

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1952

A 'RE-EXAMINATION' OF SEGREGATION

IT IS unconstitutional for a state to segregate white and Negro children in its public schools? That is the great question that the U. S. Supreme Court has agreed to face up to, after years of skirting the issue.

The Court made its intention known yesterday when it agreed to hear two cases challenging the constitutionality of segregated public schools. One originated in Topeka, Kansas, the other in Clarendon County, S. C.

In both cases, plaintiffs contend that segregation per se is unconstitutional. They say that Negro children are denied by a mark of discrimination and hence denied the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the law.

In the Topeka case, a special district court found that separate facilities for Negro children were equal to those provided for whites. In the Clarendon case, another special district court ordered S. C. school authorities to equalize admittedly inferior Negro facilities.

In the second place, no amount of legalistic reasoning can circumvent the clear distinction made by Judge John J. Parker in the Clarendon case between voluntary and compulsory segregation.

The basic principle enunciated in past decisions were the only factor in the decision of the court to hear these two test cases would not preclude the outlawing of segregation. The principle hasn't changed.

Judge Morris Soper of Baltimore added new standards when the Fourth Circuit Court declared the Negro school in Durham, North Carolina closed in Durham inferior to the UNC law school. He declared that "the quality and character of any school depends in large measure upon the quality of its teachers."

KEFAUVER—THE 'LITTLE' DEMOCRATS' CHOICE

CHARLOTTEANS will have a chance this week to see the man who, if the wish of a preponderant plurality of Democratic voters is fulfilled, will be the party's standard-bearer this Fall. The "little" ones like him.

The increased favor with which Democratic voters are looking at the Negro policy candidacy of Sen. Estes Kefauver is nothing short of phenomenal. He won all primaries he entered except Florida's. In February he was the Presidential choice of 21 per cent of the Democratic voters, according to the Gallup poll. In April he was the choice of 33 per cent, in May 41 per cent.

In this week's poll he rates 45 per cent, equalling the combined preferences expressed for his five leading competitors. Barkley, with seventeen per cent, Governor Stevenson and Senator Russell, with ten per cent each, Ambassador Harriman and Senator Kerr, with five and three per cent respectively.

He is also the overwhelmingly favorite Democratic candidate of independent voters. Forty-two per cent of the independents want him, a number again equal to those who support the other five major contenders.

Countless reasons of copy have been written in an effort to explain mild-mannered Senator Kefauver's popularity. We expect his success boils down to these factors:
1. Many Democrats and independents agree with what he stands and votes for.
2. He has an enviable record of effective opposition to machine politics and corrupt government.
3. His straightforward, unassuming manner devoid of bombast and rhetoric, inspires public confidence in him.
4. Because of his brash independence he's been in the Administration doghouse, and sympathy goes to the underdog.
5. Many of his critics claim he is an opportunist exploiting his name and his record is filled with constructive work for good.

NEW MESSENGER BOY

ONCE upon a time a shift in Russian diplomatic policy... change in Russian foreign policy. This was true in the dismissal of Maxim Litvinov as Foreign Minister... followed by the short-lived Stalin-Hitler pact.

The present-day Soviet representative one hardly he called a "negotiator" in the ordinary sense. He is in truth treated as a mechanical mouthpiece.

Neither Major Party Offers

Voter An Acceptable Choice

By RAYMOND MOLEY

(Eight of a series of 12 articles of a condemnation of the book "How to Keep Our Country a Program for Political Action," by Raymond Moley.)

THE magnificent ideal of government... the republic through two alternative parties has been preserved through all the vicissitudes of our national life.

Great national services are possible of real fulfillment through a two-party system. But they are growing more and more difficult, because our two national parties lack vitality.

Not only is the two-party system in the South politically extinct, but by the strange process of social and economic evolution the South is being pulled out of its old system.

REPUBLICAN PARTY WEAK IN THE SOUTH In the South, Republicanism is largely a hungry dream.

With party government thus broken, scattered and disintegrated, the Federal machine, as taken over the direction of the Federal executive for some years past, has become a dictatorship.

THE MARK OF WEARINESS With party government thus broken, scattered and disintegrated, the Federal machine, as taken over the direction of the Federal executive for some years past, has become a dictatorship.

When Harry S. Truman took over, he continued the trend, for he was trained in the craft of machine rule. As a result, the present ruling regime is Presidential capitalism.

THE decline of the parties to become glaringly apparent when we scan the election results in the past few years. In 1928, for example, the total number of Americans eligible to vote rose from approximately 22,000,000 in 1928 to 49,000,000 in 1948.

THE Republican Party, even a north and west of the solid South, has grave infirmities. In perhaps 25 per cent of the States, the majority of the congressmen in 24 States, the party also has lost its vitality.

THE White House has been following with interest — to put it mildly — General Eisenhower's maiden efforts in the political arena.

THE President was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

In fact, on the morning after Ike's Abilene blast, the President was wise enough to realize that Eisenhower had quite a bit to learn yet about politics.

Talking to Stanley Andrews, head of the Point Four program for helping backward areas, Truman said that after he left the White House he would be in touch with Andrews' work.

Old Comrades Watch Ike IN the Pentagon, some of Gen. Eisenhower's old comrades-at-arms watched his Abilene speech and press conference with the keenest interest.

For the understatement of the week we submit the remark of Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America: "The 15-cent pork steak is gone... Little Rock Arkansas Genet."

Estes Just Keeps Rolling Along



Movies Of 1912

Roosevelt-Taft Split Recalled

By JAMES MARLOW

WASHINGTON

THE scalding bitterness between the Taft and Eisenhower camps may be over in their struggle to seat rival delegates at the Republican National Convention next month.

The contest now is focused on disputed delegates in Texas, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi. Eisenhower has offered to compromise on some disputed Southern delegates, although he hasn't said how. The Eisenhower people say no.

If the fight becomes too fierce, it may split the Republicans into such hostile camps that it will cost the party the election. It could happen, and did happen before in the Taft family.

The senator's father, President William Howard Taft, went through this experience 40 years ago in a rivalry with Theodore Roosevelt at the Republican National Convention in Chicago where this one will be held, too.

That struggle did more than just break the party into factions. It split the party. Roosevelt ran against Taft on an opposition ticket. The divided Woodrow Wilson won the election easily.

No one this year is suggesting a repeat of 1912. The Taft-Eisenhower fight creating a rival party to run against Roosevelt has not yet begun. He'll support the candidate chosen by the convention.

When he was elected in 1904, Theodore Roosevelt said he wouldn't seek or accept another nomination. But he had no intention of doing so.

He and Roosevelt, who had been together when the 1904 election came around, were not too far apart. Taft, his friend and associate, as his successor. And the Republican convention that year accepted Roosevelt's choice as Secretary of State.

All of Roosevelt's followers left Taft's four-year administration. They told Roosevelt so when he

came back from an African hunting trip before the 1912 elections to participate no longer in the Republican nomination and announced his intention to run for president in the 13 states which had presidential preference primaries.

But most states were "bull moose" and had no primaries and there the Republican politicians had a word to say for Taft. Roosevelt's victory eight 88 electoral votes, with Roosevelt getting 88 electoral votes, while Taft won 83.

The result: The Republican party smashed wide open, with Roosevelt getting 88 electoral votes, while Taft won 83. The Democratic ticket with 455 electoral votes.

The national committee and the credentialing committee, just as 40 years ago, will be the key groups deciding what Taft or Eisenhower delegates this year can be seated and take part in the nominating.

And, as in 1912, the big fight will be over delegates from the South where the Eisenhower people claim the Taftites squeezed them out.

CONGRESSIONAL QUIZ

By Congressional Quarterly Q—How is U. S. production of planes coming along?

A—It is "far behind" Soviet production, especially in the field of jet planes, according to John D. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, who testified May 26 before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. But Small said our production is "pretty well off the ground."

Q—Is the government going to subsidize American production of jet fighters?

A—A Senate Committee is studying that problem. At a hearing May 12, the Civil Aeronautics Board proposed a multi-million-dollar government loan program to subsidize U. S. jet-propelled aircraft development. But the Defense Department said this might interfere with military aircraft production. Sen. Pat McCarran (D-Nev.) predicted May 13 that U. S. Airlines would begin using British planes unless the U. S. subsidies construction of American jets.

Q—Can WACs become members of the G. I. Club?

A—No, but there's a move afoot to change that. At a hearing before Senate Armed Services Subcommittee, Mrs. Alma MacArthur was supported by the former WAG major who lost her commission when she had a baby.

Q—Will the ban on military service for members of the Sen. Russell B. Long (D-La.) presiding, agreed with her.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Truman Considers Ke Politically Naive

When Eisenhower had called him in and a map on which was charted the North African strategy.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

McArthur Vs. Marshall

YET, at Abilene, Ike's old comrades pointed out the blasted U. S. China policy, knowing full well that Gen. Marshall, as ambassador to China, had first set out the policy.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

What do you think of it? Marshall asked. The President replied that the map was not too hotly surprised by the unexpected drop in the support of the opposing candidates General Eisenhower and Senator Kefauver.

who so bitterly castigated his old friend, Ike refused to "engage in personalities."

What Lost China THOSE who sat in on the strategy meetings of World War II know all too well what it was that chiefly lost us China.

In large part it was the natural tug-of-war between different theater commanders for guns, men, and materiel. Eisenhower in the European Theater was more materiel, while in the Pacific Theater he was more guns, men, materiel, and materiel.

Simultaneously, MacArthur in the Pacific was burning up the wire for more ships, guns, men, materiel; while in the China theater, Chiang Kai-shek was pleading for more guns, men, materiel, and materiel.

Simultaneously, MacArthur in the Pacific was burning up the wire for more ships, guns, men, materiel; while in the China theater, Chiang Kai-shek was pleading for more guns, men, materiel, and materiel.

Simultaneously, MacArthur in the Pacific was burning up the wire for more ships, guns, men, materiel; while in the China theater, Chiang Kai-shek was pleading for more guns, men, materiel, and materiel.

Simultaneously, MacArthur in the Pacific was burning up the wire for more ships, guns, men, materiel; while in the China theater, Chiang Kai-shek was pleading for more guns, men, materiel, and materiel.

Simultaneously, MacArthur in the Pacific was burning up the wire for more ships, guns, men, materiel; while in the China theater, Chiang Kai-shek was pleading for more guns, men, materiel, and materiel.

Simultaneously, MacArthur in the Pacific was burning up the wire for more ships, guns, men, materiel; while in the China theater, Chiang Kai-shek was pleading for more guns, men, materiel, and materiel.