



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, President and Publisher
BROOK S. GRIFFITH, General Manager
ROBERT H. LAMER, Advertising Director
CECIL PRINCE, Editor
PERRY MORGAN, Associate Editor
R. L. YOUNG JR., Managing Editor
JAMES McDOWELL, Circulation Manager

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1953

French & American Ghosts: Any Kin?

IS there anything new under the political sun? Many a sage Frenchman will probably sigh that under his breath as he indulges—but warily—he hazards—to the polls on the 28th to decide the fate of General de Gaulle's new constitution. Since 1848 when the last monarch was shamed, France, in the words of Sir Lewis Namier, "has faced an uneasy choice between a Parliamentary Republic in which President and Prime Minister in some extent duplicate each other, and a system based on an independent Executive which is a cross between the American presidency and the Napoleonic dictatorship."

So all this is old hat, has in fact been old hat since the Revolution of 1789 "raised political ghosts that the French have been trying to lay since then. In the weary process of trying to lay these ghosts, she has used up—as of now—four republics, a Napoleon and sundry male imitators, and a couple of monarchs. Will there never be an end? So the Anglo-Saxons, blessed with the well-ordered regimes of British and American democracy, sigh with arched eyebrows. The favorite dogma of Anglo-Saxon political philosophers is of course, that owing to their extraordinary native goodness the French people are allergic to government per se.

In our lack of compassion, we may be rudely deceived. We leave in the hands of the malady-stricken and merciful French their fate of the 28th—content that the incorrigible buoyancy which produces a reasonable and constitutional de Gaulle can in a twinkling destroy an unconstitutional one. Meanwhile, let us dig into our own political dust bin. Are we really so different from the French? Is our own political system, about which we entertain such cocksure complacency, so durable as is often made out? Or so radically different from that of France?

One commonplace of the political

scientist is sure. Interests will out. The difference between us and the French is that the very necessary little compromises which with the wink of an eye promptly condemn as "back-sliding" and "log-rolling" are resolved into a very loose two-party system—often at municipal and state levels. The French bring their interests, dressed in multifarious party styles, to the national assembly, where constant compromise and brokerage results in the unsteady rise and fall, bickering and collusion, of factions—the whole process that irks Gen. de Gaulle so much.

Let us also recall, so long as we are scratching through the dust bin, that the power of our own President—except when at present it reposes in the grasp of a figurehead—was evolved, not born. Alexander Hamilton, as Secretary of the Treasury under Washington, asked friends to call him "counterforce" in the image of his unbounded adoration of the British parliament. Jeffersonians saw it as revolutionary when they wrested control from the "Feds" and made the presidency more than a constitutional monarchy. Have we forgotten, for example, that when Hamilton ran the Cabinet Washington stormed out of the Senate one day, after a rude squabble over Indian treaties, murmuring he'd "damned if he'd go back to that place again."

Could it be, then, that only the wisdom of precedent and reasonable power in the White House has kept the spectre of Caesarism from our door? And that only the fortunate working of wise compromise has kept us from the squalid bickering of factional parties? After all, our own party system collapsed before the Civil War.

Perhaps, after all, what is demanded of us as we witness the trouble in France is less political phantasm and more political compassion.

Victor Goeller: Man And Businessman

IT has been said that there is no test of a man quite so searching as daily contact with him. For us at *Tue News*, daily contact with Victor Russell Goeller was a richly rewarding and occasionally surprising experience.

We say surprising for beneath a serene facade lurked great personal warmth, humor and sensitivity that came welling up when least expected to color and enrich the gray-flannel world of advertising.

He was a man of great creative ability and professional orientation. It is not an exaggeration to say that he was one of the outstanding advertising men in the Carolinas. It was a privilege and a pleasure to have him on the team as one of our top advertising executives. In 37 years he contributed much to *Tue News* and to the business community he served so well.

An Ozark Man Suddenly Turns Whig

WHY—we haven't, we suddenly realized, classified Gov. Faubus. Is he a Scalawag? A Copperhead? A Dough-face? Hardly. An Arkansas Man with Mississippi principles? Perhaps.

But a Whig, certainly. Of that we can be sure. Witness his statement of the other day to the press. That the "laws of the land" are acts of Congress. In one blow, then, our favorite Arkansas governor has stricken down the precedent of Judicial Review (a mere upstart, having come so late as during the chief justiceship of John Marshall, circa 1801) and raised the ancient (and respectable) Whig doctrine that the legislative arm of a democratic government is, after all, the repository of the people's sovereign will. Thus the only really legitimate arm.

This is one of a venerable and heady vintage; John Locke, 1688, at least. We won't go so far as to say that maybe it's a bit too heady for an Ozark mountaineer to be sipping.

Let us merely ponder the thing-in-itself.

The other side of the Whig coin—which declares the supremacy, the irreproachability, indeed, the quasi-divinity of the legislature—is the inferiority, the caprice, often the diabolical venom of strong-willed executive power. That, at any rate, was the idea of the old American Whigs, sprung up to spite the hissy executive maneuvers of Old Hickory—Andy Jackson's Whigs compared that same gentleman to a dictatorial centipede with his hundred arms pushing and tugging everywhere.

Well, then, if Gov. Faubus is a Whig—which is all right by us—why doesn't he act like one? Calling out the National Guard to control the Little Rock School Board; flying to Newport to negotiate plenipotentiary with President Eisenhower; of late defying the national government with one long arm, while calling the Arkansas Legislature into session with the other and denouncing specific legislation.

If that's Whiggery, it's sure aged since Locke uncoined it.

Will U. S. Fight To Defend Chiang's Island Outposts?

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON—The offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu threatened with Communist Chinese attack and perhaps invasion President Eisenhower is confronted with one of those unhappy choices which in the past have proved out of compromises within the administration.

By the resolution adopted by Congress Jan. 15, 1950, the President must determine when an attack of the offshore islands still held by the Nationalists threatens the security of Formosa and the Pescadores. If he finds that Formosa is threatened, then he can use his own initiative to order American armed forces to participate in the defense of the islands.

The language in the congressional resolution, this reporter has learned from a source participating in the making of policy at the time, was not that originally desired by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Dulles and Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson, in charge of the Far East, wanted a definite and clear statement that the United States would be jointly responsible with Nationalist China for the defense of Quemoy and Matsu. This they argued, would put the Communists clearly on notice that an attack on the islands would immediately involve American armed forces.

But the President was reluctant to make such a firm commitment. He had in mind the conflict that had raged only a few months before over the defense of the Tachen Islands, another offshore group on which Chiang Kai-shek had deployed part of his forces.

In that controversy some of the President's principal advisers believed the United States should join Chiang in repelling the kind of attack that appeared to be preliminary to a direct assault. Among them were listed the time Adm. Arthur S. Radford, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Secretary Dulles. On the opposite side, it was reported, were other JCS members, conspicuously Gen. Matthew Ridgway.

Finally, the President after much wearisome pulling and hauling ruled against any joint defense of the Tachens. Chiang was advised to evacuate the islands which were difficult to supply.

WALTER ROBERTSON
Out Of The Past...

months before over the defense of the Tachen Islands, another offshore group on which Chiang Kai-shek had deployed part of his forces.

Having had to resolve this conflict in his official family the President was in no mood to make a firm commitment on the islands still held by Chiang's forces. When, therefore, Dulles went to the White House with his proposal for a congressional resolution that would put the United States squarely on record for the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, President proposed the compromise giving him the right to decide when an attack warranted the use of American forces.

The language of the resolution adopted by a vote of 83 to 38 in the Senate gave the President the authority to take such measures as he might see fit to secure Formosa and the Pescadores against

armed attack. This, the resolution said, was "to include the security and protection of such related positions, and territories now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in securing the defense of Formosa."

ADM. ARTHUR RADFORD
... A Haunting Memory

As events in the Middle East have proved, the threat there is not due to Communist aggression. Now in the Far East, thanks to a compromise he insisted on, the President must determine whether a Communist attack justifies the use of American planes and warships.

But following adoption of the resolution, which was rushed through under the stern admonition of the late Sen. Walter George who said that any debate suggesting doubt would endanger peace in the Pacific, there has been much criticism. By leaving the status of Quemoy and Matsu open, he has been charged, the Communists were encouraged to believe that they could attack without involving the United States. This criticism has increased in volume since the Reds stopped up their latest barrage against the islands.

DIPLOMATIC DILEMMA

Two years after the Formosa resolution Dulles came to the President with another sweeping proposal. This time it was for the declaration that became known as the "Eisenhower doctrine" for the Middle East. As passed by Congress it provided that "if the President determines the necessity," the United States will use armed forces to assist any nation requesting aid against attack from a Communist-dominated country.

As events in the Middle East have proved, the threat there is not due to Communist aggression. Now in the Far East, thanks to a compromise he insisted on, the President must determine whether a Communist attack justifies the use of American planes and warships.

'Tactic Of Indecision' Is Beneath Big Power's Dignity

By WALTER LIPPMANN

WASHINGTON—Questions of integration and of the islands off the shore of China, the President followed the same fundamental line of conduct. This is that he would not make a decision in advance that he believed and what he intended to do. With the Red Chinese threatening the island of Quemoy, where Chiang has most wisely locked up a considerable part of his army, the tactic of the administration was to keep everything open.

For at the time of the conference on Wednesday, the President was asked by Mr. Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post whether the fact that Chiang has so many troops on Quemoy would affect his judgment about what he was committed to do in Formosa. To this the President replied that "You simply cannot make military decisions until after the event reaches you."

committed to do in Formosa. To this the President replied that "You simply cannot make military decisions until after the event reaches you."

DENSE FOG

This conception of the character of a military commander goes a long way to explain why there is no United States policy about the offshore islands and why there is a dense fog over what the administration will do in the integration cases. As Gen. Eisenhower sees it, you do not decide until "the event reaches you," and then you react—You send the paratroopers to Little Rock, you send the Marines to Lebanon, you send the 7th Fleet to Quemoy.

The notion of waiting for events to reach you before taking a decision is not, we may venture to say, an inspired conception of military leadership in diplomacy and in politics. It is a tactic which, except in rare circumstances and among very astute and experienced men, almost always mischievous. None knows this better than Secretary Dulles himself, who has put himself repeatedly on record in favor of not leaving our adversaries in any doubt about our intentions. This, in fact, has been the central principle of the security policy of which Mr. Dulles has signed so many. They are meant, as he has often explained, to prevent miscalculation and misunderstanding in the other camp.

OPPOSITE LINE

But at Quemoy and the offshore islands we have been following exactly the opposite line. By doing this, we have put off having to decide, on the one hand, to advise Chiang to withdraw his troops from an untenable position, and, on the other hand, to commit our own forces to the defense of the islands. This has meant that we have gambled that uncertainty about what we mean will deter the Red Chinese from doing anything. Whatever the outcome, this kind of waver in our usual practice, and it is beneath the dignity of a great power like the United States.

which must not bluff and must not play tricks.

Carried over, as it has been, into the dark and dangerous problem of integration, it is a very bad practice indeed. As evidence of this, there is the speech last Wednesday by Adm. General Rogers to the meeting of the bar association in Los Angeles. Mr. Rogers made a brave attempt to make the defense of the bar association in Los Angeles. Mr. Rogers made a brave attempt to make the defense of the bar association in Los Angeles.

CRUCIAL QUESTION

The crucial question is what the federal government will do about the defiance of the southern state governments, now that the issue is not lawless mobs but the resistance of the state governments under state laws. Mr. Rogers exhorted and admonished the state governments to accept the federal law. He said there could be "no equivocation." But he also admitted, even saying how the administration proposes to begin to deal with the southern resistance.

He could not say that it is the policy of the President on this central and crucial issue. For there is no policy. There is only the tactic of not making decisions until after the event reaches you.

People's Platform

Federal Tax Racket

Worst Form Of Vice

Editors, The News: THE patriots who founded this nation, and gave us our Constitution, must never have had a party to a federal tax racket which is the worst form of organized vice in human history.

The attorney general of the United States recently announced through the press that his office would soon make a vigorous crackdown on underworld gangsters who annually plunder the victims of hundreds of millions of dollars.

This noble gesture towards the suppression of criminal activity is highly commendable and has the hearty support of all law-abiding citizens. But the racket of all is one about which the attorney general can do nothing even if he were so inclined. The yearly shakedown of Washington politicians as a result of taxes imposed on American citizens. And more than half of this money's gone as foreign aid even to Communist nations. How great a hoax can foreign aid be? The tax take from Americans is far greater than the total proceeds from prostitution, gambling, bootlegging and all other gangland rackets combined.

Larceny by taxation is as much a criminal act as extortion by threat. And when a citizen is robbed of his money, it doesn't make much difference whether the thief is an underworld thug or the Ways and Means Committee of Congress.

Just how great a hoax can foreign aid be? It looks like the leftists, one-worlders and international socialists on both the Democratic and Republican parties will continue the mad scramble toward national bankruptcy as they indulge in their throat competition with each other to rip the shirts from the backs of American taxpayers.

The latest news from Big Boy is that Gov. Hodges is going to demand more taxes when the legislature meets in January.

PARKS A. YANDLE

'Speak Into The Mike, Please—Don't Be Nervous—'



Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON—When Eisenhower takes a trip, his aide, Col. Robert L. Schulz, always takes a couple of "westerners" in his brief case. For the President's reading. Some members of the administration have been visiting that the kids could also be persuaded to read American history.

If so, his reaction to the Supreme Court and to American policy regarding Quemoy and Matsu might be more forthright.

Silence As A Policy

He would have found that his predecessors' silent hesitation to express their views on the Supreme Court is just like a off-repeated idea that the President should not comment on the court's completely foreign to American philosophy. Here is how other presidents spoke out.

Thomas Jefferson said the court's decision that could overrule Congress was "a dangerous doctrine, one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

'Thing Of Wax'

"If this opinion be sound," he said, referring to the famous *Marbury v. Madison* opinion of Chief Justice Marshall, "then indeed is our Constitution a mere thing of wax."

Jackson's Ire

Andrew Jackson, commenting on the court's decision in *Worcester v. State of Georgia*, overruling the Georgia Supreme Court, said, "John Marshall has handed down his decision, now let him run."

Abraham Lincoln said that the court in its *Dred Scott* decision had "put the democratic doctrine down" as "the homoeopathic soup made by boiling the bile of a pig that had been starved to death."

FDR Spoke Out

Franklin D. Roosevelt said that the court's *NRA* decision had taken the court "back to the horse and buggy days."

Harry Truman after the court reversed his seizure of the steel mills, said that some of the justices were "helping Joe Stalin."

In earlier decisions the Supreme Court had been a bulwark against progress.

One Way Or Another

Though not publicized like his "horse and buggy" crack, Roosevelt's most effective rebuke to the court was in a speech before the Court Club with its Supreme Court justices present, reminding them how the inheritance tax, the income tax, the child labor law, conservation, public power all had been thrown out by the Supreme Court, had to be reinstated by changing the court or the Constitution.

Ahead Of Congress

Today the court has reversed its conversion. Instead of being a symbol of conservatism, it has been ahead of the Congress. Last week, the President made it appear that the court was also ahead of him.

If Eisenhower had studied history and

Strange Contrast

This was a long way from Jefferson's "mere thing of wax," or Roosevelt's "horse and buggy" or Truman's "helping Joe Stalin" statements.

All of which left news observers wondering what the Supreme Court decision on Roosevelt would say if they attended an Eisenhower press conference. It already knew the Supreme Court decision, but he doesn't want to be quoted.

From The Christian Science Monitor

TEEN-AGE FINANCIERS

IT TAKES a long time for some people to learn that operating in the stock market is not child's play. Some who start late never do learn. But by the time the younger generation of 1938 comes of age the investing public may be more financially mature than half the newspapermen and professionals of today. That is, if a recently reported trend continues.

It is a trend toward the stock market among teen-agers. A research organization has now discovered that school children are diverting part of their allowances from the candy counter and soda fountains to the purchase of securities.

Sometimes they group together to buy a share in a well-known company. And the New York Stock Exchange's monthly investment plan is giving them a new idea about what installment buying can be. That is, it can be buying a financial future instead of a "hot rod" past-to-

morrow's "blue chip" stock instead of yesterday's jalopy.

So if you notice longer silences between juke-box records in the local restaurant it may be the sort of silence that is going to be literally even more golden in the future than it now sounds. And the teen-ager man taking a job or walking to school may be saving up not just for his first automobile but for the kind of financial situation in which he will really be able to afford one—or more.

Of course, many may save up only to buy experience. But even that is doubly valuable if you acquire it soon enough.

Remarkable about the woman who had given herself a fancy permanent at home and had just left the party one who had remained said: "To me, it looks like her parole came through just as the warden pulled the switch."—Lamar (Mo.) Democrat.