point, whether the victim is a candidate for high office of the opposing party or a nominee to high office of your own party. You don't prove yourself willing and eager to undermine the foundations of your Government's foreign policy by the most unrestrained and violent attack on our strongest and oldest allies.

On Freedom Of Choice

AS a relative newcomer to your city, I was very much interested in a letter by Mrs. Mayme Barger in your edition of Nov. 16 regarding the fact that you can find bars where whisky is sold on most of your street corners. I had not seen any and was coming to the conclusion that there was a fairly dry city. Her letter gives me hope that maybe she would care to divulge the location of a few, at thereby help alleviate the necessity for many people of carrying their own bottle into public restaurants.

I'm sure that Mrs. Barger believes in the Golden Rule, and if I were possessed of this information, I would not hesitate to share it with you.

There has been a lot of yakking lately about freedom for our federal employes and all the time they had a freedom denied the rest of us—freedom from being forced to pay their income taxes.—Greenfield (S. C.) Pizzomov.

Let's Drop Police Fuss

LET'S drop the police fuss. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editors. The News reserves the right to condense.

For one am tired of all this wrangling about the J. Edgar Hoover and Chief Littlejohn. I for one am well satisfied. Maybe our police department is not up to the mark in being modern, but I feel mighty safe. I feel I can go to sleep nights. I would be glad to see the whole thing dropped where it is.

Outsmart the informants that seemingly want only to tear down and discredit. If necessary, vote to let the man alone. We are satisfied.

Against Voting Machines WILLIAM C. MCINTIRE

WE do not need voting machines. The idea of spending over \$200,000 of the people's money for such contraptions is out of all reason. Hats off to the commissioners and councilmen who opposed this expenditure.

An Emergency God, Only? ADAM

I HAVE noticed lately several letters in the People's Platform, with views pro and con in regard to the liquor problem in Charlotte, which is a very small problem compared to other localities of the United States, and just one of many problems.

If these who try to take liquor away from the person would reverse the tactic and try taking the person away from liquor by religion, their efforts might not be so useless and empty. After all, force will not accomplish anything.

Here is a city with more churches than any other city its size. But when, if ever, have people lined up for blocks to get in a church as they do to see a movie, football game, or baseball game? These things are more important to them than God. What a disgrace to think they need Him only in case of emergency.

Can't you just imagine God sitting along some side street with a sign around his neck reading "For Emergency Use Only?"

On Freedom Of Choice CHARLOTTE

AS a relative newcomer to your city, I was very much interested in a letter by Mrs. Mayme Barger in your edition of Nov. 16 regarding the fact that you can find bars where whisky is sold on most of your street corners. I had not seen any and was coming to the conclusion that there was a fairly dry city. Her letter gives me hope that maybe she would care to divulge the location of a few, at thereby help alleviate the necessity for many people of carrying their own bottle into public restaurants.

I'm sure that Mrs. Barger believes in the Golden Rule, and if I were possessed of this information, I would not hesitate to share it with you.

There has been a lot of yakking lately about freedom for our federal employes and all the time they had a freedom denied the rest of us—freedom from being forced to pay their income taxes.—Greenfield (S. C.) Pizzomov.

People's Platform

Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editors. The News reserves the right to condense.

would gladly share it with her. Since everybody believes that the Golden Rule is the essence of religion or Christianity, then it must be equally true that she would want to share this knowledge with the rest of us.

From my own experience, I don't think that Mrs. Barger or anyone else could really believe that the Creator wants us to give up our freedom of choice to anybody. He might have destroyed that apple put out in the Garden before we disobeyed Him and ate it against His expressed command, but He didn't. He made the rules and He knew that if we were ever going to grow up, we had to be given the freedom to make our own choices. He knew that if Eve and I gave away this right to anybody else, we would always remain children. Why did it do that way, we never have been able to figure out, but the fact is that He wanted us to have the freedom to grow. Later on some of us did know the extent of His redeeming love.

We don't understand it. We only believe that there are some things that we must be made for ourselves by every individual. We believe with Patrick Henry that if anyone attempts to take this right away from us, whether it be by the process of destroying all the whisky stills as we know we can associate with (as McCarthy does), it is our obligation to fight for our liberty. Our reason for believing this is in the fact that our Father in heaven gave us this freedom and He refused to let it go. Therefore we shall not surrender it to any man or woman.

Dog Owner Alarmed CHARLOTTE

SOMEONE has made three different attempts to steal my pal dog, "Sparky," recently. It is very strange as dog insurance.

Doubts Value Of Coin RUTHERFORDTON

IN reference to the coin James E. Williams found, I do not believe he will find it valuable. From his description it is evidently a U. S. small cent, flying eagle. There is also a U. S. large cent that date after 1856, which is a very rare coin. It is possible it would have had some value—if in good condition.

Mr. Williams would find coin collecting a very interesting hobby should he choose to follow it. I doubt that he would find it profitable, which of course would be of minor concern if it were to be a real hobby.

I enjoy the News very much and should like to praise Mr. Quincy and Mr. Grady for their fine sport coverage.

Horace L. Carpenter, O. D.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

SOME readers have suggested that I should after the last justice of the United States in the position of being pro-Communist or a Red when I reported earlier this week that Fred Vinson, who secretary of the Treasury, transferred Harry D. White to the International Monetary Fund and advised President Truman to keep him in that job, under surveillance.

Since Fred Vinson is dead and cannot defend himself and since the last time I wish to do is reflect on a great man and a very dear friend, I should like to set forth further the views of the late chief justice on communism. I had occasion to discuss this general subject with him on a camping trip in the Adirondacks not long before he died.

It is a fact that in the summer of 1945, shortly after he became secretary of the treasury, I warned Vinson that Harry White was not a good man to have in the Treasury. I did this because I thought it was a service to Vinson and to the United States that I could not fully substantiate the evidence against White.

Clark Testimony Is Needed To Clear Up White Record

By MARQUIS CHILDS

ONE OF THE key figures in the Harry Dexter White case whose story is still untold is Assistant Justice Tom Clark. Clark was attorney general at the time of the FBI report dealing with White's connections with the Soviet espionage ring.

Spoken by Chairman Harold M. Holt of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Clark declined to respond. Yet, unless and until Clark does tell his story in full a shadow will rest on the innocent Truman in his reply to the charges of Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr., suggested that he had acted in a government position after revelations that White had been named in the spy report.

FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover, in his remarkably effective presentation of the case against White, had had Clark in any such decision and that in fact had been hampered by the action of the White House shifting White from Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to the International Monetary Fund. The question hangs in the air as to whether Clark in his advice to his superiors was in any way into account the FBI warning.

SECOND REFUSAL This is the second time that Clark has refused to respond to the call of a Congressional committee to give testimony on matters of which he had knowledge while he was in the executive branch of the government. The first refusal came from the House committee headed by Rep. Kenneth Keating investigating alleged tax favoritism and other matters in the White House. There, too, Clark would answer a key witness.

Keating committee asked Clark if he would appear. In a letter he replied that he felt he could not do so because he was a member of the House committee.

Clark was refused to respond to the call of a Congressional committee to give testimony on matters of which he had knowledge while he was in the executive branch of the government. The first refusal came from the House committee headed by Rep. Kenneth Keating investigating alleged tax favoritism and other matters in the White House. There, too, Clark would answer a key witness.

Keating committee asked Clark if he would appear. In a letter he replied that he felt he could not do so because he was a member of the House committee.

Clark was refused to respond to the call of a Congressional committee to give testimony on matters of which he had knowledge while he was in the executive branch of the government. The first refusal came from the House committee headed by Rep. Kenneth Keating investigating alleged tax favoritism and other matters in the White House. There, too, Clark would answer a key witness.

Keating committee asked Clark if he would appear. In a letter he replied that he felt he could not do so because he was a member of the House committee.

Clark Testimony Is Needed To Clear Up White Record

By MARQUIS CHILDS

ONE OF THE key figures in the Harry Dexter White case whose story is still untold is Assistant Justice Tom Clark. Clark was attorney general at the time of the FBI report dealing with White's connections with the Soviet espionage ring.

Spoken by Chairman Harold M. Holt of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Clark declined to respond. Yet, unless and until Clark does tell his story in full a shadow will rest on the innocent Truman in his reply to the charges of Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr., suggested that he had acted in a government position after revelations that White had been named in the spy report.

FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover, in his remarkably effective presentation of the case against White, had had Clark in any such decision and that in fact had been hampered by the action of the White House shifting White from Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to the International Monetary Fund. The question hangs in the air as to whether Clark in his advice to his superiors was in any way into account the FBI warning.

SECOND REFUSAL This is the second time that Clark has refused to respond to the call of a Congressional committee to give testimony on matters of which he had knowledge while he was in the executive branch of the government. The first refusal came from the House committee headed by Rep. Kenneth Keating investigating alleged tax favoritism and other matters in the White House. There, too, Clark would answer a key witness.

Keating committee asked Clark if he would appear. In a letter he replied that he felt he could not do so because he was a member of the House committee.

Clark was refused to respond to the call of a Congressional committee to give testimony on matters of which he had knowledge while he was in the executive branch of the government. The first refusal came from the House committee headed by Rep. Kenneth Keating investigating alleged tax favoritism and other matters in the White House. There, too, Clark would answer a key witness.

Keating committee asked Clark if he would appear. In a letter he replied that he felt he could not do so because he was a member of the House committee.

Clark was refused to respond to the call of a Congressional committee to give testimony on matters of which he had knowledge while he was in the executive branch of the government. The first refusal came from the House committee headed by Rep. Kenneth Keating investigating alleged tax favoritism and other matters in the White House. There, too, Clark would answer a key witness.