

Thomas L. Robinson - President and Publisher
Brodie S. Griffith - General Manager
Robert H. Lampe - Advertising Director
Cecil Prince - Associate Editor
E. L. Young Jr. - Managing Editor
Huey Stinson - Circulation Manager

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1957

Rep. Richards: The Moon Can Wait

JAMES Prieola Richards gave it out last September that he had come home to Lancaster County, S. C., to "drink spring water, look at the moon and help my son practice a little law."
He was making his manners to the homefolks after making his mark in the nation over 24 years as a congressional statesman in foreign affairs, and in South Carolina history as the state's most popular congressman, having served longer than any other.
Happily for the Eisenhower administration and the proper conduct of U. S. policy in the Middle East, the pleasant retirement Rep. Richards set for himself is not to be.
As special assistant to President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles on Middle Eastern affairs, his large fund of policy knowledge and legislative know-how will be re-invested in the U. S. fight for world leadership.
Mr. Eisenhower's political sagacity is obvious in the Richards' appointment. He now has on his team the top Democratic foreign affairs leaders of the last Congress and many Congress past, Richards of the House and Walter George of the Senate. In a period of increasing congressional irritability with Mr. Dulles and of a reawakened spirit of isolationism in the land, the services of George and Richards will be invaluable to the President in dealing with Congress. Since Rep. Richards on occasion has himself been a critic of administration policy, the appointment meets the "bipartisanship" taste test to a very high degree.
A less obvious but equally important fact of U. S. political life underscored by the Richards' appointment is the waste of the drinking of spring water by political leaders retired voluntarily or by a defeat at the polls.
Whenever most of the calibre of Dick Richards are returned to the workings of policy and legislation, the country profits.

Banish The Draft's Clumsy Inequities

ANY STUDY of the roots of discontent among today's youth would have to include a lengthy chapter entitled Military Service.
In its old age, the draft has become a clumsily inadequate and unjust system of meeting the nation's military demands. It is small wonder that youngsters in their late teens and early twenties are slightly bewitched, bothered and bewildered by the whole subject.
What is true in Charlotte is apparently true elsewhere. It is not the fault of local draft boards but of national policy.
That policy, according to the WASHINGTON POST & TIMES-HERALD this week, is the subject of sharp debate within the administration.
What has happened is that the pool of draft eligibles has grown from 710,000 in 1954 to 1,310,000 today. But monthly inductions still range from 14,000 to 17,000.
The pool is getting larger by the day. With so few called out of so many available, the armed forces reject many men for rather flimsy reasons. A youth may have a relatively minor physical defect or may simply be "unsuitable." Some draft boards also can afford to be more liberal with college and occupational deferments.
As a result, many youths live under great clouds of uncertainty. They may be called or they may not be called. Assistant Defense Secretary Carter L. Burgess, retiring Pentagon personnel chief, warns that it is "not unreasonable to assume" that if the manpower pool reaches 1,800,000 men some might completely escape military service by passing their 28th birthdays. The draft age is now 18 1/2 through 25.
Complaints of youths themselves, their parents and even some military officials are piling up, meanwhile. They include: Too many rejections and deferments; induction at too late an age; too big a backlog of fit but untrained men in their late teens and early twenties; too few military reservists who are not veterans of World War II or Korea, putting the latter in "triple jeopardy."
Some of the nation's manpower experts coldly argue that the true test of the draft is not whether it is completely fair but whether it does the job—i.e., maintaining the security of the United States. This is an unnecessarily ruthless attitude when the ideals of fairness and effectiveness could both be served by a reasonable system of universal military training.
World conditions demand that the United States maintain armed forces of considerable size and versatility at this time and for some time to come. Furthermore, past conflicts have fully established the value of a large, trained, manpower reserve. The fairest method of preparing the entire citizenry for the possibility of war—and of maintaining a constant military force under arms—is a system by which all healthy males devote at least a brief period of their lives to active duty training. Such a program, if properly administered, would leave virtually no doubts or uncertainties as to whether a youth was an automatic and expected necessity at a particular age. Educational programs and vocational careers could be planned accordingly.
The draft's clumsiness, its inequities and its uncertainties would be banished.
The need is clear. It will become clearer as the time approaches to renew the present draft act in 1959.

To Carl Sandburg On His 79th Birthday

Hog Butcher for the World
Tool Maker, Slacker of the World
Player With Rooted and the
Nation's Freight Handler
Stormy, husky, brawling,
City of the Big Shoulders . . .
THAT was Sandburg's Chicago, circa 1914. But the white-manned troubadour who sang so sagely of the City of the Big Shoulders is a Tar Heel now, an aficionado of goat breeding in Henderson County—and this week he turned 79.
On such an occasion a toast must be phrased.
Shall it be to Sandburg, the "North Carolina writer," the "literary squire of Flat Rock," the "old man of the Blue Ridge"?
No, say America's captains of culture. Goats to the contrary notwithstanding, Sandburg is the Midwest's spokesman; they cry. He wrote of prairies and steel workers and Lincoln and the Loop. It is ludicrous to associate him culturally with North Carolina. That is what they say.
They are all right—and all wrong.

THE WINTER LIGHT

NO MATTER whether the temperature is unseasonably high or low, the season's change is here when dawn and dusk times of slanting winter light, when the sunrise and sunset are far off to the south and the midday sun sweeps into the south windows.
And if the sky at dusk is rimmed with faint, greenish light you can be glad for a full of tank, a heaped coal bin or an ample supply of firewood. Winter is there in sight, in that icy band of sky, very likely it will be nipping at nose and fingers by morning after such a dusk.
Each season has its own light, its own sunrise and sunset. Spring is a lightening of the sky, a new clarity of the blue, an absence of that feathery snow-threat that is so typical of March.
Spring is an equinox and sunrise equals with the compass. Summer is a dazzle, though often gauzed with heat haze or high-flown dust. And the north-

Sandburg, a Tar Heel now, remains the Midwest's most eloquent spokesman. But Chicago ceded him not to North Carolina but to the world. He is the poet of the plain people everywhere.
His message, in a true sense, is the message of the family of man. "I Am the People, the Mob," he wrote at the very beginning. So he has been from the very beginning—a clear voice in a babble of cynicism, irrationality and superficiality, the clear voice of a democrat, an equalitarian, a humanitarian, an optimist, an idealist.
He may never write of Tar Heels as Tar Heels. But has written, and is writing, of men as men. Here are the farmers, the day laborers, the soldiers, the Negroes, the hoboes, the bums, the coal miners. Here is Man.
Man is a long time coming,
Man will get on his feet
Brother may get line up with
brother.
This old anvil laughs at many broken hammers . . .
In the darkness with a great bundle of grief the people march.

ing sun marks the summer, early sunrise, late sunset and a lingering dusk. Autumn is a time of crispness, even in the air, and the light is like the burnish for the changing leaves. Autumn sunrise seems often to reflect the flaming maple and the golden birch; and autumn is another equinox, sunrise and sunset once more square with the directions.
Then comes the southward shift toward winter, the sky clarifies itself with frost, and the light begins to shimmer. Late dawn with a long, slanting light that touches the leafless hillsides with a brief, rose glow. Then comes the cold, and the ice comes, and after that comes the snow, and the winter light on the snowy land is full of blue and purple which lie like lakes along the drifts. Then the solstice, winter at its depth, and deep, long sunlight.
We can get on if coming now, the slanting winter light, the icy green at evening, the short days, winter itself.

The New Dealing President And Me-Tooing Democrats

By STEWART ALSOP
WASHINGTON
WHEN the new Senate met and the roll was called, there was a moment of breathless suspense before Ohio's new senator, unpredictable Frank Lausche, voted with the Democrats to organize the Senate. Lausche had told no one how he would vote, and the relieved Democrats clapped and cheered. Logically, they should have wept.
For the fact is that the Democrats, in control of Congress, find themselves in a genuinely desperate situation. They are in a desperate situation simply because President Eisenhower, in pursuit of his stated purpose of making the Republican Party the nation's majority party, is getting ready to use all their issues, and leave them naked as so many jaybirds.
The President is now working hard on two major public documents—his State of the Union speech and his second inaugural address. The tone of the State of the Union speech according to a reliable report, will be "modern Republicanism" all the way, with heavy emphasis on such New Deal issues as Social Security, health legislation, schools, farm aid, and notably, civil rights legislation.
SACRIFICES FOR PEACE
The theme of the inaugural address will be "the price of peace," with equally heavy emphasis on the theme of the administration for the years to come. Obviously, it is not a tone calculated to warm the hearts of the still powerful conservative-isolationist Republican hard core on Capitol Hill.
For the moment, the conservative Republicans have been maintaining a souse-like silence, since they are still bemused by the Eisenhower triumph at the polls. But if they had organized the Senate, as they so nearly did, they would no doubt in time have given the President plenty of trouble. After all when the Republicans were in control in the first two Eisenhower years, the President was driven to talking seriously of forming a third party.
STATUS AT STAKE
But barring accidents of nature, the right-wing Republicans will lack the key committee chairmanships, and thus the means of making real trouble for the President.

Meanwhile, the Democrats are in no shape to make real trouble for him either.
The Democrats, especially the Northern liberals, are just as vividly aware as the President that the Democratic status as the national majority party is at stake. They know that the coalition put together by Franklin D. Roosevelt which the Democrats Party the normal majority for more than two decades, is showing every sign of cracking up. But what are they to do?
Plenty of Democrats are deeply disturbed by the administration's conduct of defense and foreign policy, and the Middle East crisis will certainly be heatedly debated. But there is not a man on Capitol Hill who believes that there is real political hay to be made by attacking the President's defense and foreign policy so soon after his triumph in November.
On virtually every domestic issue, the Democrats can only say "me too, only more so." To the President's version of "Modern Republicanism" This is true especially of civil rights, the only issue which really raises the voters' temperatures, on which the northern Democrats had counted heavily to woo back the slipping Negro and minority vote.
In the election, the Negro voters used the carrot-and-stick technique on both parties. The northern Democrats by no means enjoyed the feeling of the stick, which is why they are so eager to take credit for civil rights legislation. But the Republicans thoroughly enjoyed the taste of the carrot, which is why so many of them joined the Liberal Democratic attack on Senate Rule 22.
Moreover, an essential part of the Eisenhower strategy for making the Republicans the majority party is to accelerate the shift of the minority vote to the Republicans. The administration is therefore getting ready to push really hard to line up Republican votes behind the President's moderate civil rights program. If the push is hard enough, there is a good chance that the needed 64 votes can be mustered to break the expected southern filibuster.
But if that happens, the Republican administration will reap the lion's share of the credit, while really stirs up the voters? The fact that this question is so hard to answer suggests why the Democratic session may prove crucial to both parties, and why it involves a great danger to the Democrats and a great opportunity for the Republicans.

Republican chances are bright because the Johnson-Rayburn team, making the national news from Washington for the Democratic Party, are inevitably in opposition. They speak, with respect to the great revolution taking place on the issue of segregation versus integration, for the past. And while the Republicans often on this issue has been more often than not weak, timid and false, the Republican Party seems nevertheless to stand with the future.
The table a percentage changes as between 1952 and 1956, compiled by L. Richard Gulyay, the able public relations director of the Republican National Committee, Louisiana with 9.7 per cent shows the greatest gain. Next was Massachusetts, New Jersey and Rhode Island, each with a gain of 7 per cent or more. Fifth is Alabama with a gain of 6.2 per cent. But not far behind are the industrial states of New York, Massachusetts, Illinois and Ohio—New York showing a 5.2 per cent gain and each of the others with nearly twice the national average.
The explanation may be simply prosperity. That is what the Democrats would like to think. As one Democratic senator, usually on the conservative side on domestic issues, put it:
"Who prospers at the present level and virtually the whole press is chanting praise of the Republican party we don't have a chance. Perhaps we won't have a chance until the economy takes a down turn and that may not be as far off as you think."
DROUGHT LOSS
The percentage table lends some credence to this view, for the greatest Republican losses were in the drought states and in the Northwest where the prosperity was minimal or nonexistent. Oregon showed a drop of 9.1 per cent and North and South Dakota, 4.6 and 4.7 in the Republican honor roll. Losses of 10.6 and 12.9 per cent. Iowa showed a loss of 4.9 and Missouri 1.4.
What the losses above all point up is the Republican opportunity. The administration must push its constructive measures that will win friends and influence that will win votes in those parts of the country where Senate and House Republicans suffered their chief defeats. If the "new Republicanism" is incapable of the positive steps so obviously needed, then today's glittering opportunity will seem in two or three years from now to have been hardly more than a mirage.

Opportunity Without Parallel Faces 'New' Republicans

By MARQUIS CHILDS
WASHINGTON
THE OPPORTUNITY that now opens up for the Republicans is so magnificent, so remarkable that it would be hard to find any parallel for it in the American past.
The balance struck with the beginning of a new year shows up strong in almost every department. To begin with there is the great Eisenhower sweep with the President gaining 24 per cent in his '56 showing over his '52 showing.
While the Republicans failed to win majorities in House and Senate, nevertheless long-term gains show up in this department, too. Not for many years have the Republicans held both the Senate seats of New York, the largest and most powerful state in the Union. They also have had out of 47 of New York's delegation in the House which is the highest margin in a long time.
THREE PARTS
But it is in contrast with the Democrats that the strength of the Republican Party is most evident. The meeting of the Democratic Advisory Committee last week served if nothing else to show that the party divided like all Gaul into three parts. And that may be a charitable underestimate of the fragmenting process.
First is the national party insofar as it exists after the disaster of November. It was only the national party, represented by such distinguished figures as former President Truman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson and Gov. Averell Harriman of New York, that responded to Chairman Paul Butler's latest call for unity through an advisory committee.
A second province is the South, which in recent years has been moving toward greater isolation from the national party. The southern governors invited to join the advisory committee said so.
The third Democratic province might be called the congressional party and its two pillars are Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson and Speaker Sam Rayburn, both of whom not only refused to have any part of the committee but discouraged others in the Senate and House from taking part.
In speech after speech he said, "I want to let you in on a big secret. You know the position of my opponent, that issues aren't important. Well, at 2 a.m. on Nov. 7 he's going to discover that issues were important after all and that he's going back to that struck auto agency of his in Salem to sell Cadillacs again."

South, from the Democrats to the Republicans. Republican chances of holding this vote, which is about ten per cent of the total, are good. It is on this base that a new national mass party can be built.

Republican chances are bright because the Johnson-Rayburn team, making the national news from Washington for the Democratic Party, are inevitably in opposition. They speak, with respect to the great revolution taking place on the issue of segregation versus integration, for the past. And while the Republicans often on this issue has been more often than not weak, timid and false, the Republican Party seems nevertheless to stand with the future.
The table a percentage changes as between 1952 and 1956, compiled by L. Richard Gulyay, the able public relations director of the Republican National Committee, Louisiana with 9.7 per cent shows the greatest gain. Next was Massachusetts, New Jersey and Rhode Island, each with a gain of 7 per cent or more. Fifth is Alabama with a gain of 6.2 per cent. But not far behind are the industrial states of New York, Massachusetts, Illinois and Ohio—New York showing a 5.2 per cent gain and each of the others with nearly twice the national average.
The explanation may be simply prosperity. That is what the Democrats would like to think. As one Democratic senator, usually on the conservative side on domestic issues, put it:
"Who prospers at the present level and virtually the whole press is chanting praise of the Republican party we don't have a chance. Perhaps we won't have a chance until the economy takes a down turn and that may not be as far off as you think."
DROUGHT LOSS
The percentage table lends some credence to this view, for the greatest Republican losses were in the drought states and in the Northwest where the prosperity was minimal or nonexistent. Oregon showed a drop of 9.1 per cent and North and South Dakota, 4.6 and 4.7 in the Republican honor roll. Losses of 10.6 and 12.9 per cent. Iowa showed a loss of 4.9 and Missouri 1.4.
What the losses above all point up is the Republican opportunity. The administration must push its constructive measures that will win friends and influence that will win votes in those parts of the country where Senate and House Republicans suffered their chief defeats. If the "new Republicanism" is incapable of the positive steps so obviously needed, then today's glittering opportunity will seem in two or three years from now to have been hardly more than a mirage.

'However, We've Been Pretty Successful In Keeping American Newspapers Out Of China'

WASHINGTON
The balance struck with the beginning of a new year shows up strong in almost every department. To begin with there is the great Eisenhower sweep with the President gaining 24 per cent in his '56 showing over his '52 showing.
While the Republicans failed to win majorities in House and Senate, nevertheless long-term gains show up in this department, too. Not for many years have the Republicans held both the Senate seats of New York, the largest and most powerful state in the Union. They also have had out of 47 of New York's delegation in the House which is the highest margin in a long time.
THREE PARTS
But it is in contrast with the Democrats that the strength of the Republican Party is most evident. The meeting of the Democratic Advisory Committee last week served if nothing else to show that the party divided like all Gaul into three parts. And that may be a charitable underestimate of the fragmenting process.
First is the national party insofar as it exists after the disaster of November. It was only the national party, represented by such distinguished figures as former President Truman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson and Gov. Averell Harriman of New York, that responded to Chairman Paul Butler's latest call for unity through an advisory committee.
A second province is the South, which in recent years has been moving toward greater isolation from the national party. The southern governors invited to join the advisory committee said so.
The third Democratic province might be called the congressional party and its two pillars are Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson and Speaker Sam Rayburn, both of whom not only refused to have any part of the committee but discouraged others in the Senate and House from taking part.
In speech after speech he said, "I want to let you in on a big secret. You know the position of my opponent, that issues aren't important. Well, at 2 a.m. on Nov. 7 he's going to discover that issues were important after all and that he's going back to that struck auto agency of his in Salem to sell Cadillacs again."

South, from the Democrats to the Republicans. Republican chances of holding this vote, which is about ten per cent of the total, are good. It is on this base that a new national mass party can be built.

Republican chances are bright because the Johnson-Rayburn team, making the national news from Washington for the Democratic Party, are inevitably in opposition. They speak, with respect to the great revolution taking place on the issue of segregation versus integration, for the past. And while the Republicans often on this issue has been more often than not weak, timid and false, the Republican Party seems nevertheless to stand with the future.
The table a percentage changes as between 1952 and 1956, compiled by L. Richard Gulyay, the able public relations director of the Republican National Committee, Louisiana with 9.7 per cent shows the greatest gain. Next was Massachusetts, New Jersey and Rhode Island, each with a gain of 7 per cent or more. Fifth is Alabama with a gain of 6.2 per cent. But not far behind are the industrial states of New York, Massachusetts, Illinois and Ohio—New York showing a 5.2 per cent gain and each of the others with nearly twice the national average.
The explanation may be simply prosperity. That is what the Democrats would like to think. As one Democratic senator, usually on the conservative side on domestic issues, put it:
"Who prospers at the present level and virtually the whole press is chanting praise of the Republican party we don't have a chance. Perhaps we won't have a chance until the economy takes a down turn and that may not be as far off as you think."
DROUGHT LOSS
The percentage table lends some credence to this view, for the greatest Republican losses were in the drought states and in the Northwest where the prosperity was minimal or nonexistent. Oregon showed a drop of 9.1 per cent and North and South Dakota, 4.6 and 4.7 in the Republican honor roll. Losses of 10.6 and 12.9 per cent. Iowa showed a loss of 4.9 and Missouri 1.4.
What the losses above all point up is the Republican opportunity. The administration must push its constructive measures that will win friends and influence that will win votes in those parts of the country where Senate and House Republicans suffered their chief defeats. If the "new Republicanism" is incapable of the positive steps so obviously needed, then today's glittering opportunity will seem in two or three years from now to have been hardly more than a mirage.

Morse And Nixon Exchange Needles

WASHINGTON
A brief, pointed exchange between two men who don't love each other occurred when Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon took the oath before Vice President Nixon.
Nixon had gone out to Oregon twice to defeat Sen. Morse. The campaign against him was considered the "Tale of Two Cities" of all the Senate elections. A member of the Eisenhower Cabinet had even resigned to run against Morse.
Shaking Hands
S, when Morse came up to the Senate rostrum to take the oath and shake hands with the vice president, he said:
"Mr. Vice President, I want to thank you for those speeches you made in Oregon. They helped elect me."
Mr. Nixon gulped, then recovered quickly.
He Was Glad
"Well, I'm glad they helped," he shot back with a smile.
"They certainly did," replied Morse.
"You're right with the punches," chuckled Nixon.
"And you threw a few yourself," said Morse.
It was all over in 20 seconds. No one

except the two men knew what had happened.
Some Sarcasm
Note—Though there was a slight note of sarcasm in Morse's voice, he halfway meant what he said. "Tale of Two Cities" speeches had helped. For, when Nixon first came to Oregon he gave a pep talk to GOP leaders at Salem urging them to go out and get Morse. "Don't pay any attention to issues," he said, "get out the vote." Later ex-Secretary of the Interior Doug McKay got this confused "issues are not important," he told the audience. "It's the votes that count."

liberately. Shortly before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee met with Dulles last week, Senate leader Lyndon Johnson phoned four members of the committee—Mansfield of Montana, Sparkman of Alabama, Fulbright of Arkansas, and Humphrey of Minnesota—advising them not to pull any punches.
Lyndon's Notes
They didn't. On top of this Johnson attended the closed-door session himself and wrote notes to the senators suggesting questions to ask the secretary of state.
Democrats were irred at the way the administration was forcing them to take a stand on the "Eisenhower doctrine" by the barrage of publicity leaked to the press in advance. They gave Dulles such a rough time that at one point he said:
"There's only one person responsible for the foreign policy of the United States—the President."
"Then why are you coming to us with this resolution?" the senators cracked back. "If the President has the responsibility, let him exercise it."

Another Lincoln
"Who prospers at the present level and virtually the whole press is chanting praise of the Republican party we don't have a chance. Perhaps we won't have a chance until the economy takes a down turn and that may not be as far off as you think."
DROUGHT LOSS
The percentage table lends some credence to this view, for the greatest Republican losses were in the drought states and in the Northwest where the prosperity was minimal or nonexistent. Oregon showed a drop of 9.1 per cent and North and South Dakota, 4.6 and 4.7 in the Republican honor roll. Losses of 10.6 and 12.9 per cent. Iowa showed a loss of 4.9 and Missouri 1.4.
What the losses above all point up is the Republican opportunity. The administration must push its constructive measures that will win friends and influence that will win votes in those parts of the country where Senate and House Republicans suffered their chief defeats. If the "new Republicanism" is incapable of the positive steps so obviously needed, then today's glittering opportunity will seem in two or three years from now to have been hardly more than a mirage.

From The New York Times