

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

TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1953

A WAY TO SAVE TAR HEEL LIVES

This New Year was the last year on earth for these North Carolinians:
Mr. W. A. Miles, wife of a Warrenton merchant was killed in a two-car collision;
Leslie W. Merritt, 73, of Mt. Olive, and 26-year-old Sherwood Chester Jones, who died in train-car collisions;
Thomas Raymond Horney, 50, a Jacksonville, Wis. man, whose car collided with an oil truck;
Margie McKay, 20, of Elizabethtown, who died in a collision;
L. B. Johnson, 33, of Morganton, whose pickup truck returned.

The General Assembly will consider a bill that should decrease, by the hundreds, the numbers of Carolinians killed on the highways in 1953. This bill, backed by the Carolina Motor Club, will propose adoption of a "point system" for keeping tab on drivers who break the rules.
This system is now used in Connecticut, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Speeding costs four points, reckless driving six, leaving the scene of an accident eight. Other violations, and three convictions within 18 months, cost another three points. The full 12 points, or immediate revocation of the driver's license, is the penalty for driving, or permitting another to drive, while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and for involvement in a fatal accident, if held responsible.
Those are stiff proposals. But they are the kind of regulations that daily save lives in the states where they apply. They don't stop with taking the inoffensive offender off the road; they make drivers safety conscious, because each one knows that punishment is inevitable if he consistently breaks the law.
The point system, if adopted, would save many of our lives, and our children's lives. It ought to get the most careful consideration from a legislative body that has been all too callous to the dreadful highway toll in years past.

RULES CHANGE DOOMED TO FAILURE

UNLESS advance plans go askew, a group of U. S. Senators will attempt today to change Rule 22 in order to make it easier for the Senate to adopt filibusters.
The move is a direct result of a compromise plan shopped in 1949, there is no way to limit debate on a motion to change Rule 22. Opponents of a change may argue against it so long as they retain the strength to talk. Since Southern Democrats are the strongest opponents of any change in Rule 22, and since their support will be needed if the slender Republican majority is to control legislation in the 83rd Congress, the Republican leadership will hardly antagonize the Southerners by backing an all-out drive to change the rules.
With Rule 22 standing then, how can filibusters be ended? Elsewhere today, editorial pages are an explanation by Congressional Quarterly. The only way to end a filibuster against a bill, or against a motion to bring up a bill, is to get the votes of a "constitutional majority" (64 Senators) in favor of a cloture petition. Prior to 1940, Rule 22 required only the votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting on a cloture petition.
Arrangements for and against unlimited debate in the Senate are almost as old as the Republic itself.
Those who favor unlimited debate (the filibuster) say it enables a minority to resist the tyranny of a majority; that, contrary to the usual assumption, this is not a country of unlimited majority rule; that little important legislation blocked by a filibuster has been subsequently repealed; that some

check on rash action in the House of Representatives is needed; that one reason why the Senate enjoys the reputation of being the "greatest deliberative body in the world" is the right to unlimited debate.
Those who oppose unlimited debate contend that majorities are created by the people and defeated by the people, and must be in a position to carry out the will of the people; that this is a nation of majority rule, and that the minority rights in the Declaration of Independence are rights of individuals rather than legislative minorities; that among important bills first killed by the filibuster and then re-passed were the National Labor Relations Act and New Mexico to statehood, and arming U. S. merchant ships prior to U. S. entry in World War I; that an easier cloture rule would hurt the Senate into rash action; that it is the abuse of free debate that threatens the reputation of the Senate.
Logic means little, however, when the Senate argues about cloture. In recent years, regional differences of opinion on civil rights legislation have influenced debate far more than the fundamental question involved. And it is of some significance that even before the cloture rule was stiffened in 1949, opponents of FEPC, anti-poll tax, and anti-lynching legislation were able to block the vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.
At this point, it is a safe bet that the cloture rule will be invoked, and that cloture will be defeated some bill having stronger backing across the nation than any of the civil rights legislation proposed so far.

CONSOLIDATION NEEDS MORE SUPPORT

EVER HOPEFUL that talk about consolidating City and County functions will one day turn out to be more than just talk, we nonetheless doubt that Commissioners, Councilmen and legislators will designate their feet until public opinion solidifies behind consolidation.
For reasons that escape us, consolidation is viewed as an enormously difficult project. They are details to be worked out. But they are not so complicated that they would tax any group of reasonably intelligent men who are agreed upon the objective.
It has been done elsewhere. In Forsyth County we note an editor in The Winston-Salem Journal, there are already combined tax offices, municipal court, planning and zoning boards, and health department. And despite the complications presented by having two large cities within its borders, Guilford County has established a consolidated health department.
Two things will be necessary, we fear, before any real degree of consolidation is achieved here.

The first is agreement on, and passage of, the permissive bill suggested by Commissioner Sam McNeill and authorizing the County Commission and City Council to consolidate governmental functions. This will place the ball in the hands of the voters on the two local governing bodies, where it should be.
The second is to enlist the support of private citizens and organizations behind consolidation. Both the Junior Chamber of Commerce and the League of Women Voters are active in the responsibility squarely upon the shoulders of the citizens.
Consolidation will not work miracles, nor could it hold out any promise of great immediate savings. As Mecklenburg County continues to develop into a metropolitan area, however, consolidation becomes ever more urgent. They are the two cities which are urgent. City and County in many fields of government service. Consolidation of these services will not only bring greater efficiency, but over the long haul, will also be cheaper.

From The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

EISLER'S PARADISE LOST

BY SIGNS that seldom have failed, Gerhard Eisler, who escaped from the United States in 1940, and became the chief Communist propagandist in East Germany, is headed for a "paradise" and perhaps a hangman's noose. For him, the prospect must be tantalizing.
If he could just get back to the United States, he might achieve the superior status of the professional ex-Communist. After telling the FBI what he knows about his hangman's noose, he could instruct the never-behave Communist on the error of their ways and perhaps presume to tell us all what is and is not "true Americanism."
If Eisler, as an ex-Communist, should at last feel that he really knows, he will find it easy to take a ride on whatever new charge is in the air. For the ex-Communist has become an oracle licensed to accuse without proof and amend statements without consistency.
Especially might Eisler enjoy passing judgment on individuals who joined organizations

in the Thirties which were infiltrated at some time by communists. In the realm where ex-Communists reign supreme, a really-was Communist is superior to the might-have-been Communist. Even superior, it seems, to the never-was Communist.
There are books to write, magazine articles to sell and appearances before Congressional committees, which can be couched upon not to cross-examine very carefully. Eisler can just manage to unravel his history, and stow away again on the liner Ratory. Such is the tantalizing "if" for Gerhard Eisler. The vision of what might-have-been may add to his lecture a touch of reality which he helped create begins to swallow him up.
And you think kids are ruddy now, yet you don't remember when the boys would load grapefruit pipe with orange powder and think nothing about it—Pelham (Ga.) Journal.

'One At A Time, Gentlemen!'



Kerr Scott's Heritage

Spirited Moving Forward

An Editorial in The Greensboro Daily News
THE Scott administration which retires Thursday will be debated, praised, assailed and debunked—but it will not be forgotten. It will be remembered as a time of moving forward in North Carolina characterized by vigor, showmanship, candor—and mule-headedness—in the governor's office.
The mistakes made were more in methods and techniques than in goals dreamed of and sought. They centered on such things as weak appointments and political tinkering. They leave largely undisturbed, the lasting quality of the achievements.
History will remember Kerr Scott as architect of the state's largest building program in history—in roads, schools and public institutions. A Governor knew what he wanted, and he knew how to get it. He was a bulldozer, not a diplomat. He never bowed under false colors. His bulldozer, large hands and hard eyes advertised a man trained for action, not sophistry. Those who admired him least nevertheless had regard for his stamina, courage, plainness and self-renewing sense of humor. He was said of Scott, "If anybody ever accused me of having too much tact, he would take something to get rid of it." Still his gruffness and tart tongue hid a deep strain of sentiment and warmth not often seen in public.
SCOTT'S election in 1948 has been termed a "revolution." Scott himself said it was "a bottom-layer overturning the top" but it was something less than that. Scott's election was more a symptom than a revolution. It was that North Carolina will not tolerate too much mediocrity and complacency in her political leadership, nor be taken for granted in the peaceful days of the "New Deal" and "Truman" to express their disdain for a "sure thing." As challenger of the old hierarchy, Scott played a role in the "fresh air"—and he almost let it in too much.
His administration was, in retrospect, that of a man who tried to break an old political backyard. When he tried to build his own dynasty—something suggested by his predecessors—people straightaway knocked him down. In the Smith-Graham and Umstead-Olive races, Scott's open and vigorous criticism played a major part in the decisions.
Most of Scott's weak appointments stemmed from his loyalty to him and his particular head philosophy constituted qualifications for high office. Sometimes ability and integrity were made secondary when they were his administration suffered. It hurt Scott's program when he failed to solicit support of excellent men who were either neutral or not initially hostile. Scott played a rough, strenuous game of politics, and his bulldozing tactics worked so long as he went through it unscathed. He benefited the state more than his own political clique.

But in the light of history these mistakes are small. Without Scott's dynamic drive in Kingsboro, North Carolina's building program would have lagged during a critical time. History was on Scott's side. While the Legislature and most of the state's business men reneached for a recession, Scott plowed along as if the sun would shine forever. It was the perennial optimist. He believed in North Carolina, and his faith paid large dividends. By needing his lieutenants he saved the state millions in construction costs. Far from bankrupting North Carolina, he beat inflation to the punch.
THE vision and faith of Kerr Scott have enriched rather than impoverished North Carolina. A foundation has been laid—in new schools, high roads, telephones and electricity. He ties the great achievements in roadbuilding to his interest in promoting the growth of rural churches. (His own Hawfield Presbyterian Church has increased its membership by 25 per cent.)
If North Carolina hopes that her future lies in dispersed population and a contented rural citizenry sprinkled among small cities—in short, agricultural isolation—then Kerr Scott's administration has been worthwhile. The dispersed pattern of life in North Carolina is ideal for the growing South and rural revolution.
Kerr Scott believed further that goal because he was interested in keeping people happy down home in North Carolina. If his emphasis has been one-sided on the rural, it was because he believed previous urban areas had been too one-sided on the city and urban areas. Scott tried to balance the scales.
It may be realized as new decades unfold that Scott came along in North Carolina at a good time. On the foundation he built a conservative, businesslike administration conducted by a man like Scott's successor, William B. Umstead, should reap many rewards.
As part of the unfolding pattern of basically good leadership from Democratic Governors in North Carolina, Kerr Scott's administration was the welcome variation which proved the soundness of North Carolina's political judgment.

Quote, Unquote

Mr. McTavish was making the last payment on a baby. Mrs. McTavish was making the last payment on a conversation.
"Uh, how is the baby, Mrs. McTavish?" he asked.
"Uh, he's just fine," she replied. "He's getting married next week."—Carlsbad (N.M.) Current-Argus.
Of Chlorophyll, with its multiple uses, the green stuff that, at one, and in you—it can now be said that we are chlorophyll.—Nashville Banner.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

BRITISH sources close to Winston Churchill say that while his initial reason for coming to Korea was the dynamic-laden situation in Iran, the Prime Minister has become equally steamed up over reports of a strategy in Korea.
This strategy, as related to London by British observers, follows:
1. Block two divisions of Chiang Kai-shek's troops to Seoul from forwarding the Atlantic on to Korea.
2. Block the China ports.
3. Turn over a certain number of American naval vessels to South Korea and the Chinese Nationalist government to form Korean and Chinese navies, which in turn would block the coast of China.
4. Lift the present ban against Chiang Kai-shek's sending military expeditions to the Chinese mainland.
5. Possible use of atomic weapons in Korea.
6. Send three U. S. divisions to Japan, presumably to prepare for a Korean offensive next Spring.

Ike's Plans For Korea

is completely discredited, that he can never stage a comeback and that using his troops either in Korea or on the mainland would be like a red flag to the Chinese. It might, they think, be particularly demoralizing.
The British also claim that any blockade of the China coast would be tantamount to an act of war. If U. S. warships should blockade Russian-held Dairen, for instance, it might provoke war.
Churchill's advisers say that since he and Eisenhower are old comrades from World War II, during which they served together, it is not surprising that they should merely for the sake of movement, but that his moves are carefully thought out so as not to alienate this country's allies.
Note—It's interesting that while Eisenhower was about the time that some of his advisers bashed the idea of a blockade of the Chinese coast, it is interesting to suggest that the new President should not be merely for the sake of movement, but that his moves are carefully thought out so as not to alienate this country's allies.
When the team comes up again, I'll be there playing right guard — If they want me to, I'll be there. I've been kidding New Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri, whom Truman tried to have defeated in the Democratic primary in 1952.
"I want to warn you, Sir," said the President, "that about 20 days from now I'll be one of your constituents. And you'd better watch. I'm quite a letter-writer, and I'm going to write you some letters."
The President also told about the Missouri Senatorial race in which Symington defeated Republican Sen. James Kem, and the picture of a cow which Kem circulated indicating that he understood farm problems.
"Kem," said the President, "is a very good man. The only thing he knows how to milk is a corporation."

People Should Know The Truth About Awful Hydrogen Bomb

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON
NO AMERICAN high official has the faintest doubt that the Kremlin now knows the salient facts about the hydrogen bomb. At this very moment beyond question, the Soviet strategists are recasting their program in the light of the existence of this weapon which blotted out an atom.
The facts about the hydrogen bomb are being concealed from the American people. They can be, and have been, ascertained by the same non-secret processes used by the Russian intelligence. And here they are.
The first point to note is that all expectations, both official and unofficial, were surpassed by the last explosion at Eniwetok. It was farly well-known that the original aim was to build a one megaton bomb—100 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb, with an explosive force of one million times that of TNT.
There were widespread doubts at the time this aim was announced, because of the undreamed-of complexity of the technical problem. The first test at Eniwetok, however, passed the object to be exploded was not going to be a bomb at all.
It was going to be a mere "experimental" mechanism deriving most of its power from plutonium, which is the power source of conventional atomic bombs.
All this, in a cautious and dignified manner, has now turned out to be utterly misleading. As things turned out, the primary aim of the bomb tested at Eniwetok was an explosive force of between three and five megatons. It was between 150 and 250 times more powerful than the bomb that fell on Hiroshima. It was the equivalent of between three million and five million tons of TNT.
There is no adequate way to visualize this power. The only way is to compare it with the power of a Faustian man reproduced by the very fire of life. But one can at least get a rough idea of the scale of its target of a hydrogen bomb of this order. Let us strike an average, supposing that the bomb

Cloture Has Long, Sometimes Stormy, History In Senate

By Congressional Quarterly
A THREAT to raise the ceiling of cloture, with its civil rights implications, may provoke a routing of Sen. Philip H. Frank.
A much-embattled 35-year-old Senate rule, Rule XXII—is in danger of being amended by legislation, citing a 1952 Democratic Party platform statement that Congress, majority rule notwithstanding, should prevail, but may attempt to change the rule to unlimited filibustering in the Senate.
The Senate has tried to impose cloture—close debate—by which they hope to prevent opponents "talking to death" so-called civil rights proposals. Since 1917, only four of 21 attempts to close debate have succeeded.
HAS LENGTHY BACKGROUND
Rule 22 was adopted in 1917 and provided that two-thirds of the Senators present and voting could cut off debate.
But in 1949, during a parliamentary battle preceding the consideration of Fair Employment Practices Commission bills, the importance of cloture was made more difficult.
A "compromise" adopted by the Senate in 1949 provided that cloture could be imposed only if two-thirds of the 80 Senators present or absent could block such a change.
This change was approved by the Senate 69 to 23. Democrats supported it 34 to 8.
The Democratic Party, at its national convention in Chicago in 1952, adopted a majority rule plank, although the terms "filibuster" and "cloture" were not used. The plank, which appeared separately from a section dealing with civil rights recommendations, read:
"In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all classified legislation, so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate, without being blocked by a minority in either house."
A Republican Party platform had a section dealing with civil rights, but did not deal with cloture or filibusters.
1917 WILSON
PROPOSAL BEATEN
The first use of cloture was adopted in 1917 following a furor over talking to death in the Senate of a proposal by President Woodrow Wilson to arm merchant ships before U. S. entry into war.
Since 1917, there have been 21 cloture votes, but only four succeeded. Filibusters continued in the Senate until 1952, when a majority vote had been required, cloture could have been imposed. But in 1952, these 21 tests, instead of in four.
Cloture was imposed in debate on the "Internal Security Act of 1950," in 1950. It was also used in 1951, when it was used to end the debate on the "Internal Security Act of 1950," in 1951.
In 1952, it was used to end the debate on the "Internal Security Act of 1950," in 1952.
Eight of the 21 cloture votes have dealt with civil rights issues. All these have occurred since 1950, and none has been successful. However, if a simple majority rule were used, cloture could have been imposed in five of the eight ballots.

Farewell Luncheon

DR. Truman had a farewell luncheon with Democratic Senators on Monday. There were moments of sadness and also moments of humor.
Dr. Truman said good-by to colleagues with whom he had served with whom he had some personal friendship. He had been mentioned as Ambassador to France.
"Let me think the Republicans owe me anything," said Dr. Truman, "I've battled them as I could and have done the best job I know how. I'm proud of it."
When the team comes up again, I'll be there playing right guard — If they want me to, I'll be there. I've been kidding New Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri, whom Truman tried to have defeated in the Democratic primary in 1952.
"I want to warn you, Sir," said the President, "that about 20 days from now I'll be one of your constituents. And you'd better watch. I'm quite a letter-writer, and I'm going to write you some letters."
The President also told about the Missouri Senatorial race in which Symington defeated Republican Sen. James Kem, and the picture of a cow which Kem circulated indicating that he understood farm problems.
"Kem," said the President, "is a very good man. The only thing he knows how to milk is a corporation."