

THOMAS L. ROBINSON... J. E. DOWD... G. A. GRIFFITH... C. A. MCKNIGHT...

SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1953

NEW ANTI-KLAN BILL AN IMPROVEMENT

WITH the restrictions now written into a substitute bill to outlaw the Ku Klux Klan in North Carolina, it is not nearly so objectionable as was the original measure.

Safeguards have been provided for parades and meetings by social fraternities. Closed meetings of labor unions would not be interfered with. Such organizations as the Masonic order would be exempt. As explained by Solicitor Clifton O. Moore of Burgin, the bill would be clearly limited to those secret organizations aimed at circumventing the laws of the state.

Solicitor Moore was the man who prosecuted the Klan successfully in 1951-52. He felt then that stronger state statutes would have made the job easier. The bill could have been combated earlier and more vigorously.

If members of the General Assembly now feel that the law has adequate restrictions, there is no reason why they should not

approve it. The people of the state have had more than enough of the Ku Klux Klan, and any law that strengthens the hand of the state in dealing with the Klan has merit. It should be remembered, however, that the Klan's ability to survive in the South has not stemmed so much from inadequate laws as from poor enforcement of laws. On all too many occasions, law enforcement authorities have looked the other way when the Klan was acting up. And it has happened often that sympathetic jurors turned Klansmen loose even after they were arrested and brought to trial.

The first reason for the Klan is the rooting out of the hatreds and prejudices that spawn the evil outfit. Education, religion, militant citizenship—these are the permanent and lasting weapons against race by mob violence. In combating the Klan by statute, North Carolina should never forget that the best and most lasting weapon is public opinion.

THE NATION NEEDS ITS PRESIDENT'S VOICE

ANY MAN who is catapulted into a position of awful responsibility and unfamiliar work requires time to get his bearings. The Presidency carries with it an untroubled burden. The President was totally unfamiliar with many aspects of his new task. But he has oriented himself quickly and performed his task with a diligence that has tired his colleagues, with a degree of good will that has aroused the admiration of many of his pre-election opponents.

He meets daily with dozens of persons, from both sides of the aisle in Congress, from most segments of American life. But, probably because of his devotion to pressing duties and his desire to acquaint himself with many issues, he has made no public

appearances, before large gatherings or on radio and television, since his State of the Union address.

We concur with Marquis Childs' suggestion, in a recent column, that it may be time for the President to report on his stewardship to the people. Not that the people are demanding an accounting. But, in all the hue and cry engendered by Congressional conflict, the figure of the President as a leader has dimmed in the public eye. The nation needs, along with the conflict that attends democratic government and the calmness that has characterized recent Congressional sessions, a steady and steady counsel of its chief executive. It is time for the President to fulfill this further task of his office.

DR. ROBERT LARDNER GIBBON

HARDLY anyone who knew Dr. Robert Lardner Gibbon ever failed to express admiration for the expert way in which he had contrived his life and reconciled his conflicting interests. A distinguished surgeon, he never let medicine keep him from enjoying a dozen other activities. With a mind for business, he never let business pin him down. An ardent golfer, he somehow managed to find time to schedule himself to play golf every day (except Sunday), and the time and energy he put into all those activities never were so great as to keep him from

his principal interest of all, which was his family.

He was endowed with a brilliant mind and good health as he had to be to do all that he managed to do, but the quality which endeared him to everyone who knew him was an inexhaustible and unfeeling supply of good humor. Even into his middle eighties he continued to be a refreshing person to know, a still still cutting deal out of life because, it was plain to see, he had put so much into it.

ONE-WAY STREETS ARE SAFER TOO

TRAFFIC ENGINEER Herman Hoese, that man with the slide rule and stop watch, has come up with some more statistics, this time on use of newly-designed one-way streets. Traffic, he finds, has increased markedly since the "One-Way" signs went up.

On S. Caldwell St. between Independence Blvd. and 1st St., volume up 27.4 per cent. The increase is over 100 per cent on N. Caldwell St. between Trade and 5th Sts., and on E. 8th St. between Brevard and 6th Sts. The other increase ranges from 6.1 to 72.5 per cent.

This traffic increase indicates that a one-way system can do to expedite traffic on narrow streets. There's another dividend to be expected from the one-way system, one that will benefit all the community. It lies in the increased safety on narrow streets when traffic moves but one way.

Portland, Oregon has had, for about three

years now, a one-way grid system comprising 280 blocks and more than 21 miles of two-way streets. Public Safety magazine carries a comparison of accident figures in 1951—the first full year of one-way operation—with 1949. It shows that vehicle accidents in Portland's one-way section were cut almost in half. Pedestrian accidents were slashed by more than half.

Angle collisions were reduced from 1,473 to 563. The largest collision was dropped from 237 to 126. And despite the reduction in accidents, there was more than an eight per cent increase in traffic volume.

All this, of course, prefer wide boulevards, adequate lighting, and two-way traffic. New roads should be thus planned. But the one-way street has advantages not always realized by the motorist as he backs out of one he's entered from the wrong direction.

'KENTUCKY WINDAGE'

ALL ACES are supposed to be the toughest fighter pilot was modest. He was also naturally reticent to say that, in shooting down eight MIGs, he hadn't used that fancy, expensive new night the Air Force had provided him.

It is said to have let the Air Force know about this, "he said, 'I shot those eight down like you would shoot ducks.'"  
Capt Harold Fischer calls his system "Kentucky windage." He just leads the MIG, like you only by denouncing past Presidents and past administrations and calling them names. Let's think in terms of how he is going to win. That's the key. Pay less attention toward fixing the blame for past mistakes... This country needs a big-league foreign policy. There are no politics where the interests of our country are concerned.

tried, true and simple tenet of American marksmanship still has a practical application in these days of radio-controlled missiles, radar interception, and the multitudinous gadgetry that attends modern warfare.

And further, we hope Captain Fischer receives full opportunity to share his system with other pilots. Other airmen in other wars used it, but it just might be that the Air Force has become so involved in producing bigger, better and more expensive devices (some bomb sights cost more than \$1 million) that it has lost the brains and first-line planes used to be a dose of uncomplained-and effective—"Kentucky windage."

STATESMAN'S VOICE

IN THE LIGHT of the Absp brothers' revelation of American aid defectors, Rep. Charles R. Jones' recent plea for a bipartisan foreign policy and more unity between the parties takes on deeper significance.

North Carolina's lone Republican Congressman spoke before a group of his own party men in Asheville. His speech was generally high-minded and veined with statesmanship. It put first things first:

"We need unity and a solid common front to present our enemies abroad. We can't develop unity by denouncing past Presidents and past administrations and calling them names. Let's think in terms of how we are going to win. That's the key. Pay less attention toward fixing the blame for past mistakes... This country needs a big-league foreign policy. There are no politics where the interests of our country are concerned."  
"Let the dead past bury its dead and let

us fix our eyes on the tomorrow and seek to develop a course of action that will meet the approval of the people.

Mr. Jones' responsible voice is a welcome addition to the Eisenhower forces in the 83rd Congress. Even now in those halls McKean-Briggs-Veale-Jenner and Company have the new President and his lieutenants. Their eyes are turned toward the past not the future. Their goal is political expediency and self-aggrandizement, not statesmanship.

Only the leadership of men who speak in the moderate, co-operative language of Congressman Jones can see us through the crisis. It may demand more, not less, sacrifice. If it does, the people will need to hear a lot more from Jones and a lot less from McCarthy.

'If A Fire Breaks Out I'll Put In An Order For One'



Security System Needs Repair

THE strange case of Charles E. Bohlen has lighted several ugly truths about the American government. One of these is a kind of stuff that gets into government security files.

Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy hastily led his way out this side of his case at the last moment, declaring that he had never opposed Bohlen's confirmation as Ambassador to Moscow on security grounds. Only a few days earlier, when asked if he regarded Bohlen as a security risk, McCarthy characteristically declared "That's putting it too weak."

McCarthy further hinted that he had heard all about the Bohlen security file from his friend, Scott McLeod. What the Senator says must always be doubted. Yet it seems to be established that Bohlen had been in the files of the C.I.O., of leaking some sort of poisonous story to McCarthy.

Senator Taft has now supplied the appropriate commentary on the Bohlen security file. One of the very few items unfavorable to Bohlen was a letter from a State Department stenographer who claimed that Bohlen had felt her "with several" sending out alarm signals on the one brief occasion when she had taken dictation from Bohlen.

Far from being inserted in a high officer's security file, this sort of sick-minded person pen letter ought to have caused a security investigation of the stenographer. But the stenographer, in all testily, the method of compiling security files is a bit odd, at times.

Cease History

THESE reporters have a brother, John de Koven. Also by name, who seems to them as good a security risk as you could wish in wartime. He has an OSS passport, is a member of the enemy lines in both France and China. In China, he led an anti-Communist, anti-Japanese guerrilla group, and had a price on his head. "Will the bug American with the mustache" by both sets of enemies.

In no respect, he is a Connecticut Republican. The application was refused, on security grounds. With great difficulty, the reasons were ascertained. They consisted of reports by two government sources that John de Koven had not got the name quite right. He had first invented a new personality, "John de Koven." He had then inserted the name in the files of the C.I.O. and the non-existent citizen was "probably the brother or close relative" of another Mr. de Koven who had come to the attention of Henry A. Wallace's Progressive Party.

The second agent had at least got the name right. The application was refused, on security grounds. With great difficulty, the reasons were ascertained. They consisted of reports by two government sources that John de Koven had not got the name quite right. He had first invented a new personality, "John de Koven." He had then inserted the name in the files of the C.I.O. and the non-existent citizen was "probably the brother or close relative" of another Mr. de Koven who had come to the attention of Henry A. Wallace's Progressive Party.

The second agent had at least got the name right. The application was refused, on security grounds. With great difficulty, the reasons were ascertained. They consisted of reports by two government sources that John de Koven had not got the name quite right. He had first invented a new personality, "John de Koven." He had then inserted the name in the files of the C.I.O. and the non-existent citizen was "probably the brother or close relative" of another Mr. de Koven who had come to the attention of Henry A. Wallace's Progressive Party.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

IN diplomacy little things sometimes mean more than big issues. Thus the visit of Premier Benja Mayer off to the east, or the slightly bad start when President Eisenhower sent young Dick Nixon down to the airport to meet the Premier.

The French were slightly miffed at this. Considering the fact that four top Cabinet officials of France, plus an important 32-man delegation were in Washington. The French felt that like himself might well have met the Premier. They had in mind, of course, the heart of the Premier, not the Chief Minister Churchill and the fact that Mayer's chief promise on assuming office was that he would come to Washington to confer personally with Eisenhower.

Reason the President did not go to the airport was a matter of strict protocol. Mayer is only a Prime Minister, not the head of a state, and, according to protocol, President Eisenhower should go to meet the head of a state. However, Harry Truman, who used to go down to the airport

Security System Needs Repair

By shameless influence, brother John was cleared. By the same method, one of these reporters narrowly escaped detention on the Gribsholm, when checked for security on his return from a Japanese prison camp. He was sternly accused of having joined the British Army. Sharp suspicions were aroused by his bewildered inactivity, that he had been a member of General C. I. Chennault's "Flying Tigers," which were markedly non-British. Actually, his brother and present partner had indeed joined a British infantry regiment, having been repeatedly rejected by all the American services on medical grounds, but this fact did not filter through to the Japanese prison camp.

By shameless influence, brother John was cleared. By the same method, one of these reporters narrowly escaped detention on the Gribsholm, when checked for security on his return from a Japanese prison camp. He was sternly accused of having joined the British Army. Sharp suspicions were aroused by his bewildered inactivity, that he had been a member of General C. I. Chennault's "Flying Tigers," which were markedly non-British. Actually, his brother and present partner had indeed joined a British infantry regiment, having been repeatedly rejected by all the American services on medical grounds, but this fact did not filter through to the Japanese prison camp.

A Friend Intervened

THE day was barely saved, and the suspected one permitted to set foot on his native shores, by the intervention of a highly-placed friend. Apparently a special government agent had found it impossible to distinguish between two citizens of the same surname, in the extremely small town of Avon, Conn.

Two such incidents in a single family at least suggest that the existing security system is not foolproof. The letter from the stenographer with the "sixth sense" further suggests that in some respects the system is plain foolish. The FBI cannot properly be blamed. It does not do the whole job. It had no part in brother John's case—and it is ridiculously overburdened as a result of security mania. Yet it is in order to consider some sensible reform of the security system. And it is certainly well to have our own security files checked by people like Senator McCarthy, or to anyone who will look to him either.

Congressional Quiz

Q—Is President Eisenhower in favor of a 25 per cent Constitutional limit on the income tax?

A—In a 1952 letter to a Louisiana newspaper, Mr. Eisenhower said such a tax ceiling could result in larger and larger deficits, and "the rigidity" of a Constitutional amendment would be "a source of danger in possible future national emergency."

Q—Could the President veto a Congressional joint resolution to submit the 25 per cent limit amendment to the states?

A—No. Although joint (Senate-House) resolutions under other circumstances usually need Presidential endorsement before taking effect, a joint resolution to amend the Constitution does not require Presidential approval. On passage by two-thirds of the membership of both houses a resolution to amend the Constitution goes to the states for ratification.

Q—What is the purpose of the Senate bill to prohibit interstate transportation of obscene material since existing law already bans such shipment?

A—In reporting the bill Feb. 4, the Senate Judiciary Committee said it will make the illegal to transport such material privately, such as by automobile or in person. The existing ban deals only with shipment by mail or common carrier. The Committee said it acted because "nothing good could come of the permitting of such trafficking in any possible way."

almost at the drop of a hat, has spoiled visiting dignitaries. Aside from this, the French talks were pretty well a success, except on one big issue—the Saar.

The United States was ready, even before Premier Benja Mayer arrived, to make a greater aid to Indo-China. The French proposed a plan for training 54 new Viet Nam battalions and are asking the United States to arm and equip them. This is going to handicap part of our own rearmament program, but Secretary Dulles believes Indo-China is more important than Korea.

The Necessity And Difficulty Of An East-West Compromise

By EDWARD R. MURROW From A CBS Broadcast

WASHINGTON Certainly not all, and probably not much of the penetrating comment about our relations with the rest of the world appearing in newspapers or on the radio. I should like to read you a few sentences from the transcript of what they were written by S. Grover Rich, an assistant professor of political science at the University of Utah. He is writing about the psychological problem that is involved in making a compromise.

He says we are being asked to do something few other people in history have been able to do—prepare for war and then stop for peace. A nation's capacity for compromise decreases as its rearmament increases. The climate of opinion will no longer support give-and-take negotiations. Mr. Rich contends it is better to build our tanks and ships if our people are not prepared to fight. Yet we are not thereby denying our ability to negotiate.

There is a decided difference between negotiation and dictation. Any attempt to dictate to the Russians could lead to only one conclusion—strengthening their military strength simply to out-thrust us to each other—they fight.

NEEDLESS WAR POSSIBLE Unless the necessity of compromise is made clear to our people we may needlessly cause a war we should avoid. There is a very grave danger that Russia will reach a point where she is unable to negotiate. She may well have reached it already. Russian leaders may be the cool and calculated schemers they are usually pictured to be. On the other hand, they may be merely a handful of desperate men with their backs to the wall, trying to take their country back, drastic, which might save them from destruction.

Unless the necessity of compromise is made clear to our people we may needlessly cause a war we should avoid. There is a very grave danger that Russia will reach a point where she is unable to negotiate. She may well have reached it already. Russian leaders may be the cool and calculated schemers they are usually pictured to be. On the other hand, they may be merely a handful of desperate men with their backs to the wall, trying to take their country back, drastic, which might save them from destruction.

There is a decided difference between negotiation and dictation. Any attempt to dictate to the Russians could lead to only one conclusion—strengthening their military strength simply to out-thrust us to each other—they fight.

NEEDLESS WAR POSSIBLE Unless the necessity of compromise is made clear to our people we may needlessly cause a war we should avoid. There is a very grave danger that Russia will reach a point where she is unable to negotiate. She may well have reached it already. Russian leaders may be the cool and calculated schemers they are usually pictured to be. On the other hand, they may be merely a handful of desperate men with their backs to the wall, trying to take their country back, drastic, which might save them from destruction.

There is a decided difference between negotiation and dictation. Any attempt to dictate to the Russians could lead to only one conclusion—strengthening their military strength simply to out-thrust us to each other—they fight.

NEEDLESS WAR POSSIBLE Unless the necessity of compromise is made clear to our people we may needlessly cause a war we should avoid. There is a very grave danger that Russia will reach a point where she is unable to negotiate. She may well have reached it already. Russian leaders may be the cool and calculated schemers they are usually pictured to be. On the other hand, they may be merely a handful of desperate men with their backs to the wall, trying to take their country back, drastic, which might save them from destruction.

There is a decided difference between negotiation and dictation. Any attempt to dictate to the Russians could lead to only one conclusion—strengthening their military strength simply to out-thrust us to each other—they fight.

NEEDLESS WAR POSSIBLE Unless the necessity of compromise is made clear to our people we may needlessly cause a war we should avoid. There is a very grave danger that Russia will reach a point where she is unable to negotiate. She may well have reached it already. Russian leaders may be the cool and calculated schemers they are usually pictured to be. On the other hand, they may be merely a handful of desperate men with their backs to the wall, trying to take their country back, drastic, which might save them from destruction.

There is a decided difference between negotiation and dictation. Any attempt to dictate to the Russians could lead to only one conclusion—strengthening their military strength simply to out-thrust us to each other—they fight.

NEEDLESS WAR POSSIBLE Unless the necessity of compromise is made clear to our people we may needlessly cause a war we should avoid. There is a very grave danger that Russia will reach a point where she is unable to negotiate. She may well have reached it already. Russian leaders may be the cool and calculated schemers they are usually pictured to be. On the other hand, they may be merely a handful of desperate men with their backs to the wall, trying to take their country back, drastic, which might save them from destruction.

There is a decided difference between negotiation and dictation. Any attempt to dictate to the Russians could lead to only one conclusion—strengthening their military strength simply to out-thrust us to each other—they fight.

NEEDLESS WAR POSSIBLE Unless the necessity of compromise is made clear to our people we may needlessly cause a war we should avoid. There is a very grave danger that Russia will reach a point where she is unable to negotiate. She may well have reached it already. Russian leaders may be the cool and calculated schemers they are usually pictured to be. On the other hand, they may be merely a handful of desperate men with their backs to the wall, trying to take their country back, drastic, which might save them from destruction.

There is a decided difference between negotiation and dictation. Any attempt to dictate to the Russians could lead to only one conclusion—strengthening their military strength simply to out-thrust us to each other—they fight.

NEEDLESS WAR POSSIBLE Unless the necessity of compromise is made clear to our people we may needlessly cause a war we should avoid. There is a very grave danger that Russia will reach a point where she is unable to negotiate. She may well have reached it already. Russian leaders may be the cool and calculated schemers they are usually pictured to be. On the other hand, they may be merely a handful of desperate men with their backs to the wall, trying to take their country back, drastic, which might save them from destruction.

While there is conflict, neither party can back down without a severe loss of prestige, military and territorial advantage, or both. Assuming the improbable, if Russia should announce tomorrow that it would be willing to negotiate a world-wide settlement of our differences, what could we say? We are in a position to give up. And if we confess the inability of our own statements to compromise on these vital issues, we must also recognize the difficulties facing the Kremlin. Professor Rich contends that big wars are often started by small countries. And he says that goded on by Russia or the United States a belatedly, the British, the French, or Hungarian Army officer, could easily, by some irresponsible act, begin a chain of events which would engulf all into the morass of World War III, (if the attack on South Korea has not already begun).

DANGEROUS POLICY

In the matter of armament races, alliance systems and balance of power, history is on the side of the sceptic. Professor Rich if not a sceptic, is certainly no believer in the "cold war." Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.

He believes that as a nation we are entering a sort of psychological no-man's-land, quite unlike anything that has ever known. Our policy is not wrong but only dangerous, far more dangerous than the policy of just retreating.