



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, President and Publisher
RODIE H. LAMPEL, General Manager
ROBERT H. LAMPEL, Advertising Director
CUTLIP PRINCE, Editor
FRANK MORGAN, Associate Editor
R. L. YOUNG JR., Managing Editor
HUEY STINSON, Circulation Manager

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1958

Differences At Memorial Can Be Healed

DISCONTENT in medical circles over certain administrative affairs at Charlotte Memorial Hospital has perhaps been magnified in importance.

The fact remains, however, that strong disagreement exists over the role of doctors in determining hospital policies.

The seriousness of this internal friction was dramatized recently by the resignation of Dr. Paul Kimmelschick, the hospital's brilliant, internationally recognized pathologist—and the tutor that followed it.

Since the public's interest in Memorial Hospital is great public concern about the controversy has been equally sizable. As a potential patient every citizen seeks certain assurances about the smooth and reasonably blissful relations between the parties who may at any moment have custody of his fate.

Memorial Hospital needs the public's full confidence and, strangely enough,

the public needs to have complete confidence in the hospital.

If these lingering disagreements can be settled then by all means let them be. Nobody's best interests are served by prolonging a season of off-the-record grumbling on both sides. It bothers the public and it certainly does nothing for the well-being and contentment of the doctors, the administrative staff or the members of the institution's board of commissioners.

We firmly believe the matter can indeed be straightened out by a measure of compromise on both sides and some needed repairs on the lines of communication between the parties who are currently out of sorts with each other.

Memorial Hospital is a great asset to the community. It is responsible to some extent for Charlotte's reputation as one of the region's leading medical centers. That reputation must not be permitted to wither away.

The Southern Art Of Under-Doggery

EVERY year about this time the memory of Robert E. Lee fans those little sparks of the Confederacy that still linger in many southern breasts.

Partially the stainless steel character of his personal virtues is the cause of misty-eyed remembrances. But Lee was not the only man of integrity who led southern armies. What committed Marse Robert to southern sainthood was his habit of winning against overwhelming odds.

There is a touch of irony in the fact that southern politicians get so exercised over this fact every year. They themselves are without peer in the practice of under-doggery, as a quick look at the balance of power in Congress will attest. Surveying the seats of power in Washington, U. S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT finds southerners filling most of them.

Senators from 11 southern states head eight of the 15 standing committees in the upper house. In the House, 11 of the 19 standing committees have southern chairmen. The recognized leaders of both houses—Sam Rayburn of the House and Lyndon Johnson of the Senate—are southerners. This preponderance of southern influence on the course of national legislation is no mean feat to have been achieved by eleven states that, in varying degrees, still consider themselves as hemmed-in and embattled minority.

How To Buck Up The Billionaires

OUR tears flowed like pale dry sherry the other day when J. Paul Getty, "the richest man in America," unbended his soul to AMERICAN WEEKLY readers in a confession called "It's Tough To Be A Billionaire." Mr. Getty's own peculiar misery is based upon the conviction that great wealth often brings nothing but unhappiness.

A sample of the wretchedness billionaires must endure: "Even the simple, everyday matter of tipping can become a major problem. If I tip well, someone is certain to accuse me of showing off. If I don't overtip, that someone will be the first to sneer 'peny-pincher'."

These and other heart-tugging complaints merely confirm the desperate need for a League for Improving the Lives of the Rich, first advocated as a social welfare program by the late Clarence Day. Certain prejudices, even among benevolent people, exist today as they did in Day's day. People grant that many rich people are unhappy and lead miserable lives, but nevertheless they make these assertions:

1—When people are distressingly rich it must be their own fault.

2—Nobody has to stay rich if he'll just make an effort.

3—If he won't make an effort, he is probably a very bad lot.

But Mr. Day and other early humanitarians recognized that society cannot just walk selfishly off and mind its own business when confronted with a real social problem. "The rich are our brothers," he said. "How can the rest of us let

ourselves be truly happy when our brothers are suffering?"

The only sensible solution in a civilized society is a League For Improving the Rich.

Mr. Day, a man with 20-20 social vision, "saw many missions for such a league to perform."

It could establish neighborhood houses in all the rich districts where reformers could go and live just like the rich. This would enable a few of us to mingle with them, day by day, and gradually brighten their outlook and alter their standards.

It could send trained welfare workers to inspect the most desperate cases and gently reform one by one their conditions of living.

It could instruct volunteers in the best methods of rich relief work, especially methods of relieving the rich of their wealth.

The seriousness of the problem was never quite so apparent until we read Mr. Getty's catalog of complaints. The plain truth is that his unhappiness touched us to the quick. Suddenly we realized there must be thousands like him—maybe even millions—who are denied the simple joys of a healthy poverty-stricken existence, free of any fears about excessive tipping and things like that. Some may live right here in Charlotte. Surely Americans with a social conscience will not let this go on forever.

Clarence Day was right. The hearts of our people are kind. They just haven't thought.

distinctly outranks her husband, a mere prince.

Yet after a lifetime of subordinating the pronoun "I," we can't help trying to think up circumlocutions—or circumlocutions—to avoid it. Perhaps the Queen could adopt the editorial "we" in the manner of her grandmother, the late Queen Victoria, who once said, "We are amused." This "we" could refer to Queen Elizabeth II but imply the inclusion of Prince Philip.

We are sure that the British long ago worked out this thing to their own satisfaction and American suggestions would only be resented. Yet it's disconcerting somehow—as disturbing as the remark made by Sir Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister Churchill, who when entering a room once told the group, "It's me."



Involved In An Angry Controversy Over The Nation's Defense Are (l. to r.) Johnson, Truman, Butler, Adams and Symington

Sleazy Rewriting Of History Can Do U.S. Great Harm

By STEWART ALSOP

AS FAR as their record on defense is concerned, both parties live in glass houses of a particularly fragile sort. Nevertheless, to judge by recent oratory by Presidential aide Sherman Adams and others, the air is going to be thick with stones during this campaign year. And a good many of the stones in the Democratic rockpile are clearly marked with the name of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Washington. The so-called ballistic missile was started in 1946 and canceled in 1947 when the Army Air Corps was part of the Army. It is that correct?

Symington: "Mr. Lanphier, I think the so-called ballistic missile was started in 1946 and canceled in 1947 when the Army Air Corps was part of the Army. It is that correct?"

Lanphier: "Yes, sir. We checked the record before we came and it was July of 1947."

Symington: "At which time I think the record should show that the chief of staff of the Army was Gen. Eisenhower."

The fact that Gen. Eisenhower happened to be chief of staff when the first Atlas contract was canceled by the Army is insubstantial stuff, as Symington himself implied later in the testimony. Yet the kind of partisan rewriting of history in which Adams and other Republican orators have recently indulged has been largely made up of just such insubstantial stuff.

Not entirely, to be sure. For however rocky and condescending ex-President Harry Truman testified in effect that the Eisenhower administration in the pre-Sputnik era paid little or no attention to its land intelligence of Soviet missile progress. The President and his advisers, in short, simply refused to listen to what they did not want to hear.

The Republicans, of course, have a rockpile too, to use against the class house of the Democrats. Not only ex-President Truman, but titular party leader Adlai Stevenson and Senate Leader Lyndon Johnson are vulnerable on the defense issue.

Stevenson, in 1956, bought the "no missile in defense" idea, which may have been the better part of political val, but which certainly did not contribute to any elevating "democratic dialogue." As for Johnson, his voting record on defense has been good. But he is obviously open to the charge that he only summoned his Preparedness Subcommittee to make a serious inquiry into preparedness after the issue had been dramatized by the Sputniks.

Altogether, with one or two exceptions, it is hard to see how anyone is going to make any political hay out of a name-calling, rock-throwing contest on the defense issue. Perhaps for that very reason, that sort of contest will be avoided, as both President Eisenhower and Senate Leader Johnson devoutly wish. Obviously defense will be an issue, and ought to be an issue, since it is the hardest problem the country faces. But the kind of sleazy rewriting of history which politicians like Sherman Adams and Democratic Chairman Paul Butler are beginning to produce can do only both parties and the country—the maximum of harm.

But there's another fact which is also very much on the record: Johnson's disastrous budgets were devised with the advice and consultation of the then Gen. Eisenhower. To protect himself, Johnson used to speak ostentatiously of his first two budgets as "like one" and "like two."

As for the more recent past, the testimony before the Johnson committee provides the Democrats with a veritable rock-quarry, if throwing of stones on the defense issue starts in earnest.

Take, for example, the executive session testimony of Allen Dulles, chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, a brother of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and an impeccable Republican.

Dulles' testimony was both honest and accurate, and for that very reason it added copiously to the Democrats' rockpile. For Dulles testified in effect that the Eisenhower administration in the pre-Sputnik era paid little or no attention to its land intelligence of Soviet missile progress. The President and his advisers, in short, simply refused to listen to what they did not want to hear.

The Republicans, of course, have a rockpile too, to use against the class house of the Democrats. Not only ex-President Truman, but titular party leader Adlai Stevenson and Senate Leader Lyndon Johnson are vulnerable on the defense issue.

Stevenson, in 1956, bought the "no missile in defense" idea, which may have been the better part of political val, but which certainly did not contribute to any elevating "democratic dialogue." As for Johnson, his voting record on defense has been good. But he is obviously open to the charge that he only summoned his Preparedness Subcommittee to make a serious inquiry into preparedness after the issue had been dramatized by the Sputniks.

Altogether, with one or two exceptions, it is hard to see how anyone is going to make any political hay out of a name-calling, rock-throwing contest on the defense issue. Perhaps for that very reason, that sort of contest will be avoided, as both President Eisenhower and Senate Leader Johnson devoutly wish. Obviously defense will be an issue, and ought to be an issue, since it is the hardest problem the country faces. But the kind of sleazy rewriting of history which politicians like Sherman Adams and Democratic Chairman Paul Butler are beginning to produce can do only both parties and the country—the maximum of harm.

'Maybe We Should Propose Shooting This Stuff Across In Rockets'



The article further states that "One Klansman said the Indians were acting as a 'front' to break down the barrier of segregation. This is an unqualified statement. They are doing no such thing. They are merely attending to their

People's Platform

Pembroke Is Not An 'Indian Town'

Editors, The News:

A CHARLOTTE NEWS Tuesday, January 14, 1958, entitled "Lambert-Klan Goes On Warpath Against Indians." This article is in error in its facts and in its purpose.

First of all the Indians of Robeson County do not "have a town of their own, Pembroke, near Lumberton, and a college, Pembroke State College for Indians." Pembroke is just like any other town. All three races own property. Pembroke State College is a public college. It is not an "Indian town."

There is no college in Pembroke for Indians. From the time of the founding of the institution to 1945, enrollment in the school was limited to Indians of Robeson County. In 1945 the limits of the admission were extended to include persons from Indian groups registered by the federal government. The 1945 legislative assembly amended the statutes so as to give authority to the Board of Trustees to extend the limits of admission to include "any persons of the Indian race who may be approved by the Board of Trustees." Acting under this authority the Board of Trustees in May, 1946, took action approving the admission of white students. Since that time there has been many white students attending the college very successfully without incident. The local and official name of the institution is now "Pembroke State College."

Responsibility for organizing primarily belongs to national and international unions affiliated to the AFL-CIO and not the parent organization, except in unusual cases. Loss of income, failure in many instances to organize in local industries and an intensified survey, which indicated that the climate for organizing is not too good, led to the necessity for the last.

An organizer's existence is indeed precarious. The very nature of his work makes it necessary in many instances for him to spend a great deal of time away from his home base, and it is generally understood that anyone accepting a position as a union organizer realizes this and should be willing to accept any assignments, shifts and transfers of personnel under the parent organization and its national and international unions have been, for a long time, a very common practice. A very determined effort is being made to place all of these laid off with a national or international union, and those who fail to get employment will be given a very generous termination benefit.

Despite all of this, it was a very disheartening time to have the responsibility of advising the people who were laid off, for whom I have the highest regard.

—CAREY E. HAIGLER
Director, Region 3, AFL-CIO

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON. Most forthright newspaper in New Mexico of late has been the Santa Fe New Mexican, founded in 1849 and proud of its boast: "Oldest Newspaper in the West."

Though old in years the New Mexican took on new life when publisher Robert McKinney took it over 10 years ago. The paper exposed financial wrongdoing in the office of the state adjutant general and forced a refund to the taxpayers. It exposed the terms of the Beha-Taylor oil deal with the Navajo Indians, showed up graft and inefficiency in the Springfield Reform School and put a stick of publicity dynamite under padded coats of constructing New Mexican prisons.

He Got The Job. Later, orders came from the front of face to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez.

Editor Resigns. Simultaneously he had been a policy of no critical editorial comment on Eisenhower, no comment on Dulles, no comment on U. S. foreign policy, no comment on domestic problems, no criticism of New Mexico's Gov. McPherson. Simultaneously, Joseph Lawlor, for six years news editor, then editor, resigned. Explained Lawlor:

People's Interest. "As he left for Europe McKinney told me: 'My primary interest is in seeing

Is This What Press Freedom Means?

in the spring of 1957 as publisher McKinney began angling for appointment under Eisenhower, orders were given to tone down critical editorial comments. Herblock's cartoons when they were too hard on either Ike or Adlai. Lewis Strauss, Atomic Energy chairman. He also railed on criticism of Senate Democratic leader Lyndon Johnson.

He Got The Job. Later, orders came from the front of face to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez.

Editor Resigns. Simultaneously he had been a policy of no critical editorial comment on Eisenhower, no comment on Dulles, no comment on U. S. foreign policy, no comment on domestic problems, no criticism of New Mexico's Gov. McPherson. Simultaneously, Joseph Lawlor, for six years news editor, then editor, resigned. Explained Lawlor:

People's Interest. "As he left for Europe McKinney told me: 'My primary interest is in seeing

the monthly balance sheet."

Lawlor, who had helped expose waste in penitentiary construction, including the adjutant general's office, inefficiency in state government, was trained in the Thomas Jefferson school: "No government is good enough to be without enemies and where the press is free none ever will."

He Got The Job. Later, orders came from the front of face to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez.

Editor Resigns. Simultaneously he had been a policy of no critical editorial comment on Eisenhower, no comment on Dulles, no comment on U. S. foreign policy, no comment on domestic problems, no criticism of New Mexico's Gov. McPherson. Simultaneously, Joseph Lawlor, for six years news editor, then editor, resigned. Explained Lawlor:

People's Interest. "As he left for Europe McKinney told me: 'My primary interest is in seeing

the monthly balance sheet."

Lawlor, who had helped expose waste in penitentiary construction, including the adjutant general's office, inefficiency in state government, was trained in the Thomas Jefferson school: "No government is good enough to be without enemies and where the press is free none ever will."

He Got The Job. Later, orders came from the front of face to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez.

Editor Resigns. Simultaneously he had been a policy of no critical editorial comment on Eisenhower, no comment on Dulles, no comment on U. S. foreign policy, no comment on domestic problems, no criticism of New Mexico's Gov. McPherson. Simultaneously, Joseph Lawlor, for six years news editor, then editor, resigned. Explained Lawlor:

People's Interest. "As he left for Europe McKinney told me: 'My primary interest is in seeing

the monthly balance sheet."

Lawlor, who had helped expose waste in penitentiary construction, including the adjutant general's office, inefficiency in state government, was trained in the Thomas Jefferson school: "No government is good enough to be without enemies and where the press is free none ever will."

He Got The Job. Later, orders came from the front of face to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez.

Editor Resigns. Simultaneously he had been a policy of no critical editorial comment on Eisenhower, no comment on Dulles, no comment on U. S. foreign policy, no comment on domestic problems, no criticism of New Mexico's Gov. McPherson. Simultaneously, Joseph Lawlor, for six years news editor, then editor, resigned. Explained Lawlor:

People's Interest. "As he left for Europe McKinney told me: 'My primary interest is in seeing

the monthly balance sheet."

Lawlor, who had helped expose waste in penitentiary construction, including the adjutant general's office, inefficiency in state government, was trained in the Thomas Jefferson school: "No government is good enough to be without enemies and where the press is free none ever will."

He Got The Job. Later, orders came from the front of face to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez. He was told to drop criticism from Sen. Chavez.

Editor Resigns. Simultaneously he had been a policy of no critical editorial comment on Eisenhower, no comment on Dulles, no comment on U. S. foreign policy, no comment on domestic problems, no criticism of New Mexico's Gov. McPherson. Simultaneously, Joseph Lawlor, for six years news editor, then editor, resigned. Explained Lawlor:

People's Interest. "As he left for Europe McKinney told me: 'My primary interest is in seeing

From The Greensboro Daily News

THE QUEEN AND I

SINCE the language used by Britain's monarch is "The Queen's English," then presumably she can use it in any way she likes.

Nevertheless, to one who learned back in grammar school that the pronoun "I" should be second in combination with another pronoun, it was a shock to see the following in the Manchester Guardian:

"The Queen has sent the following message to the Governor-General of Ceylon: 'I and my husband are deeply distressed to learn of the tragic damage caused by the floods in Ceylon. Please convey our sincere sympathy to the relatives of those who have lost their lives and those who have been made homeless.'"

Upon reflection, of course, it is clear why the Queen must necessarily put herself first. She is head of the realm and

distinctly outranks her husband, a mere prince.

Yet after a lifetime of subordinating the pronoun "I," we can't help trying to think up circumlocutions—or circumlocutions—to avoid it. Perhaps the Queen could adopt the editorial "we" in the manner of her grandmother, the late Queen Victoria, who once said, "We are amused." This "we" could refer to Queen Elizabeth II but imply the inclusion of Prince Philip.

We are sure that the British long ago worked out this thing to their own satisfaction and American suggestions would only be resented. Yet it's disconcerting somehow—as disturbing as the remark made by Sir Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister Churchill, who when entering a room once told the group, "It's me."

distinctly outranks her husband, a mere prince.

Yet after a lifetime of subordinating the pronoun "I," we can't help trying to think up circumlocutions—or circumlocutions—to avoid it. Perhaps the Queen could adopt the editorial "we" in the manner of her grandmother, the late Queen Victoria, who once said, "We are amused." This "we" could refer to Queen Elizabeth II but imply the inclusion of Prince Philip.

We are sure that the British long ago worked out this thing to their own satisfaction and American suggestions would only be resented. Yet it's disconcerting somehow—as disturbing as the remark made by Sir Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister Churchill, who when entering a room once told the group, "It's me."