

**The Administration--A Year Later**

WHEN THE NEWS, after casting admiring glances at Gov. Adlai Stevenson, gave its endorsement to Gen. Dwight Eisenhower before the '52 election, it stated three fundamental issues in the campaign.

- All-important, we said, were:
1. The unity of the free world and success in the struggle against communism;
  2. The unity, and faith in their leaders, of the American people; and
  3. A change in stewardship which would provide a "sobering steamboat of authority" for the then minority party, and the "catharsis of occasional defeat" for the then majority party.

Today, one year after President Eisenhower took office, is a proper occasion to judge the accomplishments of his administration as regards these key issues.

IT IS too soon to judge the impact of the Eisenhower administration on free world unity and Communist aggression. This is because the administration has redirected foreign policy, under hard-working Secretary of State Dulles, and the effect of these policies is still undetermined. He has used the "shock treatment" on Europe, threatening withdrawal of U. S. support if EDC is not approved speedily. He has pronounced the "retaliation" policy under which, if Russia or a satellite communist aggression, the U. S. may retaliate promptly against the homeland of the enemy. The conclusion of the Korean armistice, the Eisenhower foreign policy and "atoms for peace" pronouncements, the expressed willingness to negotiate, certainly may be put down on the credit side of the ledger. On the other hand, official disinterest in the vital NATO organization, the failure of the administration to back to the hilt its Foreign Service in the face of unwarranted attacks by congressmen, raise some doubts about foreign policy as conducted by this administration. Only in retrospect, after several years have elapsed, may that policy be accurately judged.

Certainly the administration has evinced a maturity that merits the confidence of the American people and augurs well for the growth of responsibility in the GOP. The Republican Party, which so recently flitted as "creeping socialism" or "sell-out" almost any action of the incumbent Democrats, has unhesitatingly endorsed some of the preceding

administrations' actions, and thus given them a degree of respectability and permanence which another Democratic administration could not have done.

But we recognize," said Secretary Dulles last week in a foreign policy address, "that many of the preceding foreign policies were good." The previous administration's social security system, said the President in his message to Congress, "is basically sound—it should remain, as it has been, the cornerstone of the government's programs to promote the economic security of the individual." By accepting, and offering improvements to, Democratic programs for social insurance, health, housing, public works, etc., the administration has given little comfort to those members of its party who would like to turn back the clock of history.

BUT perhaps the best thing that can be said of this administration is that it has not hesitated to make politically unpopular decisions. The farm issue affords the best example. It took a great deal of courage to stake out a position for farm price supports in the face of strong opposition by millions of farm voters and scores of farm congressmen. The easy and more expedient thing would have been to continue the old farm program—at least through this year's election. Likewise, it would have been expedient for the administration to continue the previous administration's casual attitude toward enforcement of non-segregation in areas under federal jurisdiction. But instead, the administration chose to carry out vigorously its non-segregation views. The weak spot of this administration has been in the field of civil liberties. After several halts and sidesteps, the President at last gives lip service to firm espousal of individual rights. But meanwhile his administration is proposing further use of writtap evidence, the de-factualization (perhaps this is unconstitutional) of the courts, and other measures which the proposal to have management as well as labor leaders take loyalty oaths.

On the whole, however, the Eisenhower administration, after a year in office, beginning to measure up to the high standards he had set for himself. The President now acting like a President, there is reason to expect great accomplishment in the second year of his administration.

**County Schools Need More Funds**

THE circulation of petitions among county residents asking that the County Commissioners levy the full 20-cent special school supplement is long overdue.

The voters inside the city authorized the Council to levy a maximum special tax of 50 cents on the \$100 valuation. This year, the Council levied 41 cents, and Charlotte schools will have an extra \$1,393,905.50 to boost teacher salaries, employ additional teachers, and provide other "extras" beyond the basic state program.

But beyond the city limits, rural residents are paying this year only 15 cents

in special school tax, although the Commissioners have been authorized to levy up to 20 cents. The 15-cent levy will produce this year only \$150,150,—slightly more than 10 per cent of the extra money available to the city system.

Since the difference in the special supplement is the main reason why the City schools are considered superior to those in the county, residents of the latter area should insist that the Commissioners levy the full amount authorized.

And if they want to improve the county schools further, they should call for a new election at which they could authorize a still larger supplement.

**A Good Line, But Not Jefferson's**

LAST week, we did a little piece about the famous quote—"that government is best which governs least." We had used it in a previous editorial, attributing it to Thomas Jefferson, but subsequent checking with the Charlotte Public Library produced no evidence that Jefferson ever said any such thing.

So we asked Jeffersonian experts in our audience to step forward with the source of the quote. They kept quiet.

So we bundled up the whole problem, which was beginning to frustrate us, and shipped it off to Rep. Charles Roper Jones, suggesting that someone in the Library of Congress might be able to track the quote down. That was a mean trick to play on Mr. Jones, who has more important things to worry about at the beginning of a new session, but he sent the problem along to the Librarian of Congress. This week came a reply from Mr. Jones:

"I have inquired of the Library of Congress concerning the Jefferson quote and they had the same impression that you and I had, that is, that Jefferson had said, 'That government is best which governs least.' However, in checking, they

found that he had written all around this thought but that the closest quotation in his own words is, 'I am for government rigorously frugal and simple.' This is from a letter to Elbridge Gerry and can be found in the Ford edition of collected writings, Volume VIII, Page 327.

"The origins of the quotation in question, according to the Librarian, is from a book of Albert Hubbard's. In this book, he tells of a visit to Monticello and attributes the words of the quotation to Jefferson, but there is no record of Jefferson having said or written them as Hubbard put them down."

Mr. Jones even sent along the copy of Hubbard's *Norfolk Book*. On Page 31, he wrote: "At Monticello we tread softly over the green turf once pressed by the feet of Thomas Jefferson, who said, 'That country is governed best that is governed least.'"

Well, we're happy to clear up the point. And the next time you hear a political orator use the quote as Jeffersonian doctrine, you can stand up, interrupt him, and say:

"That's a good line, bub, but it's not Jefferson's."

**From The Northern Goo!**

**FRONT PORCH EXPERIMENT**

SBROWN, the laziest man in the county, was conducting an experiment. Lolling in his favorite rocker on the front porch of his little cabin, he would turn his face to the west and rock a little while, then turn toward the south and rock some more. Changing back, the experiment would go on.

"What's the trouble, Si?" his wife called out, finally attracted by his peculiar conduct. "What are ye movin' about so much fur?"

"I jest trying to find out which is the easiest—rockin' east and west with the wind, or north and south with the grain in the floor," was Si's reply.



HERBERT  
 © THE WASHINGTON POST CO.

**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 editors. The News reserves the right to condense.

**Littlejohn Case Poorly Prepared**

Great Falls, S. C.  
 Editors, The News:  
 I would not be so hasty as I Stanley Kramer was in his Saturday's letter in the Peoples Platform, suggesting punishment for the witness who appeared against the chief of police, because if punishment could have been imposed upon witnesses for perjury, it should have been on both sides.

In his address to the court, Judge Rudolph did not vindicate the chief, because of positive proof of his innocence, but because of insufficient evidence against the chief's guilt, in spite of the grand jury's findings.

Personally I believe the whole case was poorly prepared.

—HENRY KAYE

**Modern School Emphasis Wrong**

CHARLOTTE  
 Editors, The News:  
 I HAS recently come to my attention that the sum of approximately \$10,000 has been spent for a most important educational instrument.

It is something new, and an expensive item at that, costing on the average of some \$18 per unit, plus an additional \$65 for installation. As I understand it, there are some 40 of these units in the schools, and through a logic that I cannot quite follow, it is expected that these items will make better students of my children, and their classmates. I am referring to kilns—ovens in which crockery is baked.

If you are wondering where and how such an item of equipment fits into the curricula of the schools, when the same amount of money could hire a highly certified teacher for several years, or be applied to the building of a new school, or establishing educational clinics, installing new labs, etc., then it is time that you became aware of the modern educationalists, and the effects they are having on the public school systems of the nation, but at the county at large.

Today we need minds trained to

the use and evaluation of facts. With military training interrupting the cycle of education, basic educational training must be effected in the public and high schools of the nation, grants, modeling pottery, jewelry making, field trips, and sport programs may all have a place in our schools, but anything however, these should be extra curricular.

To me it is positively amazing how the founding fathers managed the establishment of this country at a time when there was no other government to study and model, without the benefit of modern education. All they had to go on was their seemingly antiquated liberal educations, and minds disciplined by mere scholarship.

Z. HURWITZ

**League Appreciates Help On Program**

Charlotte  
 Editors, The News:  
 ON BEHALF of the Junior League of Charlotte I want to thank you for your cooperation and assistance in the television series "What Matters Most" sponsored by you and WPTV. Your assistance was of great value to us.

—MRS. GORDON KENNA JR.

**18-Year-Olds Merit The Vote**

CHARLOTTE  
 Editors, The News:  
 I simply cannot for the life of me understand how some of our governors in the 48 states stand up and yell at the top of their voice that the 18-year-olds are grown men and women, and old and strong enough to fight for our great country, yet they are "mere kids" when it comes to voting for public officials.

If any 18-year-old is declared by the law of these United States to be of enough age for his or her country, old enough to be called a dead or living hero at 18, then that person is old enough to be able to cast a sensible ballot.

—J. R. DEAN

**Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round**

WASHINGTON  
 It is now exactly one year since Dwight Eisenhower entered the White House, a year that has seen the most dramatic changes here in a thousand stretches of like it of today.

He and Business—A year ago Eisenhower's economic theories sounded like a National Association of Manufacturers pamphlet. Now he has swung back halfway to the ideas expressed at the P Street Club right after the war which so shocked the Republican backers. "If men's lives were conscripted in wartime," he said at the P Street Club dinner, "why shouldn't profits be conscripted too?"

He is more conservative than in those immediate postwar years, but less so than a year ago. Today he doesn't believe in a complete hands-off policy toward business. Nor does he believe that the doctrine of states' rights, so loudly proclaimed a year ago, constitutes a cure-all for every ills.

He and Economy—No longer does the President believe he can balance the budget. Nor does he view government spending as anathema, as he did a year ago. He is willing to put his foot in government spending

water as an offset to recession worries. But he is a long way from taking the men's spending plunge. . . . And some of the economists around him recall that it was a lot of spending to halt a business slide once it starts. . . . Ike has changed his mind about creeping socialism and the Tennessee Valley Authority already set aside \$105,000,000 to start another "creeping socialism" project on the St. Lawrence, once the seaway project passes Congress. . . . The economy bloc in the Eisenhower administration, notably Secretary George Humphrey and Budget Director Joe Dodge, still remain Ike's close friends, but he does not follow their advice as much as formerly. . . . Sometimes the Chief Executive is unhappy torn between the two wings of his official family.

Men Around Ike—A man who had little experience in civilian government is almost completely dependent on the men around him. That's why it's significant that a new flock of advisers has moved in around the President.

He and Foreign Policy—Secretary Harry Hopkins, but they are far more progressive than the big-business, golfing partners who used to move over from Sea Island to Augusta when Ike went to the "Georgia White House." . . . Some wisecracks call them "hucksters" rather than lobbyists. It's true that the new flank is passionately concerned with upping Ike's Gallup Poll.

Kevin McCann, president of the Defense Council, Charles Moore, president of the American Public Relations Association, former public relations adviser to Ford Motors; Dr. Arthur Burns, liberal head of the Council of Economic Advisors; C. D. Jackson, former publisher of Fortune Magazine and the man who pushed Ike into the anti-Communist speech; and Robert C. Cutler, Boston banker who got into the White House through Justice Felix Frankfurter. . . . This group unanimously and vigorously and unanimously opposed to the right-wing GOP. They are pulling Ike to get back to the middle-of-the-road course where he once had the support of many Democrats.

Ike and Congress—Congressional relations is a field that greatly worries the President. At one time he figured that the "good" members of Congress, the White House luncheon, personal visits, and friendly talks with Congressmen in line. . . . Now he is a wiser man. Nothing but a strong and successful policy, he figures, can really win the support of Congress with him. . . . And he still hasn't learned this completely. . . .

**Old-Line Republicans Fret Over Program & Patronage**

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

BENEATH the polite platitudes about party harmony, a rumble of Republican discontent can be heard without benefit of any hearing device. Old-line Republicans simply do not like the Eisenhower program.

But there is another source of unhappiness. That is patronage. Republican national committee men out in the country want to know why more jobs have not been available to hand out to the faithful who have waited so long for the dawning of a new Republican day.

Their discontent is reflected in the rampant behavior of members of Congress and party leaders in Washington who must deal with this discontent in an election year. Most department heads are under continuing pressure to "turn the rascals out"—or more of the rascals at all costs—to make way for good Republicans.

ANGRY AT DULLES  
 The pressure has been particularly severe on the Department of State. Old Guard Senators growl that Secretary Dulles has not gone nearly far enough in reversing the foreign policy of past years. And why hasn't he? They want to know. They're ready with an answer—because all these New Dealers, or worse, are still down there making policy. An interview with one of these pillars of the old order goes approximately as follows:

Question: You are really convinced, Senator, that these people down below the assistant secretaries are making policy? Or at any rate, fixing it so that new policies cannot be implemented?

Answer: Why, I certainly am! Do you know how many people in policy-making jobs have been removed in the State Department? Twenty-seven! Just 27 out of 5,000.

Question: Aren't most of these people in the career service specialists in their jobs? Could you replace them with anybody?

Answer: We can find plenty of good people who have a Republican point of view. Somebody said to me the other day that firing maybe as many as 50 over there might be just like a new chief of staff of the army command and firing the officers removed in the State Department? Twenty-seven! Just 27 out of 5,000.

Question: Aren't most of these people in the career service specialists in their jobs? Could you replace them with anybody?

Answer: We can find plenty of good people who have a Republican point of view. Somebody said to me the other day that firing maybe as many as 50 over there might be just like a new chief of staff of the army command and firing the officers removed in the State Department? Twenty-seven! Just 27 out of 5,000.

**Living Makes Sense After You Quit Counting Calories**

By ROBERT C. RUARK

JUST recently I moved another step nearer to the Sixx, with a birthday I shall prefer to keep anonymous, and among the small comforts was the fact that I have at last quit counting calories. The fetish to be slim and sleek no longer afflicts me. I eat what I want and don't seem to get any fatter, thinner, or prettier.

I have just read a big advertisement for a rum, which went on to say that this particular brand of Cuban sunshine had less calories than a lamb chop, two slices of cold pineapple, a half-grapefruit, or an egg, according to how you mixed it. I notice, also, that calorieless soft drinks have been booming.

Certainly, the diet business has been a major industry in recent years, with people starving themselves to a thin, wiry, and wiry of the calory count of everything they eat, or don't eat. Considering that as recently as when I was a boy — as recently? — we didn't know a calory from a cauliflower, I think the thing has gotten out of hand.

**Silly Claims**

The ramifications of the liquor diet strike me as a little silly, since I never knew a drinkin' man who cared whether he was fat or skinny so long as whatever he was chokin' down could make him forget overdue bills, income taxes, office troubles, stomach bugs, and unreasonable wives. If he had his choice, he would give up lamb chops, sliced pineapple, and

That's the bunk! There isn't any comparison there at all. That is a sample of the hot breath down the neck of the State Department in its long experience in foreign policy. Secretary Dulles is well aware of the importance of this in the arms race. He knows that a great and responsible nation cannot abruptly pull a switch and reverse the policies in response to a political change. He knows that technical skills are required in almost the same degree in the arms services and that a specialist cannot be replaced by a deserving party worker or contributor who outdamages his machine on which much depends.

Some interesting questions are raised by this pressure for change. One may ask how far it is to go. Before the career foreign service was established most diplomatic posts, including consulates, were political plum.

ANGRY AT DULLES  
 The pressure has been particularly severe on the Department of State. Old Guard Senators growl that Secretary Dulles has not gone nearly far enough in reversing the foreign policy of past years. And why hasn't he? They want to know. They're ready with an answer—because all these New Dealers, or worse, are still down there making policy. An interview with one of these pillars of the old order goes approximately as follows:

Question: You are really convinced, Senator, that these people down below the assistant secretaries are making policy? Or at any rate, fixing it so that new policies cannot be implemented?

Answer: Why, I certainly am! Do you know how many people in policy-making jobs have been removed in the State Department? Twenty-seven! Just 27 out of 5,000.

Question: Aren't most of these people in the career service specialists in their jobs? Could you replace them with anybody?

Answer: We can find plenty of good people who have a Republican point of view. Somebody said to me the other day that firing maybe as many as 50 over there might be just like a new chief of staff of the army command and firing the officers removed in the State Department? Twenty-seven! Just 27 out of 5,000.

Question: Aren't most of these people in the career service specialists in their jobs? Could you replace them with anybody?

Answer: We can find plenty of good people who have a Republican point of view. Somebody said to me the other day that firing maybe as many as 50 over there might be just like a new chief of staff of the army command and firing the officers removed in the State Department? Twenty-seven! Just 27 out of 5,000.

**Living Makes Sense After You Quit Counting Calories**

By ROBERT C. RUARK

eggs, and waste happily away to nothing on a diet of pure booze.

You notice a tendency in lots of liquor advertising to suggest subtly that the brand is nourishing, bone-building, nonfattening, character-molding, and generally, and a boon to the American spirit. This is especially true in the beer ads, which make me feel guilty about my own drinking. I see a case while watching a ball game.

I sincerely believe that a lot of the canned goods, like soups, are in forms of fat, and are attacking frames made frail by constant experimentation and tampering with man's stomach. I desire to eat what he wants to eat when he is hungry. We have more and more a variety of low-calorie starches and fats and carbohydrates that when you contemplate a piece of pie, there is a call for the psychiatrist at the same time.

For years I never ate desserts, and I was afraid of getting them again and feel just fine. Maybe one day I will grow me a watermelon out front and an extra slice for my friends, trying out for any movie roles or competing in any track meets, and I find I'm getting fat. I'm lunch, when I am thin, and has the meantime, the dinner goes as usual. I do not know what will be the take-out, but it cannot be canned calory, you bet. I'll be just plain grub.

**Why**

After all, both Dulles and Eisenhower were among those appointed to carry those policies forward.

The News after one year in the White House, the President works harder than before. Sensitive to criticism that he is lazy and makes more decisions himself, he has recently delegated almost everything, even having set up a committee that send up his blood pressure and worry his doctor. . . . But Ike knows that his entire career is now in the balance and is determined that the verdict of history will be favorable. . . . In many respects he does not. . . . And never been persuaded to run 50 times. . . . Few people realize the possibility of losing in the White House, but in the White House, it is impossible to raise the possibility. . . . Though Eisenhower is determined to do his best job as man, he is also determined that he will not run again.