

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, President and Publisher
 BRODIE S. GRIFFITH, General Manager
 ROBERT H. LAMPERT, Advertising Director
 CECIL F. FRANCE, Editor
 TERRY MORGAN, Managing Editor
 R. L. YOUNG, Jr., Managing Editor
 JAMES McDOWELL, Circulation Manager

SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1958

Court Probe Poses Task For Council

THE investigation of possible irregularities in certain operations of City Recorder's Court, which involves at least one police officer, still is going on. But it is no secret that the reputation of both agencies already is sagging under a heavy burden of public suspicion.

It could hardly be otherwise, in view of the official report that court funds have been used to cash bad checks for another police officer and that forfeited but unpaid bonds of considerable value have piled up in Recorder's Court.

This is no time to draw conclusions from these reports, nor to engage in innuendoes that might injure innocent persons or offices. There will be plenty of time to specify irregularities, if any, and to assign blame, if any, when the official investigation is completed and the auditor's report on the court clerk's office is examined.

But it is time right now for City Council

to recognize its ultimate responsibility in this matter, and to prepare itself to make a full and complete report to the public. These circumstances must not be touched upon once over lightly in Council's inner sanctum, and then left to simmer in unresolved suspicion.

The public report must be followed by assigning blame for any wrongdoing, and by studied but vigorous efforts to correct any imperfections in administration of the court. Nothing short of a thorough and straightforward response by Council can remedy the loss of public confidence that is already apparent.

There may be more smoke than fire in the current situation, or more fire than smoke. We don't know. But we do know that Council must play the firm role in full public view when the facts are in.

Its reputation is at stake too.

In Diversity, There Is Also Strength

WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS, the mountain climber and world traveler who finds time between global adventures to sit with the U. S. Supreme Court, can always be depended upon in a pinch to remind Americans of their rough and ready heritage. He was at it again the other day during a television interview.

Douglas, ruggedest of the federal judiciary's rugged individualists, was complaining testily that the inclination today is "to look for a teacher who is so-called 'safe,' a minister who is 'safe,' a congressman who is 'safe.' He defined as "safe" any individual who does not have unorthodox or original ideas and who is "not a contentious character."

The inclination is, unfortunately, real. It is a part of the legacy of the late Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy and others and it has no real place in American life. What it amounts to, in Douglas' words, is "a general contraction of the feeling of ability to speak freely and a general lowering of the standards of free expression that we have enjoyed in early days. In the Jeffersonian sense of freedom of speech there should be no horizon on debate on talk."

The words are old and possibly trite, but they still have meaning and significance in the age of conformity and the Organization Man.

It is easy to forget in a nation that has enjoyed the fruits of a reasonably secure and comfortable existence for so long that freedom drops in strength with diversity. When men prefer uniformity they are forsaking individuality and forfeiting their freedom.

Coda For A Chicago Horn Blower

IN the spring of 1942 the public government and most of all, the broadcasting industry, were seeing—James Caesar Petrillo had spoken in the name of "live" music.

Making records for radio and juke boxes was forbidden for his 138,000-member American Federation of Musicians. A THIS IS THE ARMY show was never aired and NBC was forced to cancel a high school orchestra program. Not one of the talented amateurs could produce a union card.

Editorial writers flew into a frenzy. Americans at war were deprived of an important morale builder by "Little Caesar," the "Mussolini of music." Not that the cocky Chicago horn blower was unpatriotic. On the contrary, he even ordered his boys to play the national anthem before and after each engagement.

Petrillo was simply more interested in

musicians than music — especially "canned" music — and would not be muted on the subject. To stress his point he once blared his pipes, the difference between Heifetz and a tavern fiddler."

After 38 years of labor politicking the music czar has mellowed. His last big battle was with members of his own union whom he claimed made excessive demands on the movie industry. Those demands, he contended, were too costly for "a sick industry."

This week Petrillo, one of the toughest of labor's leaders, shed a tear and announced he would no longer be chief of the 260,000-member federation of music makers in spite of placards pleading "Jimmy, Don't Leave Us," and "Jimmy, We Need You."

Now Jimmy can go home, light up a pipe, turn on the radio, and find out the difference between Heifetz and a tavern fiddler.

From The Richmond Times-Dispatch

BUSY, BUSY 'DOCTORS' ON TV

ONE wonders how doctors ever find time to see patients; they keep so busy giving commercials on television. Or so it seems.

There was a period a few years back when cigarette ads were full of endorsements by the "medicos." A cartoon of the era showed two men standing in front of a big building and one was saying to the other, "It must be a cigarette factory; I've seen lots of doctors going in and out."

Today the medical men are selling patent medicines on television. Of course, the doctors in the TV commercials aren't really doctors, but they often wear white coats and otherwise look so professional that you just take it for granted that they have M.D.'s after their names.

What brings this to mind is a new story in the efforts that the Federal Trade Commission and the maker of an anti-acid remedy have agreed that the latter will modify its commercials in which actors dressed as doctors recommend the product.

The ad part that the company must stop claiming that stomach acids can burn a hole in a cloth napkin. No longer will we be fascinated by watching

the scientific-looking fellow in the white coat pour "concentrated stomach acid" on a piece of cloth and then see him hold up the cloth to let us observe the enormous hole through it. The demonstration is especially appealing at mealtime.

Well just have to be content with other intriguing demonstrations of medical science, such as the one in which the hammer beats on the brains until the victim swallows the right medicine. Or that fascinating peek into a gentleman's insides wherein "As" get into the stomach but can't open the latch, while "Bs" push the door open and go flying through the blood stream.

You sure can learn a lot about medical science watching TV.

Science can magnify the human voice 12,000 times and if you don't have it come out and listen to the neighborhood baby some night. — GREENVILLE (S.C.) PIEMONT.

Those who insist that the country lacks a sense of direction seem to be oblivious that the government directives that are issued — LAUREL (Miss.) LEADER-CALL.

Charles De Gaulle's Neither A Buffoon Nor A Dictator

By WALTER LIPPMANN

WASHINGTON
 WHAT HAS happened in France illustrates a truth which I first came upon years ago in a history of the French revolution. It is that a regime, an established order, is rarely overthrown by a revolutionary



CORBELL HULL
 Two Faces Were Useful

movement, usually a regime collapses of its own weakness and corruption and then a revolutionary movement enters among the ruins and takes over the powers that have become vacant.

Thus it is simply not true as some are saying that a democratic and free system of government has been overthrown by a conspiracy of generals and extremists, connived at by generals and right wing politicians, among them Charles De Gaulle himself.



JUAN PERON
 No Republics In France

crucial is a disgrace to the good name of France, was presided over by a Socialist politician who owed his appointment to a Socialist Prime Minister. As respects North Africa, the authority of the French government in Paris had collapsed long before the revolution broke out last month. As early as February, after the bombing of the Tunisian village of Sidi-Bou-Said, it was no longer plain as the nose on one's face

that the Paris government was impotent to govern. It is false, therefore, to look upon Gen. De Gaulle as the man who overthrew or conspired at the overthrow of the parliamentary government. He has come to power because that government could no longer pretend that it was able to govern.

AN OLD MAN

It has been said by some that while Gen. De Gaulle himself is not a Fascist, he is an old man, like Hindenburg in Germany, who in his senility will place way to a French Hitler. All I can say is that, having seen him recently, he did not seem in the least senile to me. He was then, as he has always been, a man of extraordinary historical insight and imagination, in this respect, not only I would say, but not equal to Churchill. There is in De Gaulle no trace of the modern vulgar dictator, of the Hitler, Mussolini, Peron, or Nasser, and he has shown in his books that his mind is profound and that his style — since he uses no ghost writer — is a true expression of his mind.

There has never been any doubt, it has seemed to me, that he is an authentic bearer of the central traditions of the Western society. He does not use its values as stereotypes and slogans, as the battered clichés that political orators have made of them. His mystery, which communicates itself to the French when they are in trouble, is that, being authentic and not time-serving, he touches those chords of memory which bind a nation together.

BAD RELATIONS

An interesting book could be written about the bad relations which existed during the war between President Roosevelt and Gen. De Gaulle. I do not intend to know the whole story but as a newspaperman in Washington and in London, I knew about significant bits and pieces of the story. Their bad relations began originally because at the beginning of the war, after the fall of France in 1940, there were two French governments. There was one inside France at Vichy under Marshal Petain which was of course dominated by Hitler and the victorious Nazi armies. The other French government was in exile in London, and it was under Gen. De Gaulle.

It was our official policy, for which there were very good reasons of expediency, to maintain diplomatic relations with Petain's government in Vichy and in North Africa. Our good reasons were that we intended to influence North Africa and hoped for the collaboration of the French officials and soldiers. This policy, which was followed by Secretary Hull and the President, required that we have no relations with the Free French.

Though our hearts were with the Free French, our calculated policy required us to be with the Vichy French. We had a double-faced attitude caused

much misunderstanding, and one irritating incident after the other. Roosevelt and De Gaulle never forgot and outlived their original cross purposes.

TEMPERAMENTAL CLASH

All this was complicated by a temperamental clash between Roosevelt and De Gaulle. It is illustrated well enough in the perennial and celebrated joke that Gen. De Gaulle, who must be about six foot three and is all

male, regarded himself as the Maid of Orleans, the Joan of Arc of the French disaster. Roosevelt seemed to think this was exceedingly funny, that it proved that Charles De Gaulle was not to be taken too seriously.

But it was a Philistine's joke. For while, obviously enough, De Gaulle was a man and Joan was a woman, his historic role in the French disaster, like hers in the days before, was to rally the nation and to compel the govern-

ment to resist the invading enemy. It is no surprise that there was no warm understanding between the two men, one of whom thought that the other's historic mission was a joke.

In fact it was no more absurd, nor was it any more concealed, for De Gaulle to think of Joan of Arc than it has been for, let us say, American presidents, in times of crisis, to think of themselves in terms of Washington and Lincoln.

'I Think I'm Beginning To Feel A Sense Of Urgency'



Politics In Ferment

Will Dixie Lose Dominance?

By ROWLAND EVANS, JR.

WASHINGTON
 IMPORTANT tell-tale signs are pointing to the strong Democratic majority in the House next January since the pinnacle of the Roosevelt New Deal.

Time remains, of course, for that prospect to come a cropper before the Nov. 4 election. The chill wind that blew out of California this week, however, put new sting into the bad political weather that has dogged the Democrats in one primary election after another this spring.

Strangely enough, even the Mid-West Republicans seem to have election-year jitters, despite the tradition that farmers vote Republican when prices and harvest are good. How else can we explain the vote of Rep. George of Kansas and several other farm-state Republicans for that "socialistic deal" that the Democrats tried unsuccessfully to substitute for the Eisenhower unemployment pay bill?

Informed estimates that the Democrats may pick up between twenty and forty new House seats are immensely significant. They simply mean that the composition of the new House would well give the northern and western Democrats effective majority control without the help of the southern conservatives. If that happens, the center of power in the House would shift from the moderates to the northern liberals, and with it the power to enact legislation.

Every one knows that the Democratic prospect in the Senate is excellent. Not so well known, however, is the full measure of their power in the House.

AVERAGE LOSS

Not since 1934 has the party occupying the White House seen its seats in the House drop in a non-presidential election. In the five off-year contests,

since then, the administration party has lost an average of 44 seats. The House has been a Republican since their 1956 total of 198 would drop to less than 160 seats and the Democrats would jump from 233 to 270.

Another statistical hazard for the Republicans is their large number of "marginal" districts. The districts most likely to reflect changes in voting patterns. Careful study of results in the 1956 and 1954 elections shows that the

farm prices, the "tr" of events seem to be running strongly against them. Many economists expect the recession to last well beyond this fall and predict a fairly long period of relatively high unemployment.

OMINOUS NEWS

Headlines that bristle day after day with ominous news from abroad are confusing and upsetting a lot of voters, as this reporter can attest from a recent survey in the Middle West. An uneasy feeling that affairs here have been permitted to get out of hand, and that the Republican administration is somehow to blame, is promising electoral dividends to the Democrats.

MAGIC NUMBER

What all this means is that the "magic number" of 270 seems to be within range of the Democrats for the first time since 1936.

The Democrats elect that many members, the northwesterners know they can dispense with the Republicans and most of the southern conservatives of their own party and it command a majority. Achievement of the "magic number," in other words, would do no less than transform the entire political climate in the House and in Congress as a whole. Such "liberal" legislation as school construction and income tax reduction, not even under serious consideration today, would pulse with new life.

But, and its impact on the Presidential election, is the real stake in November.

THE QUITTERS

Even more significant is the staggering number of Republican incumbents who, for one reason or another, have decided not to run for re-election. They already total 23, well over 10 per cent of all Republican members and the list is not closed yet. This means that new Republican candidates must be given a costly hold-up and go before the voters without the advantage of an established reputation.

But the most nagging and fundamental of all Republican worries is the fact that, aside from

SEN. WILLIAM KNOWLAND

The News Was Bad

Republicans have 79 seats that are especially vulnerable, while the Democrats have only 51.

Every one knows that the Democratic prospect in the Senate is excellent. Not so well known, however, is the full measure of their power in the House.

Not since 1934 has the party occupying the White House seen its seats in the House drop in a non-presidential election. In the five off-year contests,

since then, the administration party has lost an average of 44 seats. The House has been a Republican since their 1956 total of 198 would drop to less than 160 seats and the Democrats would jump from 233 to 270.

Another statistical hazard for the Republicans is their large number of "marginal" districts. The districts most likely to reflect changes in voting patterns. Careful study of results in the 1956 and 1954 elections shows that the

farm prices, the "tr" of events seem to be running strongly against them. Many economists expect the recession to last well beyond this fall and predict a fairly long period of relatively high unemployment.

Headlines that bristle day after day with ominous news from abroad are confusing and upsetting a lot of voters, as this reporter can attest from a recent survey in the Middle West. An uneasy feeling that affairs here have been permitted to get out of hand, and that the Republican administration is somehow to blame, is promising electoral dividends to the Democrats.

The Democrats elect that many members, the northwesterners know they can dispense with the Republicans and most of the southern conservatives of their own party and it command a majority. Achievement of the "magic number," in other words, would do no less than transform the entire political climate in the House and in Congress as a whole. Such "liberal" legislation as school construction and income tax reduction, not even under serious consideration today, would pulse with new life.

But, and its impact on the Presidential election, is the real stake in November.

Even more significant is the staggering number of Republican incumbents who, for one reason or another, have decided not to run for re-election. They already total 23, well over 10 per cent of all Republican members and the list is not closed yet. This means that new Republican candidates must be given a costly hold-up and go before the voters without the advantage of an established reputation.

But the most nagging and fundamental of all Republican worries is the fact that, aside from

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Editors' Note: Drew Pearson continues his report on his recent trip behind the Iron Curtain.

BUCHAREST
 THE Union of Rumanian Journalists meets in the old House of Lords of England. This is about the only time the Newspaper Guild meeting in the old Supreme Court Chamber on Capitol Hill.

The old House of Lords chamber is actually an art theatre in the United States, with a rotunda instead of a movie screen. In the rear are a battery of translation booths, where speeches are translated into other languages — English, French, German, Spanish, Chinese, Russian and Portuguese.

Having preached the idea of people-to-people friendship until it is now officially adopted by the Eisenhower administration, I decided I had better practice what

A Close-Up View Of Red Journalists

I preach and, upon invitation, I attended this Rumanian meeting of journalists.

Because our plane broke down in Budapest I arrived late and attended only one day's session. I had no idea how I would be received. The last clipping I had seen from a Bucharest paper paid its respects to me with considerable vigor. It said that we organized the freedom balloons to reach the people behind the Iron Curtain. At that time, Universal of Bucharest had written:

"Pearson is a defender of American democracy. Not long ago he organized radio debate on American democracy in which it was he who expounded the American way of life was praised and worn-out anti-Soviet calumnies were uttered."

The Moscow press had hammered me harder. It even wrote: "If the Mag-

nates of Monopolistic Capital profiteers on wars, so also do their newspaper salesmen. Such a one is that veteran of slander Drew Pearson." Pravda once charged: "Pearson is a traitor to any means to sabotage the cause of peace."

So it was with some doubt that I accepted an invitation to attend a meeting of newspapermen behind the Iron Curtain. I didn't know whether I would be greeted with boos and jeers.

How To Do It?

I was met, however, by a delegation of newspapermen who informed me I had and to preside in absentia, both to speak and to preside over part of the meeting. The latter was a little more than I had bargained for, and I wanted to know how I was going to be able to recognize the fact that I didn't know a soul be-

hind the Iron Curtain.

It's difficult to draw conclusions from talking to people during a short visit, but I got the impression that newspapermen in the Soviet countries are far more open-minded than ever before and want to be friendly toward the United States. Certainly they have come a long way from the period when they hammed at the U.S. editorially day-in-and-day-out, and when it was impossible to communicate behind the Iron Curtain except by balloons.