THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

TUESDAY, AUGUST 24, 1954

Death Behind Bars: The Rush Case

SKIMMING the edge of public indignation about the weekend violence at Woman's Prison are disturbing questions. What mystery clouds the death of 18-year-old Eleanor Rush? Why was discipline so lax and supervision so careless that a 3 1/2-hour riot could be detonated during recreation period?

The circumstances of the Rush girl's death were not pleasant. She was found on the floor of an isolation cell—her neck broken, her hands trussed behind her back.

Twenty-five minutes earlier, she had been "restrained" by Prison Supt. I. D. Hinton, two prison guards and a nurse. Her "hollering, banging on the door" had caused a disturbance, said Hinton. Leather handcuffs were clamped on the prisoner's wrists "to prevent her from banging on doors and so forth." She was left in solitary confinement.

Prisons Director William F. Bailey told newsmen later that the prison doctor supposed she "ran into a wall of the cell and broke her neck"; but there were no marks to indicate that her head had hit the wall or the cell floor.

Why, if the girl was actually violent, was she not kept under closer surveillance? Assuming she was unharmed by prison officials, why was an inmate suspected of being a mental case left to her own devices in quarters where she might be fatally injured? Is it not customary at Woman's Prison to see that a demented prisoner does not destroy herself during a violent outburst? Don't prisons have padded cells?

Even if no actual brutality is involved in this case, it seems perfectly clear that prison officials were guilty of some degree of negligence.

We remember no occurrence of this kind during the administration of Miss Ronie Sheffield as director of Woman's Prison. Miss Sheffield knew how to handle women. She knew discipline. She recognized too the fine line between coddling and rehabilitation. Her record was uniformly good. But in the end, she became the victim of the rankest sort of political chicanery. She was yanked from her job following a vicious whispering campaign which started in Raleigh and spread across the state.

Later, Prisons Director Bailey commented that running Woman's Prison was no job for a woman.

Weekend events in Raleigh only serve to reinforce our doubts about the validity of that opinion. The investigation of these events, now underway, should penetrate to the very heart of the matter. The people of North Carolina will accept nothing less than the complete truth about what occurred on that hot August night in the somber, gray world of Woman's Prison.

Score Sheet On The 83rd Congress

THE 83rd was no "do-nothing" Congress. Slow to start (understandably, as the first Republican administration in 20 years, headed by a politically inexperienced President) it accomplished little in its first session. Many of the big issues were purposely postponed until this year. During this second session most of them were met head-on. And most of them, excepting those dealing with foreign policy and Communist control, were in our opinion satisfactorily resolved.

We count these as major and desirable victories:

1. The institution of flexible farm price supports;
2. The go-ahead on construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway;
3. The decision—accompanied by safeguards against monopoly—to give private enterprise more opportunities in the development of atomic energy.
4. A major overhaul in tax law, which corrects many injustices without reducing sharply anticipated revenue.
5. The extension of social security coverage to 10 million more persons and increases in social security taxes and benefits;
6. Removal of economic controls;
7. Decentralization of governmental controls, along with the decision of the federal government to leave several fields to state and local governments and private enterprise.
8. Reduction of federal expenditures.

The administration fulfilled its pledge to give control of offshore oil to the states. It did not, because it didn't try very hard, get statehood for Hawaii or revision of Taft-Hartley. Health and housing programs far short of the President's request were enacted. The veterans as usual got their share of legislation, although not as much as they wanted.

Ironically, the biggest administration victory in foreign policy was a negative one—the defeat of the Bricker amendment which was supported mainly by Republicans. The reciprocal trade act was extended for one year but not liberalized. Appropriations for mutual security, foreign aid and U. N. technical assistance were sharply cut. The administration made no real attempt to change restrictive immigration law.

But the most important and disturbing failure of the 83rd Congress' record is this: During a time when the Communist machine was rolling on to new victories and the free world alliance was falling apart, Congress shut its eyes to the danger of external communism. Instead, it concentrated on the vastly smaller threat of internal subversion and espionage. It permitted its character assassin, Sen. McCarthy, to continue his machinations. He was not censured nor were curbs for the likes of him devised. Laws were passed requiring the licensing of printing facilities used by Communist front organizations, prohibiting Communists from being officials of labor unions, granting immunity to witnesses invoking the Fifth amendment in national security cases, voiding the citizenship of Americans convicted of advocating overthrown of the government, stripping pension rights from government employes and officials convicted of felonies and—in a final burst of campaign-inspired maneuvering—outlawing the Communist Party.

In the campaign now starting, candidates must not be permitted to let this record against domestic communism obscure the fact that Congress—and indeed the whole administration—has miserably failed to stand up to the danger presented by the totalitarian threat. We would not minimize the problems and cost involved in an effective foreign policy. But the administration record in foreign policy is poor indeed, and that fact may in the end outweigh the other laudable gains scored by the 83rd Congress and Eisenhower administration.

'A Place To Sit Down Is Needed

CHARLOTTE'S tree-shaded Old Settlers' Cemetery is an island of tranquility in a midtown sea of hustle and bustle. Tombstones have been repaired, grass planted, walks renewed, lights installed. Crowd-weary shoppers, looking for a little peace and quiet after the bargain counter rush, can thank the city and its $10,000 beautification program for this untroubled sanctuary.

Only one thing is missing. The visitors must either keep moving, lean against a tree, hang over a fence or sit on the grass. There are no benches.

A committee headed by former Mayor Vic Shaw is now studying what further improvements will be needed at the old cemetery. We strongly urge that benches be added—and added soon so they can be enjoyed this year before chilly breezes began to whip around the ancient markers.

Now that all of its antique charm has been restored, Old Settlers' Cemetery is one of the few peaceful spots in this whole fidgety metropolis. It should be a place to go for undisturbed thought and meditation, for rest after a whirl of shopping or a day at the wheels of industry, for a quiet smoke and a moment of reflective relaxation. The addition of benches is a civic "must."

From The Carolina Israelite

HOW DO YOU FEEL?

THIS is another silly conversation. "How do you feel?" What do you mean by that?

Usually the question is asked of a man in action—a man on the go, walking along the street, or sitting at his desk working with vim and vigor, and suddenly someone comes along and asks, "How do you feel?" What do you expect him to say? Usually he says "Fine," but you've put a bug in his ear—maybe now he's not sure.

Maybe, if you are a good friend of his, you have seen something in his face, his walk, or his eyes that he missed that morning. It sets him to worrying a little. First thing you know he looks in a mirror to see if everything is all right while you trip merrily on your way asking someone else, "How do you feel?"

The question, "How do you feel?" certainly is pertinent under certain conditions. Like, for instance, when you first visit a friend—a close friend in the hospital— and after he has come out of the ether it would be fair to ask: "How do you feel?" But if the guy is walking on both legs, looking for a place to eat, or going to a movie, or working up a storm at his desk, it is silly to ask him that silly question.

When George Bernard Shaw was in his eighties someone asked him that stupid question, "How do you feel?" and he told him off: Said Shaw, "At my age, you either feel all right or you are dead."

We'd like, just once, to hear a hillbilly band announcer who didn't call the day's fare the "programmee."

Progress report: Inefficient farmers are advised to get out of business. They make too small a contribution to the farm crops surplus problem.—MEMPHIS PRESS-SCIMITAR.

"It's an invitation to join the Wauconda Country Club . . ."

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.

Plenty Of Books Are Being Read

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

THE cry that nobody's reading anymore is heard so often today that it has almost become the slogan of the age. It is repeated in your Aug. 19 editorial, "Preparing for the Last Reader." How can this be true? A great deal of reading is being done today. For instance, a paperback edition of "From Here To Eternity" sold 1,700,000 copies last September and October alone. Some 260 million pocket books were printed in 1953. Book clubs seem to have a lot of members. The libraries are still open. Plenty of books are being published. Plenty are being read too.

—CHARLES BATEMAN

American Citizenship Comes Before U. N.

Monroe

Editors, The News:

THE Illinois State Convention of the American Legion criticized the 1953 Girl Scouts handbook because in its index there was no reference to the constitution or to a chapter on U.S. citizenship; and because it gives United Nations and One World citizenship precedence over American citizenship.

Legionnaires were urged to withdraw support of the Scouts until time-honored American patriotic and historical ideals in the teaching of American youth were restored.

The Illinois Legion desired that the Constitution of the U.S. which declares that the inalienable rights of man are endowed by his Creator, should take precedence over the United Nations Charter which (in deference to the Communists who declare the rights of man are derived from the state) refused in its inception to make mention of God.

Are the veterans wrong in desiring that the education of our youth be on the rock of American principles rather than on the sand of the United(?) Nations?

By what standards do you justify the distortion and ridicule contained in your editorial of Aug. 10, and the cartoon of Aug. 13?

—PETER J. KING

Senate Acted Wisely On McCarthy Issue

Lincolnton

Editors, The News:

YOUR EDITORIAL a few days ago regarding the action of the Senate in deferring action on McCarthy reflects the shallow thinking so evident in much of your editorial writing.

In your editorial, you also took a swipe at President Eisenhower for his failure to censure McCarthy. Certainly you, of all people should be well aware that the President has no powers over a duly elected representative of the people of a sovereign state. To give him such power would destroy the constitutional precepts of separate legislative and executive powers. Furthermore Roosevelt and Truman both in the past tried to purge certain representatives and senators and were completely rebuffed by the voters, as well they should have been. That is one state right we had all better hope is never usurped.

In calling for the Senate to vote on the McCarthy issue without gathering all the facts and permitting each and every senator to consider each charge separately and carefully is to deny McCarthy the very rights you accuse him of denying others.

Many of these charges are old charges that have been reviewed before and no action was deemed appropriate but now have been revived. If they weren't deserving of censure then why should they be now?

No, Mr. Editors, the Senate did no wrong in postponing action on McCarthy. They did only what a fair and honest body would be expected to do. McCarthy, regardless of whether you approve or disapprove of him, deserves every chance to disprove the charges made against him before a non-biased committee, where facts can be separated from fiction. The Senate retained its dignity and respect in taking the action it did.

—CHARLES EUREY

Wage Earners Ought To Check Tax Bill

Hamlet

Editors, The News:

AS A subscriber to your paper for 15 years I am at last prompted to write to your People's Platform. I have just read of the recent federal tax revision law which was presented by Congress to President Eisenhower and subsequently signed by the President. It behooves me to know that our President and Congress were so vitally concerned with the welfare of our country that they were so considerate as to pass a tax law that means such a great overall tax reduction as this law does. It relieves corporations of tax that will enable them to expand as never before, which will in turn mean more employment, which will in turn mean more money into the coffers of the U. S. Treasury because it is understood that the bulk of the federal tax take is from wage earners.

Let us not forget that in addition to the benefits mentioned above that the wage earners were kept in mind, as the new law provides that the individual will have until April 15 instead of March 15 to file federal income tax reports. I had never thought of it, but it must be the best month of the year for a wage earner to borrow money.

In 1952, I think, President Truman asked Congress to pass a federal tax reduction bill which provided for a $40 per year reduction in income tax for every individual, rich and poor alike. You will probably recall that this was denied in favor of a tax reduction bill that provided for a larger percentagewise reduction for the wage earner, however it amounted to a few dollars savings to the wage earner and up into thousands of dollars for the more fortunate. To anyone who knows the fundamentals of arithmetic, this cannot be denied. I would like for all wage earners to further investigate this tax revision bill which took the headlines in our papers and ask themselves "what benefits do I receive?" when they file income tax returns next year.

—H. H. BALLANTINE

It's Ominously Quiet Now In Dark Medina Of Fez

By MARQUIS CHILDS

FEZ, Morocco

IT MAY NOT be war that is going on in this strife-ridden land, but here at Fez in the ancient Medina, seat of so many mosques and shrines holy to the Moslems, it looks remarkably like war. An occupation by at least 2,000 troops of the Foreign Legion was carried out in orderly, efficient and bloodless fashion to subdue the boiling, pent-up emotions of some 250,000 Arabs and thereby try to prevent new outbreaks of violence.

So successful has the occupation been that Gen. Laparra, French governor of the region of Fez, believes he can withdraw most of the troops, leaving small contingents stationed around certain critical areas. He laughs when he is asked if all the extremists in the Istiqlal independence movement and the fanatical Nationalists and killers have been captured in the series of arrests made immediately after the occupation. Of course not, he says. They are mostly still hidden within the fastness of the Medina, many of them having taken asylum within the Grand Mosque of Moulay Idriss.

But according to Gen. Laparra, the occupation has quieted the populace. It is like a pot of boiling water, he says, and you must hold the lid on until it cools.

Walking through the Medina under occupation is an unforgettable experience. There is about it an almost incredible theatricality. This is the ancient past, the pre-biblical past, held behind the massive walls of the Medina at bayonet point. And yet, despite the quiet, the strangely subdued air, one can almost hear the ferment of forces long suppressed.

Even in normal times the Medina of Fez is for the foreigner a somewhat disquieting experience. The visitor from a small neat European city is so completely swallowed up in its dark intricate twistings and turnings. Veteran French officials frankly admit that it is in large part unfathomable and unknown.

But in normal times the byways are filled with noisy life, with a pushing and pulling and shouting stilled only at times of prayer. Now it is quiet, so quiet that the sound of French walkies chattering from command post to command post breaks the silence. The shops are shuttered and locked. A few merchants bold enough to open up were attacked by their fellow Arabs for this sign of compliance with French law and order.

The scene of greatest activity is police headquarters, located in a building with a courtyard and carved galleries and brilliant tiled walls. A detail of half-naked young prisoners assigned to scrub has just been brought back to their cells inside headquarters. Interrogation is going on in a dozen small rooms as one suspect after another is brought in.

The Moulay Idriss, place of asylum, is not just a mosque but a complex of shops and small dwellings as well. To violate it would produce a violent explosion, and soldiers and police have been warned to keep their distance. You can look down through a low arch and see people sitting against the wall of the mosque. Even when most of the troops were taken out of the Medina on the third day, a considerable force was assigned to the entrance of Moulay Idriss, and part of their task was to see that no more than enough bread went in to keep those sheltered inside alive. The hope was that they would get hungry so that those considered dangerous could be seized.

It is a costly business transporting more than 2,000 troops to this remote city to restore order. Obviously, France cannot afford it over any long period. Economically and militarily the drain would be too great.

That is why Francis Lacoste, resident general of Morocco, is reported to be leaving for Paris in mid-September to discuss with Premier Mendes-France a series of reforms to be instituted at the earliest possible moment. Negotiations of an informal nature are now said to be going on with exiled independence leaders in New York, Cairo and elsewhere. If any basis of agreement can be reached, such as is being worked out in Tunis, then it may be possible to proclaim the kind of change which would have a chance of acceptance.

That is, it will have a chance unless the violence, fanned by certain important religious and political anniversaries, grows greater. Not for very much longer will it be possible to hold the past within the ancient walls by bayonet and machine gun.

Neither Party Is Confidently Predicting Mid-Term Victory

By DORIS FLEESON

WASHINGTON

DESPITE the oceans of brave talk that will be heard between now and November, neither Republicans nor Democrats are deeply confident they will win the mid-term elections.

The hardened professionals show a remarkable unanimity of opinion on this score. For one thing, since they don't really know, they are playing safe by not claiming too much.

They have another trick to disguise their inner confusion. It consists of explaining how this is one election that will be decided on local issues. It is said—again on both sides—that for the first time in years the President will not be an issue, nor will a war, nor will some striking innovation in domestic policy.

It is not surprising that Democrats talk in this vein. They very much want it to be so. Also, when they say that while Eisenhower is a fine, honest man, he is not going to be a great President, they are telling only what they truly believe personally. When they go on to say, however, that the people are disappointed so that Democrats need not fear the President on the hustings, it is an assumption.

The real surprise is that Republicans are not more confident. Most of the big guns are on their side and, as a veteran reporter once put it, "The race may not be to the swift nor the battle to the strong but that is the way to bet!" On the basis of the political balance sheet Republicans should be enormously cheerful. With a few exceptions—Speaker Joseph W. Martin is sincerely confident—they aren't.

Their assets are abvious: A popular President and the vast power of the presidency to help its friends and hurt its enemies; most of the money; most of the newspapers; tax cuts; and, above all, no war and no depression. And they are loaded with experts in radio and television to help put over their story.

BIG CHECKS NEEDED

The Democrats don't have to worry about money quite as much as they claim, but they are desperately up against it for big checks right now with which to reserve costly radio and TV time that must be pre-empted well in advance. They have no one striking issue for the whole country. They still are on the defensive on the Communists-in-government issue, despite Sen. Joseph McCarthy's slippage.

Also, there is yet no plan to utilize Adlai Stevenson's talents to the full. Anyway, he is only one man, with a tiny staff, what he does must come out of his bone and a sinew, including all the planning, travel arrangements, service, etc. In contrast, everything is done for the President at the White House where every detail has an experienced hand watching it.

The Democrats have some advantages. They have better candidates on the whole, and a strong bloc of junior senators, attractive and vigorous, who will go out and help those candidates.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Administration Easy On Red-Led Unions

WASHINGTON

CONGRESS was in a dither last week about outlawing the Communist Party, all because the administration asked for a bill to nullify Communist-dominated unions.

But the paradoxical thing is that the National Labor Relations Board at this very same time has been dragging its feet about permitting non-Communist unions to oust these Communist-dominated unions. And today, of course, the Eisenhower administration controls the National Labor Relations Board.

Furthermore, certain big manufacturers, chiefly the International Harvester Co., have made various moves to keep these Communist unions in their plants.

In brief, all the furor about getting rid of the Communist-dominated unions might have been unnecessary if Mr. Eisenhower's appointees on the National Labor Relations Board and certain industrial leaders had acted.

This may seem hard to believe, but here are the facts.

In the summer of 1952, the Farm Equipment-United Electrical Workers called a strike in various International Harvester plants. Three years before this in 1949, the FE-UE union was kicked out of the CIO by Phil Murray on the charge that it was Communist-dominated, so it was not surprising that during the 1952 strike, International Harvester printed a full-page ad, Sept. 8, 1952, festooned by the hammer and sickle of Soviet Russia, which stated; "It is our belief that the most influential leaders of FE-UE are either Communists or Communist sympathizers . . ."

Harvester Protects

Thus International Harvester went on record that FE-UE was a Communist-dominated union. This was in 1952. But despite this, only one year later, the same International Harvester rushed out to defend the same Communist-led union and to protect its continued operation in its East Moline works and in other of its factories. This was in 1953.

In August, 1953, labor leader John T. Watkins led a bolt away from the Communist-led FE-UE and with a large number of his fellow workers sought to join the vigorously anti-Communist United Auto Workers.

Whereupon the Harvester company refused to deal with the new group. Instead it dealt with Donald Taigland, whom the company itself had called a Communist during the 1952 strike and whom the Un-American Activities Committee had also labeled a Communist.

Finally, when the bolting anti-Communists asked the labor board for an election, International Harvester opposed it. It made various motions asking the labor board to dismiss the petitions for an election and did its best to keep the Communist-led union in the plant. In fact, the company and the Communist-led union made exactly the same legal moves before the labor board.

These motions are all in the official record and anyone can call at the labor board and read them. It's an amazing series of documents.

Furthermore, the company hired as its attorney Donald Morgan of Peoria, brother of the mayor of Peoria, a political backer of Congressman Velde of Pekin and Peoria, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, who has an office in the same building. So far as is known, Don Morgan hitherto had handled no labor board cases. His appointment seemed to stem from his acquaintance with Velde.

Velde Steps In

For shortly after Morgan took this case, Congressman Velde summoned before the Un-American Activities Committee none other than John T. Watkins, the man who had led the anti-Communist bolt away from the Communist-led union in the Harvester plant. In other words, instead of helping the non-Communist bolters, Velde hurt them. He cited Watkins, who swore he had never been a Communist, for contempt, because he refused to talk about his fellow workers.

Thus it looked as if Chairman Velde, his friend, attorney Don Morgan, and International Harvester were all playing footsie together in trying to keep a Communist-led union in the East Moline plant.

This is the same Congressman Velde who introduced the recent bill to outlaw Communist-infiltrated unions.

Finally, after months of delay, a labor election was held and the workers, when given a chance to vote, decided to junk the FE-UE and join the non-commie auto workers. But they had a hard time getting that chance to vote.

Meanwhile the labor board, now controlled by Eisenhower appointees, hasn't helped them much. There are other Communist-led unions in the Richmond, Ind., International Harvester plant; in the Farmall plant at Rock Island, Ill., and in other plants. And the labor board has been inexcusably dragging its feet in permitting elections for the ousting of the FE-UE union.

What happens is that when the workers lead a bolt away from the Communist-led union and nothing happens, they get tired and go back to the commie-led union. Every day of delay gives Communist leaders a chance to threaten, bulldoze, and create dissatisfaction among workers. In the Farmall plant, for instance, the labor board postponed elections for four months until only this week. In the East Moline plant, the board stalled for six months.

What labor needs is not an act of Congress, but less finagling by certain business leaders and less procrastination inside the labor board to delay elections. For when labor is given a chance to vote, it almost invariably votes against communism.

Mr. Velde would do a real service if he investigated International Harvester in this connection, but he won't. They have been his staunch political supporters.