THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

1888—Sixty-Fifth Anniversary Year—1953

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

FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 1953

THE PRESIDENT'S PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM

WE THOUGHT the President did a superb job yesterday, in his Washington talk to the newspaper editors, of setting forth the objectives of the free world and the terms upon which these goals may be predicated. It was the kind of speech that at once voiced long-sought aspirations and practical means of achieving them. Though the onus for delaying the peace was placed squarely upon the Soviet Union, there was no rancor in his words. It was, in sum, the kind of policy statement from which orderly negotiation of East-West differences may be initiated, if the Soviets so choose.

The simple yet moving words of the President will translate well into the languages of peoples who have been questioning the objectives of the new administration, and it is this audience to which he directed many of his remarks. If peace can be negotiated, he said, then a substantial portion of the present armament expenditures can be used to help underdeveloped countries. The questionable doctrine of "liberation" of satellites, associated with the Republican Party during the campaign, was not mentioned. But he pointed up the benefits that will result from bridging the unnatural division of Europe.

The President stated well the eternal desire to do away with this damnable business of stupendously-priced armaments in a world that needs more homes and schools and foods, but properly emphasized the necessity of military strength until such time as progress is made on the several major issues that now divide the world.

Of the five major issues he listed, only one, the completion of an Austrian peace treaty, may likely be settled in the near future. Satisfaction of the others, an "honorable armistice and "free elections in a united Korea", an end to Red aggression in Indo-China and Malaya, the unification of Germany and creation of a European community with "full independence of the East European nations", would involve major deviations from the Reds' world plans. Despite all their sweet talk of late there is no reason to believe these plans have changed under their new regime.

Steps toward disarmament need not await the solution of these problems. As the President said, just "progress" with them would cause the U. S. to welcome agreement on armament reduction. We can always hope for, but do not expect, sufficient progress in negotiation. If that progress is not forthcoming, them the President, having made his fair and frank proposition to the Reds, must lead the free world once again toward the goal of strengthening and uniting itself until such time as the Reds may become convinced of their error. Meanwhile, in his fine statement of principle and program, the President took an initiative in the cold war that demands the respect of friend and foe alike.

IT'S UP TO THE PEOPLE NOW

IN THE November, 1954, general election, the people of North Carolina will be asked to approve an amendment to the state constitution limiting each county to one Senator. The amendment was introduced by Rep. Clifton Blue of Moore County, and it has passed both houses.

The amendment is deceptive. To those who do not understand the bicameral system, it may seem fair to keep any county from having more than one Senator. Actually it is highly unfair, and undemocratic, for it would deny proportional representation to the more populous areas of the state.

In the North Carolina General Assembly, the House of Representatives is set up on a geographical unit basis. Every county, no matter how small, is entitled to one Representative, leaving 20 more to be scattered around on a population basis.

The 50 seats in the State Senate, on the other hand, are apportioned by population. The Constitution is quite clear on the subject, and quite emphatic in saying that the 'Senate Districts *shall* be so altered by the General Assembly . . . that each Senate District shall contain as near as may be, an equal number of inhabitants . . ."

The 1951 General Assembly refused to carry out its constitutional duty.

The 1953 General Assembly also refused to obey the Constitution. Instead, it is now asking the people to amend the Constitution so that no county could have more than one Senator in any future redistricting. (Mecklenburg, Forsyth and Guilford are now entitled to two each.)

Hence the appeal for fairness and for democracy must now be taken to the people.

Will they underwrite the General Assembly's callous indifference to its constitutional duty?

Will they approve an undemocratic system that will forever deny popular representation?

Will they draw a line between the small counties and the larger counties that will inevitably become a battle line, creating strife and bitterness and turmoil?

We have enough confidence in the basic spirit of fair play among North Carolinians to believe that the people, given all the information, will reject the amendment and thus tell the General Assembly that they place a high value on their constitution, and expect the Legislature to obey its mandates.

TWO BAD BILLS

THE TWO BILLS introduced in the N. C. House of Representatives to authorize ABC elections in Valdese and Lake Lure ought to get the same unfavorable report as that given to the state referendum measure.

The county unit is the only logical instrument for local option on liquor, and we believe it to be, then it should be preserved. If towns and cities within counties begin to hold separate elections, the county option principle will be subverted.

It is true that the precedent of city ABC elections has already been established in North Carolina. That does not make them right. The News has consistently opposed violating the county geographical unit on this question, and our convictions remain unchanged.

REWARDING THE TRAINED YOUNG DRIVER

YEAR BY YEAR, the evidence grows that safe driving habits and a respectful attitude toward the killing power of an automobile can be instilled in young people by driver education courses. On the average, the accident and violation rate among trained young drivers is about half that among untrained young people.

A three-year survey in Vermont showed that trained young drivers had one-fourth as many accidents and one-fifth as many violations as an equal number of untrained drivers. In Racine, Wisconsin, untrained boys had four times as many accidents and over twice as many arrests as a trained group.

Taking note of these and other findings, one automobile insurance company (Allstate) has just announced that it will grant discounts on car insurance rates for high school trained young drivers. Bodily injury and property damage liability premiums on private passenger automobiles will be cut 5 to 15 per cent when all under-25 drivers of the insured automobile who live in the owner's household have completed driver education courses. The exact percentage of the reduction is governed by the amount of instruction and practice driving shown on the certificate. The company's proposal has been approved by N. C. Commissioner of Insurance Waldo Cheek.

We hope that other companies follow the lead, and that further reductions in premiums are made until rates finally conform to the statistical evidence compiled in the continuing surveys across the nation. Such a trend would encourage the establishment of more driver training courses with higher standards, because the discounts offer a financial incentive for students and parents to take advantage of driver education.

Governor Umstead has recommended establishment of the courses in every high school in North Carolina. When that goal is attained, we should see a gradual tapering off of the tragic highway death and accident toll.

By Sam Ragan In The Raleigh News And Observer

THE SOUTH HAS CHANGED SINCE GRADY'S DAY

THINGS have come a long way in the South since Henry Grady made his famous speech before a Boston audience in 1889 on the funeral of a one-gallus farmer from Pickens County, Georgia. In his speech, Grady said:

"They cut through solid marble to make his grave, and yet a little tombstone they brought to him was from Vermont. They buried him in the heart of a pine forest, yet the pine coffin was imported from Cincinnati. They buried him within touch of an iron mine, and yet the nails in his coffin and iron in the shovel that dug his grave were imported from Pittsburgh. They buried him by the side of the best sheep-grazing country on the earth and yet the wool in the coffin bands and the coffin bands themselves were brought from the North. They buried him in a New York coat and a Boston pair of shoes and a pair of breeches from Chicago and a shirt from Cincinnati. The very flax in the linen in which he was clothed for that funeral but the corpse and the hole in the ground."

But things have changed and the southern Association of Science & Industry in its 1953 Southern Industrial Directory points out that now they could:

Select a polished marble monument from 13 big manufacturers in seven Southern states; buy a fancy casket with nylon lining made in the Carolinas, from 21 different Southern manufacturers; get nails, shovels, and other hardware from 149 Southern steel fabricators, or from 101 big foundries, using metal from 19 rolling mills; find material for the coffin bands in more than 1,000 Southern textile mills; dress him from the skin out in fashionable clothes made in 622 different apparel plants; fit him with shoes made in 72 plants and shined with polish from Tennessee or Oklahoma; carry him in a hearse made in Alabama, burning gasoline from Texas and rolling on tires from Louisiana or Mississippi.

A Pennsylvania girl of seven already has had eight operations. That's a lifetime of conversation.—*Portsmouth (Va.) Star.*

There's No Peace In Sight For Secretary Benson

First Amendment Reaffirmed

A Notable Court Decision

An Editorial In The Camden (S. C.) Chronicle

"CONGRESS shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

So states the first amendment to the Constitution. This is the guarantee that we may say and print what we believe to be true, and that in addition we have the right to attempt to convert other people to our ideas—in other words, to influence public opinion.

Even so, a general statement of principle no matter how unequivocal is subject to interpretation when a specific instance is evolved. A case which has just recently been decided by the United States Supreme Court—and which may have historic significance—is in point here.

In 1950, a House of Representatives committee conducted an investigation of lobbying. This was during the Fair Deal days when instead of harassing Communists, the Administration was harassing those who are harassing Communists.

Rumely's Contempt Citation

AMONG the witnesses summoned was Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of an organization known as the Committee for Constitutional Government. This organization had published and sold books which were extremely critical of New Deal philosophies, policies and acts. Dr. Rumely was ordered to disclose the names of people who had bought books to the value of $500 or more. He refused. The House, by a narrow vote which generally followed partisan lines, cited him for contempt of Congress. He was found guilty in a Federal District court and sentenced to a $1,000 fine and a six-months prison sentence, the latter being suspended.

Dr. Rumely appealed and the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals reversed his conviction, citing the First Amendment. The Government then took the case to the Supreme Court.

Now the Supreme Court by a 7 to 0 vote with two Justices not participating, has held that Dr. Rumely was not guilty on the grounds that the resolution under which the lobbying committee acted did not empower an investigation into publishing activities.

Justice Douglas, with Justice Black concurring, went much further in a separate opinion. Justice Douglas dealt with the Constitutional issue involved. Here, in part, is what he said:

"If the present inquiry were sanctioned the press would be subjected to harassment that in practical effect might be as serious as censorship . . . A requirement that a publisher disclose the identity of those who buy his books, pamphlets, or papers, is indeed the beginning of a surveillance of the press.

"The finger of the government leveled against the press is ominous. Once the government can demand of a publisher the names of the purchasers of his publications, the free press as we know it disappears.

"Then the specter of a government agent will look over the shoulder of every one who reads. The purchase of a book or pamphlet today may result in a subpoena tomorrow . . . The books and pamphlets that are critical of the Administration, that preach an unpopular policy in domestic or foreign affairs, that are in disrepute in the orthodox school of thought will be suspect and subject to investigation . . .

Fear Instead Of Freedom

"IF the lady from Toledo can be required to disclose what she read yesterday and what she will read tomorrow, fear will take the place of freedom in the libraries, bookstores and homes of the land. Through the harassment of hearings, investigations, reports and subpoenas government will hold a club over speech and over the press."

This decision of the Supreme Court is a historic one. It comes just after a period in which one national government had sought to harass the newspapers of this country because the newspapers were brave enough to point out the tragic results that would ensue if its policies were followed.

Politicians who have axes to grind always hate the newspapers; those who are really trying to serve the public do not.

People's Platform

Baruch Liked Editorial

NEW YORK

Editors, THE NEWS:

THANK you so much for your understanding and courageous editorial of March 27th, headed "Always the Special Interest."

—BERNARD M. BARUCH.

The Guard Is Ever Ready

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I WOULD like to take this opportunity to express the sincere appreciation of the 449th Field Artillery Observation Battalion (NGUS), Charlotte and Mecklenburg County's own National Guard Unit, for the splendid co-operation and cheerful assistance which your newspaper and the local radio stations have given us in the formation of our new unit.

Only through the newspapers, radio stations and by word of mouth can the people of our community be informed of the functions and duties of their National Guard. Many do not realize that although we drill only once a week, we are ever ready for the Governor's call in any emergency that is local, or for call to the colors in case a national emergency arises.

The National Guard, being a local unit, is now and has been in the past, happy to contribute to the local Red Cross Blood Bank. Through the good fortune of our wonderful geographical location, we have not been called to fight forest fires, dike flooded rivers or quell prison outbreaks, but we are ready to serve if the occasion ever arises.

We are constantly training a defense force for the protection of your homes and properties at a cost to the taxpayers of approximately 85 per cent less than a unit in active Federal Service.

Charlotte should be proud that it has furnished two units in the present conflict and has others that are ready if needed.

The National Guard is over 300 years old. It is of the people and for the people—let's keep it that way. Our units have an interest in the people and we hope they have an interest in us, such as you and your paper have shown so well. Again we say many sincere thanks.

WILLIAM M. ST. GEORGE
Major, Artillery, Commanding

'Disengagement' Or Expansion Of War The Choices In Korea

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

THE NEW Administration has come up with two different plans for resolving the most painful problem before the country. That problem is, of course, to bring an end to the fighting in Korea. Or if it is not possible to stop the shooting, then at the very least to get most American troops out of the Korean peninsula.

Shortly after he took office, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles talked about the importance of "disengaging" Americans in Korea and the French in Indo-China. As Western troops were disengaged in Asia, the conflict would become unprofitable to the Communists and presumably the two wars would sooner or later come to an end.

GRADUAL WITHDRAWAL

The "disengagement" would occur as increasing numbers of South Korean forces in Korea and loyal dietnamese in Indo-China were trained and supplied with American arms. This would be a slow process. American air and naval units would have to stay on even after American ground forces were "disengaged."

That was before the Russian peace overtures and the development of negotiations in Korea for exchanging prisoners. The second plan came as the agreement on the sick and wounded was being worked out.

No matter what denials are made, it seems to this reporter justifiable to call it a "plan." By one with authority subordinate only to the President, it was said that a peace settlement in Korea would be acceptable on the basis of a division of that country between North and South with the dividing line roughly 80 miles North of the present battle line.

This was told to a group of Washington correspondents in the same manner that similar information is repeatedly put out. That is, it could be reported although the source of the report could not be disclosed. This reporter obtained it on that basis.

Washington correspondents of long experience were surprised that information of such gravity should be made known when the negotiations were in a delicate stage. Advance warning to the Communist that they would be expected to give up 80 miles of hard-won territory could shatter the peace efforts at the outset.

Some may argue that the reporters should have used self-restraint and have refrained from printing any stories about a Korean peace settlement even though the rule of "use but no attribution to a source "was spelled out. But that kind of censorship never works short of all out war and one may seriously doubt whether it should work.

The damage done can be appraised only with the development of the situation in Korea. One positive result was achieved and that was to reveal once again the difficulty—one may almost say the impossibility—of Secretary Dulles' situation. When the story of the proposed dividing line in Korea was printed on the front page of the New York Times, the storm broke.

Republicans who have long been advocates of General MacArthur and total victory in Korea immediately denounced the concept Their denunciations brought a series of denials. This was after the "conclusion" of the "Eisenhower Administration," the White House declared.

SENATORS OPPOSE DIVISION

A day or two later, Sen. Robert A. Taft, the majority leader of the Senate, said that any settlement leaving Korea divided would be unsatisfactory. A day or two after that Sen. Karl Mundt (R-S. Dak), announced in an interview that there would have to be a housecleaning in the State Department since the top jobs were still held by those favoring a Truman-Acheson policy. The implication was plain that if they were not removed, the department's budget would be cut.

So the Administration seems to be faced with two choices—either expanding the war to try to bring the victory these Republican Senators demand or permitting it to continue as a stalemated war with "disengagement" as a official way out. In the light of campaign oratory of last Fall when Taft denounced "Truman's War" in Korea and candidate after candidate promised peace, these choices will be deeply disappointing.

Secretary Dulles has shown in the past that he understands the realities of Korea and America's position in Asia. He has said that the Soviets, because of the proximity of strategic centers in Siberia, could never accept a Korea wholly held by a hostile power. Nor could the United States agree to a Korea held by the Communists because of the American stake in neighboring Japan. Those are still the harsh Korean realities.

'Who Said That' Can Make The Smarties Look Silly

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

THIS IS a pure plug for a commodity that I have no commercial interest in, and have only been associated with as a matter of love. It is a television program, called "Who Said That," which has been kicking around a long time without proper appreciation, and the time has come to demand that it be appreciated properly.

I was in on the dry-run birth of "Who Said That" about seven years ago, together with such an evilly assorted group as Mary Margaret McBride, Hans Kaltenborn, Bob Trout, and similar villains. At the time I thought it was a tremendously funny show. It now appears that this is going to be recognized.

PLAYS IN HINTERLAND

With the peculiar idiocy that afflicts television, "Who Said That" has been farmed out to the sticks on a sharecropper basis, and has not run locally in my home town of New York. I saw the show for the first time as a spectator last night, and will go on record that there is no more adult, and funny, piece of entertainment going.

This character Kiernan, who evidently is engaged to the most able horse that ever acted for the peering public, will collect a kudo for being the most funny man around, in a quietly adult manner. The horse which was leaning over his shoulder was good, but he is strictly a pantomime kid, like Charlie Chaplin. Kiernan can talk. The horse just happened to be there — a gift horse, I believe, looking into Walter's mouth.

Due to the ambling pace of this prose, you are probably wondering what "Who Said That" is, unless you've seen it. It is simply a program where brother Kiernan asks a lot of sarcastic questions at fairly famous people about what they should be read, if they can read at all, during the past week in the public prints. Some of the reactions are fairly fabulous.

In the one last night, Nancy Chaffee, the tennis gal who's married to Ralph Kiner, who hits for a living, milked our own Fred Sparks that Kiernan tossed at her, and was generally undistinguished by her other answers. Chaffee's a smart girl, too, but she was having an off-night.

I did a swan song on it the other week and answered everything. The time before that I was such an utter bum that Joan Blondell looked smart by comparison, and she had the worst evening anybody had ever had at an inquisition. My old friend Mary Margaret McBride is a pretty glib gal at her own trade, and I have seen her rendered speechless by sheer fear.

I claim the fame of having given the luckiest dumb answer that ever registered on "Who." One time Trout or Kiernan, I forget which pulled a loaded gimmick with a question concerning who was responsible for the longest home run ever hit in Yankee Stadium. Good Gomez, the old Yank lefthander, was on the show, and for a deperation gag I said Gomez. Gomez is only the worst hitter who ever lived.

It turned out I was right because Gomez did throw a ball that somebody, possibly Rudy York or Jimmy Foxx, clouted for the record, and I was suddenly an unconscious hero for saying that Gomez was responsible.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Famous Godfathers Meet Their Namesakes

WASHINGTON

PRESIDENT Eisenhower has attended only two private parties since he took office; one the much-publicized reception at the home of Senator Taft, the other an unpublicized party at the Fort Myer home of Gen. Omar Bradley where he met five famous godchildren. They were: Dwight Eisenhower Marx, Omar Bradley Marx, George Marshall Marx, Bedell Smith Marx, and Rosey O'Donnell Marx . . . All are children of toy manufacturer Louis Marx, who named them after five famous generals of the Army. The godfathers were present at the Bradley home to greet their godchildren . . . Contrary to some reports, Ike is not a stockholder in the Marx Toy Co., though he did invest in the Charm-Ali Lipstick Co., organized by Marx after the war. The investment did not prove a bonanza.

Scared Pat McCarran—Russell Forbes, acting General Services Administrator, who so badly wants the job of permanent administrator, is a lifelong Democrat from Tampa who's been trying to make the Ikeites think he's an adopted Republican. One of his first acts was to fire Mrs. A. Mitchell Palmer, one of two surviving widows of the Woodrow Wilson Cabinet . . . Ex-Sen. Harry Cain of Washington got to be such a nuisance calling at the White House that Ike finally appointed him to a short term on the Subversives Board . . . Estimates of married midshipmen at Annapolis range from 50 to 200. Midshipmen are honor bound not to get married. If caught, they're fired . . . Sen. Pat McCarran is so scared that young Tom Mechling, who almost defeated Senator Malone, will run against him, that McCarran's political cohorts have passed a special bill aimed at barring Mechling from holding office in Nevada. It prohibits anyone from holding Nevada office without five years domicile in the state. Mechling married a Nevada girl, has lived there a couple of years . . . (if McCarran's new law applied to divorces Reno would starve.)

Planted press stories—It's been 26 years since a background State Department press conference backfired as badly as that of John Foster Dulles in which he recently indicated the United States would abandon Chiang Kai-shek and draw the Korean peace line at the narrow waist of the peninsula . . . A similar ruckus occurred in 1927 when Robert E. Olds, Undersecretary of State for Frank B. Kellogg in the Coolidge Administration, called in Kirke Simpson of the A.P., Ludwell Denny of the UP, and Mauritz Hallgren of the INS, planted a story that Russia threatened Nicaragua and the Panama Canal, hence the landing of U. S. Marines in Nicaragua . . . Kellogg and Coolidge were looking for an out on their unpopular move of sending the Marines into Nicaragua . . . The UP and INS refused to carry the story without hanging it on a State Department spokesman, but the AP obliged . . . Dulles' recent background talk was organized by Time Magazine's Jack Beal at the Carlton Hotel. One or two newsmen bowed out, including the Washington Post's Ferdinand Kuhn on the ground they didn't want to be served up confidential information they might learn elsewhere . . . Dulles talked freely—for background, not for attribution or quotation. Published in that form, it brought China-lobby Senators swarming around his head.

Atomic artillery hassle—When Miss Helen Farr, librarian of the Madison (Wis.) "Free" library, banned the book "McCarthy, The Man, the Senator, The Ism," local book stores got so many orders they couldn't fill them . . . One of the Greek shipowners whose activities were pointed up by this column (and still are uninvestigated by McCarthy) made so much money he purchased the famed French gambling Casino, Monte Carlo . . . Army has been hassling with the Atomic Energy Commission regarding publicity for the new atomic cannon, to be fired at Frenchman's Flat . . . Army wanted to carry the atomic shell across the continent by easy stages — by boat, plane, train, truck —so as to get maximum publicity. But the Atomic Energy Commission said "no." Then the Army wanted to carry a dummy shell across the continent for publicity purposes . . . So far no decision . . . Michael McDermott, for 30 years State Department press relations officer and the trusted confidante of Presidents, will wind up his diplomatic career in a new job—as ambassador to El Salvador. But despite his long and trusted background, he has to be subjected to the usual all-out FBI test before he can be appointed even to tiny Salvador.