

BY JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS
 1888—Sixty-Fifth Anniversary Year—1953
 THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher
 J. E. DOWD, General Manager
 B. S. GRIFFITH, Executive Editor
 C. A. MCKNIGHT, Editor
 TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1953

CLEARING THE AIR ON SECRET AGREEMENTS

THE Republican position on "secret agreements" has been somewhat confusing. Perhaps it can be clarified by starting at the Republican National Convention in Chicago last Summer. There the platform-writers declared that:

"The government of the United States, under Republican leadership, will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings such as the Yalta Pact and Communist enslavements."

As the campaign wore on, denunciation of the Yalta, Tehran and Potsdam agreements became increasingly bitter. We still vividly recall one publication, "Yalta To Korea", distributed by the Republican National Committee. In it Lattimore, Hiss, Stalin, Roosevelt, Truman and Acheson were pictured as co-signers of a policy by which "not only had Russia been given control over Eastern Europe, it had also won a secret agreement assuring Soviet dominance over Asia."

In his State of the Union message, President Eisenhower said he would ask Congress for a joint resolution "making clear that this government recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings of the past, which purport to be 'enclavements.' The President said then he didn't want Congress to repudiate in whole any one secret agreement, such as the Yalta Pact. But steps should be taken, he said, to show that Americans never agreed to enslavement of any people.

Friday the President asked Congress to join him in denouncing Soviet Russia for subjecting her peoples, in the name of the one-time secret treaties of agreements such as the Yalta Pact. The Pact itself was not criticized. The Russian violation of that Pact was.

The Republican policy has changed from one of condemning the Democrats for making secret agreements to condemning the Russians for breaking them. One need not be a cynic to note that, after using one line to beat up the Democrats, the Republicans switched to a position that more accurately reflects reality.

The new policy makes certain sense. The President is to be commended for turning aside the demands of some of his colleagues and pinning responsibility for the enslavement of satellites on the Russians, where it belongs, instead of on the Democrats.

The resolution, if adopted, will not cause the Soviets to leave our countries they have taken over. But because of its moderate tone, it will not arouse false hopes among eastern Europeans that they are about to be liberated. It won't give them the idea that the country is about to be re-enslaved. It won't encourage the Japanese to think Sakhalin and the Kuriles are about to be returned to them. It should, however, "register dramatically," Secretary of State Acheson said, "the many breaches by the Soviet of wartime understandings (and) the desire and hope of the American people that the captive people shall be liberated." Too, it should serve as a stimulus to the anti-communist demagog, and enable Democratic Congressmen wholeheartedly to join their Republican colleagues in its pronouncement. For these several reasons it should be approved.

A SORRY STORY

THE General Assembly callously compounded its sins by passing Saturday session. Only one Senator, H. P. Bailey of Wake, was present. He called the Senate into session and forthwith passed three local bills, all by himself.

The legislators in having Saturday sessions and fourteenth passed three local bills, all by himself.

The legislators in having Saturday sessions and fourteenth passed three local bills, all by himself.

September Conventions Suggested

TV Can Shorten Campaigns

By WILLIAM S. PALEY
 (From an address to the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia)

PROBABLY no Presidential campaign in our history captured and held the attention of as many citizens for as long a period of time as the recent one. For this I think television may take considerable responsibility and credit.

Television brought the vast canvas of national politics within human compass by the warm and familiar dimensions of the home. To be sure, radio did this, too, by introducing the sound of the candidate's voice. But television did it even more; it showed the glint in his eye, the mole on his cheek, the smile that revealed sincerity or disingenuousness—the cast of his character and personality. With 18,500,000 home television receivers it was possible for four out of ten families to see the candidates simultaneously and under the same conditions and to participate collectively in the act of forming their judgments and opinions.

It was most important that it was their own opinion, arrived at independently, rather than one filtered through the mind of a third person, whether a reporter, a commentator or an editorial writer.

Another striking contribution to the democratic process was television's effectiveness in sustaining throughout the campaign period a higher level of political interest than was ever previously attained. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that the record registration and turnout over 63,000,000 voters on election day.

The public would share equally in the benefits accruing from a shorter campaign. Initially keyed up by the excitement of the conventions, most citizens live in a heightened state of emotion during the campaign. Differing political sympathies flare up in frequent arguments. Under present conditions, this atmosphere of controlled hostility is maintained for a period of six months. It is tiring to the spirit, not to mention the body politic.

But an even greater benefit of a shorter campaign period would be the physical and mental strain upon the candidates by eliminating a large portion of the traveling and speaking which they must now subject themselves to.

The public would share equally in the benefits accruing from a shorter campaign. Initially keyed up by the excitement of the conventions, most citizens live in a heightened state of emotion during the campaign. Differing political sympathies flare up in frequent arguments. Under present conditions, this atmosphere of controlled hostility is maintained for a period of six months. It is tiring to the spirit, not to mention the body politic.

THE MOTORISTS' BEST SECURITY

MASSACHUSETTS is the only state with a "universal" (compulsory) auto liability insurance. Forty-one states use the "security" system of insurance. It requires uninsured motorists to be licensed in order to deposit security sufficient to cover possible damage claims.

North Carolina and five other states require neither insurance nor security. As a result, motorists of these six states who are injured by uninsured or impoverished drivers, often are burdened with hospital bills and mortgages, to pay for injuries they sustained blamelessly.

The General Assembly now is considering adoption of the "security" system. It would be an improvement. It would encourage drivers to insure. But it would not solve the big problem, which is to make sure that the Gov. Thomas Dewey, who is trying to replace the "security" system with the "universal" system in New York. In support of his plan the governor said:

"I will insure to the innocent victim of a motor-vehicle accident the ability to recover a reasonable amount of money. No one has advanced a single reason why (they)

should have the freedom to drive and kill and maim without responsibility."

The main advantage of the "universal" system is in the fact that it provides for accident compensation before the accidents happen. Under the present system, motorists who fail to satisfy judgment against them must furnish proof of future financial responsibility. But that doesn't help satisfy the first judgment. The "security" plan would keep this same feature of the present law, and add the requirement that drivers involved in an accident post security to satisfy possible judgments arising from that accident. Thus if the guilty party is well off the person he injured will be compensated.

But if the offender is poor, the security he can put up might not adequately compensate the injured party, even though the poor man must undergo severe financial hardship to pay security damages.

Universal insurance, as a requisite to car registration, would be reasonably fair to both parties. It affords all motorists the most real security.

DISCRIMINATION IN ITS FINEST SENSE

THE Phi Delta Theta fraternity chapter at Williams College in Massachusetts surrendered its charter to the national organization the other day. Until the next biennial convention of the fraternity, at which the chapter is banned from its parent organization. Why? Because the chapter pledged a Jew.

Most national fraternities have restrictive clauses in their constitutions. They vary, but the wording frequently excludes from membership any man other than a white Christian.

What has happened at Williams, with the Phi Deltas, is not an isolated instance. Recently the recent one of the Phi Deltas chapter pledge a Jew, a Negro, an Oriental. These college men are breaking down the old barrier for heartfelt reasons, not for publicity. As the president of the Williams Phi Deltas said:

"We had written the national that we were not fighting them, but that as a group of men at Williams College, we wanted to take in a member who was clearly eligible by every tenet of the fraternity except the one which is contradictory to the principles our organization has established. . . . We here at Williams College chose men on the basis of individual merit. We hope the national will recognize that what we have done is for the betterment of the fraternity as a whole in the eyes of the people throughout the U. S."

Young fraternities men, throughout the country, are taking a stand for a great principle that is being demanded by the times. We commend the youngsters for seeking to practice discrimination in its finest sense, "to distinguish or to select the right from the wrong" (E. H. Ross). He is "taking a stand," for judging a man for what he really is.

FROM THE RICHMOND NEWS-LEADER
THAT CLAMMY HAND OF FEAR

THE youthful playwright who enters a national college playwriting contest, announced this week by the Samuel French organization in New York, runs into a formidable set of rules. The sponsor "reserves the right at any time to declare ineligible an author who is, or becomes publicly involved in a scholastic, literary, political or moral controversy."

If that reservation is taken literally it should narrow substantially the field of competition. Any playwright, no matter how youthful, who has been involved in a scholastic, political, literary or moral controversy of some sort is almost certain to be a dull clod and a writer of wooden plays. If a college lad writes a letter to the campus paper, attacking what he deems to be academic freedom, he is guilty of engaging in a

"scholastic controversy?" And what if he engages in a public debate on the relative merits of New Deal socialism and free enterprise? Does that political rhetoric bar him from the competition?

The sponsors are privileged, of course, to make any rules they choose—to specify, for example, that only collegians with blue eyes and light wavy hair may compete—but the foregoing prohibition against controversial activity strikes us as being a black comedy. There is nothing so serious as being actively very cranny of contemporary life. The last place we'd expect to find this manifestation is in the theater which, until now, has always had writers who are not afraid to be soapy, spineless hulks, well in bad shape even though.

September Conventions Suggested

TV Can Shorten Campaigns

Real Implications Of TV

Seven Weeks For Campaign

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Husband Murders

Frustration In Government

To Cut The Anticlimax

Most Jailed Reds Are Trouble-Makers

Ike And Oil

That Clammy Hand of Fear

Discrimination In Its Finest Sense

The Motorists' Best Security

A Sorry Story

September Conventions Suggested

WASHINGTON
 THERE was not a word in an old rule. There must be an exception, however, for the relationship between Eisenhower, Eisenbower and Senator Robert A. Taft. The word was widely expected; by friends of both men it was expected that the best is happening instead of the worst is news of a rather major.

The difference between Taft, the opposition chief, and Taft, the leader of the Senate, is not power, no doubt holds the key to the matter. The Ohio Senator, who used to be a strident in the ranks of the Democrats, has now become a rather lonely voice of calm good sense, in a Congress which regrettably alternates between roundaboutness and a plain drive.

When the witch-hunters were heating up their branding irons, it was Taft who quietly depicted invasions of academic freedom. When the lawmaker - strategists were talking of bombing Peking to bring about the end of the Chinese blockade. And when everyone else was still pretending to want to go toward Eisenhower, he was the first Republican Administration in twenty years. Hence he is not in a sense he is, a quite different man.

Yet this is really only the beginning of the story. The Taft who has not so much knuck in the past, for forgiving those who have opposed him.

CHANGED MAN
 A deep respect for facts and intense political partisanship are two of the strongest traits of Taft's character. When he was in opposition, he went to participate in extremes which profoundly alarmed the more moderate and worldly-wise Republicans. But Taft is now in contact with the facts, and he bears a large share of the responsibility for the country's first Republican Administration in twenty years. Hence he is not in a sense he is, a quite different man.

Yet this is really only the beginning of the story. The Taft who has not so much knuck in the past, for forgiving those who have opposed him.

Washington's Statue Is Hard To Find -- For Good Reasons

EDITOR'S NOTE: Our man Othman thinks he's not lazy, so we've omitted his name. The freight bill was a whooper.

This article's enterprise by now had cost \$26,000 and some odd dollars. The freight bill for the other \$2,000 for a base to hold the statue and the great day for unloading was Feb. 19, 1951. The Navy band, too, had made patriotic a good-looker. The string, and p.e.e.-e.-e. There was George Washington twice as big as life, clad as a Roman senator on the way to his bath. He wore the long, thin Roman sandals from falling.

CONGRESSMEN HORRIFIED
 Ever Capitol Hill rose a horrified. Congress decided after weeks it was time to strip his middle. Then the parliamentarian discovered an old law which would allow for a law to destroy any of its works of art.

The statemen built a wooden shed for the statue and set it up on a narrow road with olive trees on each side was a problem. Horatio asked that the statue be set on the trees on the left, between Florence and Leghorn. This plus incidental expenses, cost the taxpayers over \$18.

The longshoremen started to hoist the statue onto a boat. The statue was hoisted and crashed through the hull and sank in the mud. The ship settled on top of him. The U. S. Navy sent a battleship to Italy; sailors fished Washington from the mud and he was decked in New York, but the railroad tunnels between there and here weren't big enough for the statue to squeeze through. The Navy took him to

Issue, he confided, "I picked up by accident six years ago.

"Back in 1947, I was visiting in Fort Worth, Tex., and I reported the first time a document. It contained, 'That document is the basis for my belief that the field and I belong to the states, not the federal government.'

"It was an old, faded piece of paper addressed to the Congress and signed by the Texas Legislature. It was written when Texas was trying to come into the Union and the League of Nations was offering to turn over the federal government to Texas public lands if Congress would assume the state's \$100,000,000 debt."

"During the campaign, when the title-lanes issue came up, I remembered that I had reported the first time a document. It contained, 'That document is the basis for my belief that the field and I belong to the states, not the federal government.'

"It was an old, faded piece of paper addressed to the Congress and signed by the Texas Legislature. It was written when Texas was trying to come into the Union and the League of Nations was offering to turn over the federal government to Texas public lands if Congress would assume the state's \$100,000,000 debt."

Frankly, he concluded, "that's just as simple as keeping your word."

"I was a member of the Down Home when he was a guest of Amos Carter, No. 1 Texas citizen.

"All I know about the titelands of

