

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1953

ANOTHER JOB FOR THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

YESTERDAY we said the General Assembly could save many Tar Heel lives by adopting the "point system" of punishment for highway lawbreakers. So many "points" (violations) would mean revocation of the offending driver's license. Today we will consider another aspect of auto law the legislature ought to get interested in. We need, in North Carolina, a fairer and more comprehensive system of auto liability insurance.

The present system often penalizes the safe driver. A man who, along with other drivers in his family, has a perfect safety record, may pay about \$30 per year more for liability insurance than a reckless driver does. This is because, generally speaking, the insured who does not use his car for business and has "no operator" of the automobile under 25 years of age resident in the applicant's household, "gets the cheapest rate."

The reason for this discrimination is the large number of accidents in the under-25 age group. But there are many fine drivers in that age bracket—and a lot of dangerous ones, too.

The present system can also be catastrophic to the uninsured. Juries are awarding increasingly, sometimes fantastically high verdicts to traffic victims. These high awards, in turn, affect the insured, too, and are resulting in higher and higher rates. And because many drivers aren't insured, the traffic victim injured by a pauper suffers severe financial, as well as physical, hardship.

There are several plans for remedying or lessening these several hardships. Governor Dewey is trying to get New York to require universal liability insurance for all motor vehicle owners in the state. New York insurance men prefer an "unsatisfied judgments fund" setup, as now used in New Jersey. Under this plan insured motor vehicle owners pay \$10 and Mr. Trump pays \$5 into this fund. If an uninsured driver is involved in an accident and cannot meet the total cost of the court judgment, the money is drawn from the fund.

JOHNSTON MAKES A BELATED DISCOVERY

SOUTH CAROLINA'S ebullient Sen. Olin Johnston, just back from a seven-week jaunt to Europe and North Carolina, has fired a shotgun blast that has sent some of our editorial writers brethren stalling. U. S. employees abroad, the Senator says, live too high, draw too much money, and do too little work. We ought to fire half of them, he adds, and cut the pay of the rest.

Well, government employees are always fair game for politicians, we suppose, and the season never closes. If the Senator has his facts right, and we do not question them, something ought to be done. But we doubt that sweeping Congressional action is in the offing. A seven-week look-see by a committee of Senators is the right approach.

Senator Johnston is not the first to point out the urgent need for reorganizing the whole last foreign branch of the U. S. Government. Back in 1946 the Hoover Commission branched out of its domestic field long enough to report that the U. S. had 200,000 employees in 86 countries, working under 44 agencies that were controlled, in turn, by 39 Congressional committees. The Commission strongly recommended a bipartisan study of foreign affairs just like the one it had completed on domestic functions.

Having editorialized on the topic some time, our editor went on to say that Senator Johnston's belated discovery of slipshod personnel practices, dubious pay scales for clerks and stenographers, and duplicating functions. Had the Senator and his colleagues been on their toes, they would have done something about the Hoover Commission recommendation three years ago.

It's still the best idea that has been advanced so far. The nation needs better coordination in its many foreign activities. It needs better qualified people. And, above all, it needs a better sense of direction and purpose.

There are, undoubtedly, hacks and miffids in the foreign service who would be hard put to earn a decent living in competitive private employment. But there are also many well-trained, faithful and earnest U. S. representatives, who have taken important gov-

Louis Groves In The Chapel Hill Weekly

TERRIFIC IS THE WORD NOW

"SWELL," meaning first-rate, tip-top, excellent, has been in the language (or half in, you might say, since it is classified as colloquial or slang) a long time, but it acquired a fresh vogue a few years ago. For a considerable period in the 1940's, the adverb took on a new meaning. It was no longer a book or a play or a picture was admired, the favorite word for it was "swell." The word was also applied to human beings, and a man or woman in high favor with the speaker would be called "a swell person." Now "swell" has faded out of fashion and has been replaced by "terrific." Wherever you hear someone saying that this or that is "terrific." In reviewing a television show for the New York Herald Tribune one day last week, John Henry, after the accolade by declaring it was "terrific." Soon after I read Crosby's piece a neighbor told me that when she had gone into one of our Chapel Hill stores and described the sort of dress she was looking for, the saleswoman had said to her: "I've got just what you want. It's terrific." A friend of mine who came back from New York after seeing a play he had been reading about and yearning to see, told me it was "terrific." A traveler from New Jersey, passing through Chapel Hill the other day on his way home from a tour of the Western Carolina mountains, described the Blue Ridge Parkway, also the Nantahala Gorge, also the Great Smokies, as "terrific." There is no end to "terrific." It is, not yet. Of course there will be. "Terrific" will fade out, just as "swell" did, to be replaced by some new word. Or will there be a return to "swell"? My vote is against that. I have never been a devotee of "terrific." It has been used so much that it has lost its meaning. It has been one of the most overused words in the English language.

President-elect Eisenhower flew to Korea in an Air Force plane, toured the battlefield in an Army jeep, and set out for home in a Navy cruiser. Unification. Get it, Pentagon? —Charlotte Times.

Another idea, detailed in *Best's Insurance News*, strikes us as a sensible means of rewarding the careful driver. Under this system the state motor vehicle department would require that every licensed operator designate the car to which his "operating experience" be assigned, and each person applying for a car license would be required to list the names of operators assigned to the vehicle. Then the vehicle department would issue an "insurance classification," with the auto license, with categories from A to Z. All newly-licensed cars would get a classification in the middle of the alphabet. If the car was involved in any accidents during a certain period its rating would move up the alphabet—and its owner into a cheaper insurance rate. Each car would move down the alphabet—and into a higher insurance rate—for each involvement in accidents where the insurance company pays out money.

All these ideas have considerable merit. We'd like to see them jell into legislation at Raleigh. It's high time for our legislators to get concerned about the risks and costs of automobile travel.

RISE AND FALL

TODAY President Truman's last "State of the Union" message goes to Congress. Friday the legislators will receive his final budget. The former is designed for the history books. The budget will probably never rise above doorknob status.

Saturday Jean Monnet, architect and chief executive of the United Europe now coming into being, will deliver his first "State of the Union" message. It will offer his first budget to the six-nation European community.

Thus, this month, as an era ends in this country, another begins in Europe. With all respect to Mr. Truman's service to history, and the important material in his reports, we suspect that the history books of 1963, when referring to the 1953 "State of the Union" message, will mean Mr. Monnet's.

NO CLEMENCY

THE PLIGHT of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg has aroused any sympathy among reasonable people to a competent dissection of the signs of it. On the contrary, the contrary seems to feel that the convicted atom spies will be getting what they deserve if they are electrocuted, as scheduled.

The case against the Rosenbergs was direct. The evidence left no doubt in the minds of the jury, or of Judge Irving R. Kaufman. In fact, Judge Kaufman, in rejecting a mercy plea, said he had "studied and re-studied" the record, and that "I have seen nothing, nor have I heard anything, that leads me to cause me to change the sentence originally imposed."

Had the Rosenbergs confessed to any remorse whatsoever, had they assisted the Government in rounding up other members of the spy ring, a plea of mercy would doubtless have received a favorable response from Federal prosecutors and from Judge Kaufman. They have stood pat on their denials, uttered in the face of convincing evidence.

The Rosenbergs have shown no remorse. It was theirs to choose. Having made the decision, they should receive no clemency from President Truman now when the appeal for stay of execution now goes.

There are, undoubtedly, hacks and miffids in the foreign service who would be hard put to earn a decent living in competitive private employment. But there are also many well-trained, faithful and earnest U. S. representatives, who have taken important gov-

Louis Groves In The Chapel Hill Weekly

TERRIFIC IS THE WORD NOW

"SWELL," meaning first-rate, tip-top, excellent, has been in the language (or half in, you might say, since it is classified as colloquial or slang) a long time, but it acquired a fresh vogue a few years ago. For a considerable period in the 1940's, the adverb took on a new meaning. It was no longer a book or a play or a picture was admired, the favorite word for it was "swell." The word was also applied to human beings, and a man or woman in high favor with the speaker would be called "a swell person." Now "swell" has faded out of fashion and has been replaced by "terrific." Wherever you hear someone saying that this or that is "terrific." In reviewing a television show for the New York Herald Tribune one day last week, John Henry, after the accolade by declaring it was "terrific." Soon after I read Crosby's piece a neighbor told me that when she had gone into one of our Chapel Hill stores and described the sort of dress she was looking for, the saleswoman had said to her: "I've got just what you want. It's terrific." A friend of mine who came back from New York after seeing a play he had been reading about and yearning to see, told me it was "terrific." A traveler from New Jersey, passing through Chapel Hill the other day on his way home from a tour of the Western Carolina mountains, described the Blue Ridge Parkway, also the Nantahala Gorge, also the Great Smokies, as "terrific." There is no end to "terrific." It is, not yet. Of course there will be. "Terrific" will fade out, just as "swell" did, to be replaced by some new word. Or will there be a return to "swell"? My vote is against that. I have never been a devotee of "terrific." It has been used so much that it has lost its meaning. It has been one of the most overused words in the English language.



People's Platform

Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editor. The News reserves the right to condense.

Hooray For George; Phooey On Billy

Editor, The News:
ORDINARILY I disagree in toto with your editorials, but one of the things George Kaufman strikes the mark. As a matter of fact, I was wondering how the old boy lasted as long as he did. (Editorial Note: He'll be back on the air, later this month) as his conversation, like his plays and other literary efforts, are not slanted to please the music trade, and it is indisputable that radio and TV producers consider that the mass audience is slightly feeble-minded and sub-normal.

In this connection, I think it is rather noteworthy that our local station no longer favors us with the weekly talks of Bishop Sheen, but we still have that tin-shouting, yammering mountebank, Billy Graham, thrown at us on any and all occasions.

—JOHN S. HAWLEY.

Even Liberalism Is Suspect

Editor, The News:
My compliments to the person who wrote the editorial of Dec. 30—"This Loyalty Above All Others." Back in October several people were discussing the campaign when one of them made this remark: "If the Republicans win the election you will see the 6-1 which built this country has ever witnessed." From reports in the newspapers and over the radio it would seem that this prediction is to be fulfilled.

Your editorial further strong evidence of this to come. In one of his speeches Governor Stevenson said—"A free country is one in which it is safe to be unpopular, that is to hold beliefs, but it is questionable, in the present day, if one can hold unpopular beliefs and survive."

The pendulum has swung to the conservative side, in fact in too many cases to the completely reactionary view, so that there may be a concerted effort to destroy real liberalism under the pretense of fighting internal Communism. Those who are familiar with the New Testament should recognize the similarity of those times with the present. Jesus was in every sense a real "liberal," His influence was the greatest of all time.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON
THE inside story of the Senate Elections Committee report on the subcommittee's report on the McCarthy case is in itself a weird matter. It involved months of delay, many attempts by McCarthy at bulldozing committee members, and many gray hairs in the head of the Republican committee member, Sen. Robert Hendrickson of New Jersey.

Hendrickson, an honest Senator, but subject to human pressures, went along with the two Democratic members of the committee until near the end. Then he almost did not sign the report. In fact, before he would sign it, perhaps the most important part of all the recommendations—were taken out.

This was why the Elections Committee was in the embarrassing position of submitting a report containing 238 exhibits of McCarthy's bank statements, canceled checks and other data, giving ample evidence of concealed misuse of funds, yet made no recommendation to the Senate for action.

Senators Tom Hennings of Missouri and Carl Hayden of Arizona, the two Democratic members, felt it was important to have a unanimous report so they bowed to their Republican colleague.

McCarthy's Bulldozing

McCarthy's first attempt to bulldoze came when he threatened Senator Hennings of Missouri with exposing Communist members of Hennings' staff if he proceeded with the investigation. Hennings, however, was not fazed. He not only had no Communists on his staff, but was a former member of the House of Representatives and respected former district attorney of St. Louis.

terest was in his teaching to the "great unorganized mass of people." The traditionalists, conservatives and reactionaries of his time fought him every step of the way and finally crushed him. Are the people who still believe in the right of free speech, free thought and the other guarantees of the Bill of Rights going to sit idly by and watch the Sadducees and Pharisees of the present day destroy the very essence of American freedom and beliefs?

Your "Year-End Report To Our Readers" was also of interest and it aroused mixed feelings—some pleasant, some not so pleasant. One remark caused hearty laughter. You said "Many of you (readers) would not have believed that I would finally end." It is believed that most of us who know the present-day political leanings of The News and who also know, from past performances, how you get election and primary prizes, never had any doubt as to whom your eventual endorsement would go.

My best New Year wishes to The News and my thanks for your courtesy in the past in publishing my letters. Also my best New Year wishes and appreciation to the several readers of The News who have written me from time to time expressing thanks and approval of my efforts to discuss the current issues.

—ELMER M. SIMMONS

Tar Heel Marines Want Letters

Editor, The News:
WE would appreciate it very much if you would print our names and addresses. Our purpose is to correspond with the friendly people of Charlotte and keep informed of the happenings of that nice town. We frequently read your publication, as we were stationed there in North Carolina.

—CPL. RUSS MYERS
—CPL. RONALD BEVIN
Wmcs. Co. 3/5, 1st Mar. Div.
FMF, 3d FV, San Francisco.

Know Any Twin Jokes?

Editor, The News:
I AM editing the anecdotes of my kinsman Samuel Clemens (Mark Twain) and shall be happy to hear from readers of The News who may have Twain stories or anecdotes.

—VERLIE L. CLEMENS, Editor
Mark Twain Quarterly

one of the most respected members of the Senate, took his place.

At this time, the committee had selected Paul Cotton as counsel, a dynamic lawyer determined to bring out a thorough report.

During the period, Hendrickson of New Jersey had cooperated conscientiously. But, toward the end, he came under terrific pressure from McCarthy and his friends, Jenner of Indiana, Welker of Idaho, and Dirksen of Illinois. It was to appease them that Hendrickson demanded that the recommendations be omitted from the report.

Just before the report was issued, however, Hendrickson even delayed signing the amended report without the recommendations. He was the most honest, best public-welfare of all took place.

A committee meeting had been called for Monday, Dec. 29 at which the final draft was to be OK'd. Hendrickson was unable to show. Telephoning from New Jersey, he said he had been held up by urgent personal business, would not be able to get to Washington.

This left the committee only two days before the New Year in which to get the report to the Senate. And since it was 400 pages long, at least a day was necessary to get it finished by the Government Printing Office. So Senator Hennings and Hayden told Hendrickson they would send the report to him to read. This was done by special messenger.

BUDGET

WASHINGTON
FOR a number of reasons, the report dealing with the reformed financial transactions discovered in the banking and brokerage accounts of Sen. Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, which was used to challenge his right to a seat in the Senate. One obvious reason was that the report was returned him in November returned him to a second six-year term even though much of the information contained in the report had in one way or another already become public.

The Senate is traditionally reluctant to go back of the verdict of the voters in search of fraud and irregularity. It is a tradition that was to fall out of one unlooked closet, then keys might be found to get it out.

This was illustrated in the controversy over whether the McCarthy report would find its way to a unanimous report and what use would be made of it. In the Democratic Policy Committee were those who wanted to make the basis of a challenge to McCarthy's right to a seat, even though it would have contained what was almost certainly rejected.

While this discussion was going on, Sen. Thomas C. Hennings of Missouri, chairman of the McCarthy investigating subcommittee, issued a warning that if the report came directly from Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, the majority leader. If McCarthy's right to take his seat was challenged, then Senator Dennis Chavez of New Mexico would also be asked to stand aside pending the investigation of the election in that state last fall. Chavez's opponent in November, Patrick J. Hurley, wanted the Senate to reject Chavez on the basis of fraud in the election. From New Mexico, however, it was notorious. One thoroughly familiar with the state believes Hurley had been convicted of fraud, but only last November 4, but on at least one of his earlier attempts to win a Senate seat, The late Sen.

BRONSON CUTTING, a wealthy Republican from the East who settled in New Mexico, is said to have spent a million dollars in his own successful campaign.

Chavez was seated without challenge at the McCarthy report. While the Democratic discussion was going on over the McCarthy report, a quick canvass indicated that only two and perhaps three Republican votes would have been cast against whether the charges made the Wisconsin Senator ineligible to his seat. One would have been the vote of Sen. Robert Hendrickson of New Jersey, who finally signed the unanimous three-man subcommittee report in spite of great pressure from McCarthy and his friends. The second would have been that of Sen. Wayne Harrison of Ohio, who was no longer a Republican but an independent. A third Republican vote might possibly have come from Sen. Irving L. of New York.

McCarthy WOULD HAVE WON Several votes to sustain McCarthy would have come from the Democratic side. So in the closely divided Senate a test would have been lost and McCarthy would have claimed vindication.

That, at any rate, was the estimation of Hennings, who is responsible for the final decisions. Accused at one point of sitting on the report put together by the work of careful investigation, with witnesses testifying under oath, Hennings deserves full credit for settling it and the matter before the eleventh hour. He was backed by Sen. Carl Hayden of Arizona, the retiring chairman of the full Rules Committee.

The questions of McCarthy's conduct and of Hennings' conduct are still open. The report remains for the Republican majority to consider. It can, however, ignore the charges made not for long since McCarthy's own in his indomitable drive for power he will not be ignored.

Christmas In Addis Ababa
Almost Like Old Home Week
By ROBERT C. RUARK

ADDIS ABABA, where the law-hawk-purple locals wear a national costume of red and white, and where the hills are red and the ladies pile their hair high in a glossy rack, is almost like old home week.

The gorgeous Madame Green was on hand with fourteen months' worth of female infant named Pat. When they had thought to be passed through the last time. There was also Nalzi's man and his kid sister and another American pilot with a Greek wife and their new baby and the baby's Greek mother. The motor trouble of the Nalzi's brotkeys—exactly trying on dungaree pants and wind-up toys—was the best of the packages under the tree.

The tree was big as you have at home, and the pile of presents as high as in African compound in the high hills of Ethiopia. The turkey was almost as big as the tree, and was as much as the unwrapped presents, as much confusion as you had at home. There was even a Christmas tree in the radio station "White Christmas," and Madame Green's fine-furred coat was the same as the one I had at home.

I don't know if my trying to say except that it was sort of wonderful. I was so glad to see the African moon in a pale sky, with the hyenas just out of earshot and the sound of the drums sounding clearly over the hills.

Once in a while you become overwhelmed with the simple kindness of the people who are so friendly. In the past 24 hours I had accepted the hospitality of a family who had been so kind to me. I was interested only in being kind to strangers far from home. There were no old-fashions like the Magi in the entire attitude.

Five-Hour Phone Call

BY this time the Democratic Senators began to suspect that Hendrickson was trying to stall until it was too late for them to do anything.

So on Wednesday, Dec. 31, Hennings and Hayden got on the telephone to their Republican colleague in New Jersey and had a five-hour conversation with him. Free time for the conference was interrupted by the time off to confer with people in his office or to receive other long-distance calls. However, the telephone line was kept open for the duration of the call.

Later it was learned that McCarthy had flown up to see Hendrickson to get, cajole, and bulldoze him. Other Republicans accused him of using the phone to urge him not to sign.

Finally Hayden and Hennings concluded that it was impossible to argue details and make minor changes in the report by telephone. They asked their New Jersey colleague to come to Washington next day. He agreed. The next day, however, McCarthy refused to come. He asked the Government Printing Office to stand by—despite the holiday—to print the report.

Hendrickson accused McCarthy of using New Year's Day, late that afternoon finally signed the report—with one stipulation, namely it was not to be issued until 4 P. M. Friday, Jan. 2. McCarthy said it could not be done. He asked the Government Printing Office to stand by—despite the holiday—to print the report.