THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1952

IT HAD TO BE SAID

WITH the calm and reasonable, yet forceful, language that is one of his trademarks, President Gordon Gray of the Consolidated University has taken much of the wind out of the latest tempest on the Chapel Hill campus.

In an address at a private fraternity dinner last week-end, the text of which has just been made public, President Gray restated the fundamental principles that have guided the University to its position of eminence in the academic world and its leadership of North Carolina's development.

The Administration, he said, will "zealously protect and defend" the right of students "to think for themselves, to express their honest opinions, to criticize, to object and to complain, and to suggest." The exercise of this right, he added, carries with it a double responsibility: (1) it should be based on a full understanding of the facts, and (2) it should be circumscribed by good taste and good manners.

The right, he said, extended to viewpoints with which the Administration may totally disagree. And then Mr. Gray recapitulated the five basic responsibilities of the University:

1. To give students an opportunity "to inquire, to increase their knowledge, to be given effective help through teaching, to be free to exercise responsible freedom".

2. To protect the "freedom of the faculty to inquire and to teach without interference", always guarding against "the confusion of propaganda with scholarship".

3. To assure parents that their children are attending an institution "that still has a heart and spirit" where "they will learn how to be responsible, useful citizens".

4. To uphold for the trustees the principles of fairness and justice in the administration of university affairs; and

5. To give the people of the state an institution of service, one that helps to bring about "a happier and more contented citizenship, a healthier and wiser and more prosperous people."

These things should not need restating. They are at once the heart and soul of the University, and they are imbedded in the thoughts and hopes of the people of the state.

In this instance, a restatement of principles was clearly called for. Student leaders, concerned over what appeared to be an effort by one member of the Board of Trustees to intimidate student thought, had raised an impassioned protest through the college paper, the *Daily Tar Heel*. The protest, though overstated, was obviously sincere, just as the views of the lone trustee, though stemming from a restricted concept of academic freedom, were also sincere.

President Gray had a word for both the student leaders and the trustee, John W. Clark of Franklinton:

"The difficulties have stemmed in part from a lack of knowledge of the true facts and an incorrect assessment of authority and responsibility. Likewise, there has been a tendency to blame the university administration for strictly personal pronouncements and actions over which the university has no control and which in a free society are strictly individual prerogatives."

While totally disagreeing with the attitude and disapproving many of the past actions of Trustee Clark, we would remind University students that the man has a right to his views, and that he serves some useful purpose in expressing them. One of the tasks of any university is to turn out young people who are guided by reason instead of by deep-seated animosities and prejudices. In Mr. Clark, they have a constant reminder that reason has not yet triumphed over passion and emotion in the struggle to build an orderly society.

SCHOOLS AND DOLLARS

EYEING the higher debt limit that will result from the new property values, local school officials, City and County, are talking in terms of a multi-million-dollar bond issue—the third since the end of the war.

Unquestionably the meeting of school needs is going to require a greater investment in new plant facilities than anyone dreamed of ten years ago. Charlotte and Mecklenburg County are bursting at the seams, and much of the pressure is coming from those recurring waves of postwar children—at once our greatest asset and our biggest problem.

While the matter is still in the discussion stage, we'd like to toss in a thought. If bond money is divided between the City and County systems on a per child basis, as it has been done roughly in the past, will it meet the needs of the future and meet them fairly?

Take a look at these enrollment figures:

Year	White	Negro	Total
CITY SCHOOLS			
1945	11,952	5,648	17,597
1950	14,561	6,476	21,037
1951-52	15,717	6,884	22,601*
COUNTY SCHOOLS			
1945	9,849	3,395	13,244
1950	9,787	3,755	13,542
1951-52	10,204	3,386	13,590**

* February, 1952, figures.
**September, 1951, figures.

The current year's totals are not quite comparable because enrollment in the County schools is always light in September because some students remain at home to help with cotton picking. Ignoring that factor, however, the figures show that enrollment in the City system has grown 28 per cent since 1945, whereas in the County system it has increased only 2.5 per cent.

Money for capital improvements in the two school systems comes from a common source—the County Government. On the basis of present enrollment, a division of $3 for the City for each $1 for the County would be fairly equitable.

But this should be kept in mind. Buildings financed by the forthcoming bond issue will not be built for several years, and they must serve for many years thereafter. If the City schools continue to grow so much faster than the County schools in the next decade, would a 2 to 1 division now meet the needs ten years hence?

We don't profess to have the answer. Under the rather ridiculous dual school setup, some yardstick has to be used, and enrollment is as good as any. But short of consolidation of the two systems, isn't it practical for the two school boards to put their heads together, try to look into the future, and come to some understanding on division of bond money and placing of school buildings that will serve the interests of both City and County residents better than a flat per-child division?

When you consider that another extension of the city limits will be essential before the decade is out, thus boosting City school enrollment still more, it becomes all the more important for the two boards to map the spending of the proposed bond issue together. The taxpayers of Mecklenburg County are willing to invest whatever is necessary in the education of their children. But they have a right to expect the funds to be spent equitably, and with long-range needs of the metropolitan area in mind.

DOUBLE REVERSE

IN his book, "A Foreign Policy for Americans", Senator Robert Taft outlines his seven-point "basic strategy" for foreign policy. A good many critics, noting the close resemblance to the Truman Administration's foreign policy, wondered aloud if the Senator was breaking with his isolationist past and donning the robes of internationalism.

That impression grew when Senator Taft said recently he did not think he would have any great difficulty reconciling his views on foreign affairs with those of General Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Now, somewhat tardily, we learn via Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington Bureau of the *Christian Science Monitor*, that the seven-point program was not Taft's after all. Writes Drummond:

"Senator Taft, with a candor which is certainly characteristic, now has let it be known that the long-term strategy for dealing with world communism (outlined on Page 66 of his book) is not his program, but a program which he has simply put out for all to look at and which, he says, he reserves the right to oppose after he has looked at it more thoroughly."

Now the disillusion is complete. In his book, Senator Taft had explained carefully his reasons for opposing the Atlantic Pact but finally came to the conclusion, after the Korean and Chinese episodes, that "we have to give up the idea of the enforcement of peace by the United Nations, and I see no choice now except to rely on our armed forces and alliances with those nations willing to fight the advance of communism." Yet, on the floor of the Senate recently, he fought valiantly for an amendment to the Atlantic Treaty to restrict the President from sending American armed forces abroad "in a manner which would necessarily involve the United States in war".

The amendment, sponsored by Senator Arthur V. Watkins of Utah, got no support except from Senator Taft. Arthur Krock reported in the *New York Times* that it "was ignominiously withdrawn". That would indicate that Senator Taft has not changed his views on foreign policy, despite the trend of his book, and that those views are not in accord with the opinion of an overwhelming majority of his colleagues of both parties, as recorded on many instances in this troubled postwar era.

At least it isn't "one world" just yet. When 16-year-old Moustafa Ibrahim kissed the windowpane of a train on which his sweetheart was about to leave he was arrested and fined $14 by a Moslem Court for committing an "indecent public act". Which is no way for the Egyptians to win American sympathy in their row with Britain over Suez.—*Joplin (Mo.) Globe.*

Among the transgressors our bluecoats seek is a 30-year-old burglar who cut his foot kicking in a window at an East Fayette Street metal shop, limped into University Hospital to have his wound bound and told officials there to charge the metal shop proprietor for medical services rendered because he had hurt himself "working" there. —*Baltimore Evening Sun.*

A Communist plot has been uncovered in Nepal and just in time. We were beginning to run out of countries to aid.—*Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press.*

'Well, I'm More Exclusive Than You Are'

Bitten By Presidential Bug, M'Arthur Holds Himself Ready

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

SOMETHING new is being added to the Republican Presidential picture. General Douglas MacArthur is coming around to the view that he must himself be prepared to accept the GOP Presidential nomination.

He has made this growing belief known to several recent visitors to the Presidential suite in the towers of the Waldorf-Astoria in New York. It is still in the category of the familiar cloud on the horizon no bigger than a man's hand. But it is a fact with extraordinary potentialities for both party and nation.

Only within the past few weeks has this change come about. Up until then, to almost everyone who saw him, MacArthur had sung the praises of Senator Robert A. Taft. He urged loyalty to Taft on the Republicans who talked with him. Get on the Taft bandwagon, MacArthur argued, while there is still time.

FEARS DEADLOCK

Today it is not that the general is any less personally loyal to the Senator. But he is reported by his visitors to be fearful there will be a deadlock; that, as he is understood to have put it, "Bob can't make it." Therefore he must be prepared to abandon his announced determination to say no to all political office.

This is not likely to be disclosed in any official or public fashion until convention time in July. Meanwhile, MacArthur can change his mind again if the threat of a deadlock diminishes and Taft seems assured of a majority of the delegates on the first or second ballot.

As for Taft, he continues to have complete confidence in MacArthur's loyalty. The Ohioan has heard, however, that some of MacArthur's most passionate admirers have long sought to convince him that he, and he alone, can save the Republican Party and the nation from disaster.

Foremost among these is MacArthur's friend and aide, Major General Courtney Whitney. As a cynic once expressed it, General MacArthur is a large, imposing body entirely surrounded by Courtney Whitney. That was true in Tokyo when MacArthur was the able American proconsul for Japan. It is only slightly less true now that MacArthur is installed in the fastness of the Waldorf Towers. While no one has actually clocked it, the devoted Whitney is believed to tell his hero at least once an hour that only he can save the country from doom.

The speculation about MacArthur as official keynoter of the convention has been off the beam. He could not be keynoter since he will not be a delegate. But even though other candidates may be jealous of his intentions, it would be difficult to hold out against an invitation to the general to address the delegates.

Such an invitation would be common courtesy to one of the greatest of the nation's living military figures and a loyal party man. It could be, of course, that he would be invited to give an inspirational speech after the candidates have been chosen.

But if he should appear on the first or second day, his impassioned oratory could have an incalculable effect. He might want to point the finger of destiny at his friend, Senator Taft. He would above all want to point that finger in the opposite direction from General Eisenhower, who was once so junior to him. With so many of his most ardent admirers in the hall, the convention could be dramatically stampeded into going for the hero of the Pacific.

Little imagination is required to conjure up that scene—the emotionalism, the intensity of devotion, the wild cheering, the purple periods of MacArthur's prose rolling out in his organ-tone of a voice. And one could be sure that it that point not less than 50,000,000 televiewers would be looking and listening. For all the drama crowded into his 72 years of var and peace, that might well be the highest point.

Taft in his pre-convention campaign is every day contributing to the ardor of the MacArthur following. In almost every speech he pays the general a ringing tribute, and the cheers and applause come up in response. It would be one of the great ironies of politics if this could prove to be part of the wave of the MacArthur future. Yet that is not impossible in the atmosphere of uncertainty growing up around the Republican choice.

As Others See Us

An Indian View Of America

By MINOO R. MASANI, BOMBAY, INDIA
Member Parliament of India

(From a speech delivered before the Economic Club of Detroit)

SOME of you probably read, as I did not long ago, an article by James Reston of the New York Times entitled "Why We Irritate Our Allies." I read that and I found that the reasons given for irritating your British and French and Italian and other allies were very similar to the things that cause irritation in India. They are the same issues on which propaganda focuses elsewhere against your country.

In the case of India, or a country placed like India, there are special reasons why irritation should be more forthcoming than in the case of your Western European friends. There are two factors which make for an emotional bias. The first factor is an economic one. The second a racial one.

The economic factor arises out of the wide disparity in living standards between yours and ours. Let me put it this way. Perhaps to people in India your country, with the tremendous advance that it has made, with your great achievements in bringing to the common people the necessities and the comforts of life, may look somewhat like a country mansion looks to a slum dweller. And human nature as we know it, unfortunately, tells us that the first instinct, the first impulse, of the man in the slum who looks at a beautiful mansion must be one of envy and resentment.

It is possible that the man in the slum and the man in the mansion can do things, can behave wisely, and get over this initial barrier. But the emotional barrier is undoubtedly there. It makes it easy for us to see faults, even where none may exist.

Then there is the racial factor. There is no doubt in my mind that the past claims to white superiority have now bred among the peoples of Asia a color consciousness of their own. That color consciousness is used to devastating effect by Communist propaganda. Every act of racial discrimination whether it be in South Africa or in the United States, adds fuel to that fire.

We have had in the last two years distinguished American Negro citizens coming over to India we have discussed frankly and fairly with us their problems; who have told us of the ambitions of their people and how much remains to be done, but also of the progress made and the efforts that are being made to solve this problem. But a few months pass and comes the account in newspaper headlines of the Cicero race riot, and all the good work that is done by your compatriots just fades away. As one of your own journals put it in New York not long ago, "The Negro has become the litmus test of American democracy." That really is your Achilles' Heel, when it comes to a clash of ideas in a continent such as Asia. . .

I BELIEVE there is a lot that Americans can do. By that, I mean not your State Department, nor your Government—because it is not my province to advise them—but I mean individual private citizens of Americans, such as yours, who have the capacity and the influence to mold both the official policies of their country, and also to do things themselves, individually and collectively. I believe that there are a lot of things, big and small, that you can do to help.

The first quality for which I would ask on your part is the quality of patience and understanding. . . I would like to conclude by suggesting the need at the same time of strength. . .

Indeed, in my country, I think there is very little honest doubt about your intentions. I don't believe that, outside the lunatic fringe of the Communists, people really believe that you don't love peace, or that you are enemies of freedom. But there is considerable doubt about your strength and your wisdom. About your strength there is doubt because the record since 1945 up to date shows the Soviet Union constantly advancing, taking over something like twelve countries of Europe and Asia. And even in Korea, where the United Nations has resisted, the score is still even; it is still to be seen whether a free and united Korea can emerge. So the Communists in India take advantage of this doubt about your strength to tell people that Russia and China are winning, that those who want to save their skins had better get on the bandwagon in time or they know what will happen to them not five years from now.

* * *

CONFIDENCE in your strength—the confidence that you have and I share: that you would win if it comes to a showdown—has to be brought home to the people of India. But alongside of that, there is doubt about your wisdom and sagacity; whether you have the wisdom and maturity, assuming you win a war, to win the peace; whether you would know what to do with your victory; whether you would know how to bring a better and a freer and a more equal world. On that point, there is considerable doubt.

And who can say that there is not some room for that doubt, watching the foreign policy of your country or mine—or of any other country for that matter? A sound, a positive, democratic foreign policy obviously has still to be worked out by the free world. The initiative has still to pass from the Soviet to the democratic side.

I am sometimes reminded of the words of the Greek orator Demosthenes, when he addressed the Athenians as far back as 351 B. C. "Shame on you Athenians," he said, "for not wishing to understand that in war one must not allow one's self to be at the command of events, but to forestall them. You make war against Philip like a barbarian when he wrestles. If you hear that Philip has attacked in the Chersonese, you send help there. If he is in Thermopylae you run there. If he turns aside, you follow him to right or left, as if you were acting on his orders. Never a fixed plan; never any precautions. You wait for bad news before you act."

I do not think it would be unfair to say that this is recalled by American foreign policy right up to Korea, and perhaps even today. The point I am making is that the absence of a positive, democratic policy is felt by good people in India, who are discouraged by the lack of it.

I am sure that if the negative policy of containment, of trying to stop a threat here or plug a leak there, were to be abandoned, and a positive policy of winning the world for freedom—both the world that is free, and the world that has lost its freedom—of such an aggressive, positive policy, with the initiative in our hands, were to be adopted, I believe that would win for you, apart from any question of military strength, increasing support in my country.

People's Platform

Had Not Seen Article

GREENSBORO

Editor, THE NEWS:

AN Associated Press story in this afternoon's (Feb. 16) Charlotte News says that I said an article published in the Daily Tar Heel by NAACP Associates of Chapel Hill under the name of Murphy is a "damn lie". I have not seen the article and did not make the statement.

— JOHN W. CLARK

The People Like Ike, But They Want To Hear From Him

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

GENERAL Eisenhower is a fine man, to be sure, full of charm and high dedication, but the folks I talk to lately want him on the full record as a candidate, and they want him now, before he is nibbled to death by doting amateurs and well-meant meddlers.

The consensus on Ike is that he can beat anyone to face — if he gets the nomination. That is followed swiftly by the tag. . ."but if he doesn't come home pretty soon and tell the people what he is for and against I don't think he can rate the Republican nomination."

The big television demonstration for Eisenhower of recent week was met by mingled moans from a lot of Eisenhower admirers. This was the big love feast of actors and notables that was skippered by Tex McCrary. Songs were sung and a lot of glittery notables got up and declared out loud for Eisenhower.

"I'm interested in what Ike stands for," one cynical gentleman remarked. "But, oh God, do I have to have Humphrey Bogart or Jackie Cooper to tell me what he stands for?"

WORKS AT HIS JOB

Apart from signifying that he was willing to run if wanted, Eisenhower has dropped the future political hassel from his obvious schedule, and continues to labor full time at his NATO chores abroad. This is deemed admirable, like motherhood, but is viewed as slightly separate from a campaign for the nation's No. 1 job. He has already been a soldier; to date he has given the country no glimpse of Eisenhower the embryo President.

The longer Gen. Eisenhower clings loyally to his military tasks, the greater opportunity is created for the publicity seekers and political lachers-ons to festoon themselves from the Eisenhower coattail here in America. Such attachment can remove him from serious consideration if it goes on long enough.

One may admire actors and saloonkeepers and song writers without buying their hearty endorsements of potential Presidents. All the songs and personal appearances and snake dances go fine at football rallies and picture premieres, but leave something to be desired in a political buildup.

You must assume that Ike wants to be President. This constitutes a large desire, surrounded by spadework. It is not a job that you just accept if somebody flings it at you and nobody wants it. It is a field of job that demands a dossier of qualification and a full statement of intent. About all we have from Ike today is a reflection of our assumption and an assumption of competence as a soldier-organizer. You need a little more, for a full run for the money.

I do not believe that an extra month or so, now, means a great deal of difference in Eisenhower's organizational job in Europe. I can't believe that he isn't free to shelve it when he feels it's running pretty well. He is, after all, retired honorably from the Army. He is a declared Presidential candidate. And he cannot speak as a candidate so long as he wears a uniform on temporary duty.

It's my opinion that the people are eager to vote for Ike, if Ike will give them half a look at his thoughts on taxes, labor, foreign policy, domestic economy and a few other items of mass interest. But the longer he puts off his declaration of purpose, the less favorable will be his assessment by the people as a whole. It's like the man said: "We are not electing Jackie Cooper or Irving Berlin or Tex or Jinx or even Ike's pal, George Allen. I like Ike, but I would like him over here."

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

'Creeping Socialism' Is A Boon To Many

SALT LAKE CITY

AT dinner with Gov. J. Bracken Lee, the subject of Government spending came up. I thought I had said some rather strong things about certain forms of Government waste but found I was mild compared with the new Republican governor of Utah.

A delightful and vigorous person, the Governor claimed that Government spending was "creeping Socialism", the ruination of the nation, and that practically all spending should be curtailed by Washington. I tried to point out that certain states and even big business might squawk at high heaven if "creeping Socialism" was stopped but the Governor is an energetic talker, and I fear I was not too convincing.

Later I did some research on "creeping Socialism" and its benefits to certain states and business groups. Here are the results:

U. S. Steel Corporation—Biggest boon to Utah has been the operation of a steel mill at Geneva. Governor Lee told me this greatly increased the population of Salt Lake City and the surrounding area and contributed generously to local prosperity.

However, the U. S. Steel Corp. at first opposed the production of steel in Utah. Judge Elbert Gary, former head of U. S. Steel, scoffed at the idea when I interviewed him many years ago, and his successors continued to scoff—even after Pearl Harbor. In fact, they were so opposed to Western steel production that the Federal Government had to take the initiative itself for the Geneva plant.

Uncle Sam took all the risk and after proving that the steel industry in the Far West could be successful, then U. S. Steel, supported by some astute lobbying by Ex-Gov. Herbert Maw of Utah and Ex-Sen. Abe Murdoch, got the Federal Government to sell the Geneva plant to U. S. Steel for about 20 cents on the dollar.

The steel plant cost the taxpayers $191,326,000. It was sold to U. S. Steel for $47,175,000. Direct subsidy to U. S. Steel and the State of Utah was $144,151,000.

Fort Douglas, Utah—On the foothills just above Salt Lake City stands Fort Douglas, an important army installation. After the war, a large hunk of the fort's territory, plus important buildings, were turned over to Governor Lee's State of Utah, and are now a part of the University of Utah.

Airlines Subsidies—Utah, an inland state, benefits from quick airline transportation. Most people don't realize it, but the airlines, though now big business, get an annual subsidy of $85,000,000 through "creeping socialism." On top of this they get the advantage of 70,000 miles of air lanes services by radio range stations, beacons and traffic controls, all paid for by the Federal Government. The railroads have to pay for their own signals, telegraph and upkeep of their tracks, while the airlines get like services free. In addition, the airplanes get the use of airports, usually supplied by municipalities, tax-free. The railroads pay taxes on their property.

In 1951 the taxpayers shelled out $21,361,040 to construct new towers, beacons, and radar for the airways, plus another $73,931,733 for personnel to operate these safety aids, plus another $37,000,000 for runways and construction work at airports.

The airlines are now big business. I agree with Governor Lee that this is "creeping socialism." But I'll find that big business will be the first to howl if it's stopped.

Shipping Subsidies — Also the first to yell if we stop "creeping socialism" will be another big-business group, the shipping lines. American shipowners get $30,000,000 annually in operating subsidies. On top of this the United States Lines has a construction subsidy of $18,225,000 plus an indirect subsidy of $24,061,000 for national defense in building the new vessel, the United States.

American Export Lines is due to get a $26,000,000 subsidy for the Independence and the Constitution, but after Controller General Lindsay Warren objected to "creeping socialism" and proposed curtailing subsidies, the American Export Lines threatened to dump the ships in the lap of Uncle Sam.

Public Roads—Another form of creeping socialism is the Government's annual subsidy to the states to build highways. This costs the Federal taxpayers about half a billion dollars a year and is allocated to Governor Lee of Utah and the other 47 states.

If this were curtailed every bus line, trucking company, and many private motorists would be at the door of Congress in about 24 hours demanding that "creeping socialism" for the highways be reinstated.