



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1954

An Editor Hurls A Challenge

The freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty, and therefore ought never to be restrained, but every individual shall be held responsible for the abuse of same.

—N. C. Constitution

THOUGH President Weimar Jones of the N. C. Press Association did not refer directly to the N. C. Constitution, his stirring address at Duke University last Friday night emphasized the same theme as Art. I, Sec. 20, quoted above: that freedom should not be abused, that liberty is not synonymous with license, and that responsibility goes hand in hand with power.

It was not the first time that the American press had been criticized—and in many instances justly so—for pandering to sensation and controversy, for emphasizing the area of disagreement, for slanting news to conform to the viewpoints of publishers or stockholders.

But the address gained added significance because it was made to newspapersmen by another newspapersman, by virtue of his office and his own inclinations as editor of THE FRANKLIN PRESS has been leading the battle against General Assembly committee secrecy.

Hence, when Jones told his audience of publishers, editors and reporters that the people of North Carolina were apathetic about the secrecy law last year because "they just didn't believe us when we said it was their fight," the big banquet hall was tensely still. He continued:

"Isn't it because newspapers, as a class,

too often have boasted of reliability in their news columns, but have put emphasis on other things—such things as the dramatic, the clever phrase, have permitted the desire for speed to interfere with accuracy and consciousness to stand in the way of real objectivity; have forgotten reportorial responsibility in the intoxication of reportorial power?"

"Isn't it because we have been courageous, on our editorial pages, in inverse ratio to distance, boldly championing the cause of freedom in Indonesia or Africa, but carefully straddling controversial issues near home?"

Near the end of his address, Jones suggested that annual awards be given for "outstanding performance in the field of newspaper responsibility," and that a new code of ethics for the press should be drawn up, with the objective being the "building of a press so reliable, so courageous, so honest, it will command the confidence of the public."

And when he finished, his audience gave him a rising and extended ovation.

With rare exceptions, the newspapers of North Carolina are relatively free of irresponsibility. They make mistakes, to be sure, for newspapers are written and edited by human beings and they make all the mistakes of human nature.

But there is unquestionably room for improvement. President Jones has suggested two specific proposals, one of which may be hard to carry out. But both are worthy of the closest study by the newspapers of this state, just as the full text of his address, reprinted elsewhere on this page today, merits the close attention of readers.

You're Not Confused, Mr. Fleming

LAMAR FLEMING JR. is the head of the world's largest cotton firm. He is a member of the President's commission on foreign trade. He is also, he says, a confused man.

He is confused, he says, because the government has more butter, edible oils and other agricultural products than it knows what to do with, but refuses to sell them to Iron Curtain countries.

We do not think Mr. Fleming, who addressed the National Cotton Council in Atlanta this week, is as confused as he professes to be. For in his analysis of world trade he came to grips with the basic problems that confront it. He pointed out the danger of becoming "the creditor in a world of debtors," the danger of embargoes and tariffs, imposed by this and other countries, which aggravate this imbalance. The fundamental answers to trade problems, he believes, can be found in free trade and free convertibility of currencies.

Actually it is the government policy of prohibiting sale of butter and edible oils to Communist countries which is confused. This policy apparently is based on two factors: (1) Fear of U. S. consumer wrath if goods like butter become available to foreigners at a price below what American housewives pay, and (2) Fear that this trade with the Communists might be, or might be construed to be, a means of aiding the enemy.

Once A Week, An Uncommon Delight

IT IS TIME to pause and pass out orchids to one of the best little magazines published, Bill Sharpe's and Carl Goerch's STATE.

What compels the tribute is the current issue, which is devoted to Winston-Salem.

Of course Bill—who modestly uses pseudonyms on all but the lead story—outdid himself on this issue, because the Twin City is his old stomping ground. But the best thing about this issue, like others devoted to particular cities and counties of North Carolina, is that

it does not consist of stories hastily contrived for the special edition. The emphasis is on the editorial content, on catching the flavor and spirit of a community, and threading its history into the present with the skill of a Twin City hostelry worker.

THE STATE is written by men who know and are determined to record for posterity the story of their beloved state, a story they always tell with eloquence. It makes our weekly reading of the magazine an uncommon delight.



"Guess which bill he's going to introduce to the senate today!"

Looking In The Mirror

Challenge To The Press

(The text of an address by Weimar Jones, president of the N. C. Press Association, at that group's annual dinner at Duke University last Friday night, Jan. 29.—Eds., The News.)

EXCEPT in a very few, narrow areas, secrecy about public affairs is wrong. It is our job as gold citizens to see that these iniquitous secrecy laws are repealed. We must keep fighting until they are. That must be our immediate goal.

But that alone is not enough. Because while we are getting one law repealed, a dozen more may be enacted. To fight legalized secrecy, and stop at that, is like—if you will pardon an extremely prosaic but I think apt illustration—trying to rid the kitchen of flies with a swatter, while leaving the screen door wide open.

We must seal the flies, yes; but we also must close the screen door.

BATTLE LOST

We lost a battle in Raleigh last spring. We lost it because we had not kept our powder dry. We need now to lose the war, but we will lose it if we keep on trying to fire with powder that is wet.

Most of us are agreed, I believe, that the fight against secrecy is the people's fight. Most of us are agreed that we could and would have won if the people had been willing to fight. And most of us are agreed that the reason the people were apathetic was that they just didn't believe us when we said it was their fight.

Why have we lost the people's confidence?

It didn't just happen. Let's be honest with ourselves. Aren't we, you and I—reporters, editors, and publishers—to blame? Isn't it because newspapers, as a class, too often have boasted of reliability in their news columns, but have put emphasis on other things—such things as the dramatic, the clever phrase; have permitted the desire for speed to interfere with accuracy and consciousness to stand in the way of real objectivity; have forgotten reportorial responsibility in the intoxication of reportorial power?

EDITORIAL COURAGE

Isn't it because we have been courageous on our editorial pages, in inverse ratio to distance, boldly championing the cause of freedom in Indo-China or Africa, but carefully straddling controversial issues near home?

Isn't it because we publishers have shouted loudest about freedom of the press when, all too



WEIMAR JONES

often, what we meant was license of the press; when our real concern was not the people's right to know, but our own perquisites and pocketbooks?

The people are not fools. They have sensed these things. But fortunately, because they are not fools, we can regain their confidence. All we have to do is deserve it.

TWO SUGGESTIONS

Toward this long-range goal of a press that deserves and therefore inspires confidence, I should like to offer two specific suggestions. I hope you will think about them, analyze them critically, talk about them among yourselves, and give your Association the benefit of your thinking.

No. 1. At these Duke dinners we give recognition to technical excellence in writing and photography. Because of these contests, most of us have been stimulated to produce technically better newspapers. I suggest we go a step further and offer awards for outstanding performance in the field of newspaper responsibility. No. 2. We once had codes of ethics for the press. Nobody reads these codes today. I suspect the reason we don't read them is not so much because of a lack of interest in ethics, as because those old codes, though perhaps basically sound, were phrased in application in a world that was vastly different.

To illustrate the great differences, even in our own profession:

How many of you had even heard, 15 years ago, of the concept of freedom of information, the right of the people to know? How many of you, 10 years ago, had given thought to the idea, an idea that has today become the first, of the right to privacy? How many of you, five years ago, had dreamed of accepting, as a matter of course, the suppression of great amounts of public information, in peacetime, in the interest of national security?

FAULTY DECISIONS

Under these new conditions, most of us are wandering in the wilderness, making decisions hit-or-miss, when we must make decisions.

I propose that a group, made up of the finest character and the best brains we can find in North Carolina, be asked to assume the task of working out a broad statement of journalistic principles, to tie the hard problems you and I face in today's complex and confusing world—a practical statement not only enunciating a code of journalistic responsibility, but delimiting for us the vague areas in which none of us is ever quite sure where responsibility ends and irresponsibility begins.

To seek out and to disseminate truth—ours is a high calling. And you and I live in a great state. I covet for the newspapers of North Carolina the distinction of taking the lead in a movement toward the building of a press so sound, so courageous, so wise, that it will regain the confidence of the public.

Ultimately, that must be the solution of our problems. Ultimately, that is the one way we can stay free.

Quote, Unquote

Story published in a local newspaper quoted a 15-year-old reform-school boy as saying, to a sheriff: "Momentarily I forgot I had loaded the gun." Any kid who can remember a word like that, ought to be able to remember whether a gun is loaded.

AMERICA'S IMPACT

It would be wrong to say that Australia looks more to America than England for guidance, but it certainly looks less to England than formerly, and the impact of America on this continent has certainly been felt.

To retrace again the Canadian analogy makes itself apparent. The sentimentalists persist, but the old childish reliance on Great Britain has been replaced by a fresh confidence.

I noticed with interest that in the recent meeting of the finance ministers one Australian

Here Is The Background On The Bricker Amendment

By JAMES MARLOW

WASHINGTON

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER is the living symbol, and one of three custodians, of a basic principle laid down by the writers of the Constitution 165 years ago: the separation and balance of power between the President, Congress and the courts.

Presidents—in their traditional opposition to congressional action—have often been given them, explicitly or implicitly, in the Constitution—have had wide latitude in handling foreign affairs.

The power is not absolute, thanks to the constitutional checks and balances. A president cannot make a treaty with a foreign government unless two thirds of the Senate approves.

But a president can make an agreement with a foreign government. It may have the effect of a treaty, but, being an executive agreement, doesn't need Senate approval.

If money is needed to carry out such an agreement, Congress can effectively veto it by refusing the money, since Congress controls spending. In other agreements a president carries out laws laid down by Congress.

Eisenhower has insisted he must have traditional freedom in this field of foreign affairs.

But Sen. Bricker (R-Ohio) and others who share his views looked with misgiving upon such presidential latitude and reasoned this way:

Someday some president might get this country into trouble by deliberately making an agreement instead of a treaty which would have to be examined by the Senate.

With the result that certain citizens' rights would be lost.

Further, the Bricker group argued, even the Senate might someday agree a treaty which might mean a loss of some states' or citizens' rights.

Therefore, Bricker proposed a constitutional amendment that would specifically give the Senate the right to regulate all executive agreements. It would also provide that treaties dealing with matters the Constitution reserves to the states could be valid as domestic states could be valid as domestic

law only if the individual states passed laws in keeping with the treaties.

Eisenhower said this would hamstring any president in handling foreign affairs. In fact, he said, the whole government would be handicapped.

Bricker's supporters began to melt away and his proposal is now as good as dead—as he offered it. But there remains in the Senate a strong sentiment that a constitutional change is needed.

No one argues there is any imminent catastrophe requiring immediate action. The Senate, if it wished, could send the whole problem back to its Judiciary Committee for more study. It may wind up doing that.

But then Sen. George (D-Cal.) backed by a big bloc of Democrats, came up with a proposal of his own which, while not as stiff as Bricker's, was also turned down, by Eisenhower.

And Sen. Knowland of California, Republican Senate leader, produced a compromise proposal. The study given George's and Knowland's suggestions couldn't compare with that given Bricker's, although it might seem any constitutional change as this would require plenty.

Bricker's proposal had been given the full Senate floor vote since he first made it in 1951. The Senate Judiciary Committee considered it in 1952.

In 1953 the same committee—composed of eight Republicans and seven Democrats—held exhaustive hearings on it from February to March.

A long stream of witnesses, including constitutional lawyers and government officials, explained their reasons for being for or against it. Then the committee weighed the issues from April till June before coming up with the final version—now known as the Bricker amendment. The committee, in doing this, had the help of its staff of lawyers.

The George and Knowland proposals, based generally on the same arguments, were the products of the past few days.

Australia, On The Move, Cuts Ties With England

By ROBERT C. RUARK

SYDNEY, Australia

THERE has been, it seems to me, more than a subtle change in Australia since I was here four years ago. It seems to me that the country has struck off on its own, and has lost a great deal of its old dependence on England. It is more or less as if a large but young child had suddenly wined confidence and chopped the apron strings.

There is a stirring here that is more felt than seen, almost smelt, as a matter of fact. There was something of the same at the end of the war in Canada, at the start of its big boom. I imagine we in the States had something of the same thing in the start of the century, when we really began to roll.

The discovery here of oil, and of uranium, and the change in government cannot be entirely responsible. Nor can the attitude of the migrants, although undoubtedly they are all components of the whole. What I really believe is that a certain shock resulted from the war, and that it took several years to recover from it. And with those years came a realization that Australia was in its lone some own out here, and must stand on its own, with much less dependence on England than formerly.

AMERICA'S IMPACT

It would be wrong to say that Australia looks more to America than England for guidance, but it certainly looks less to England than formerly, and the impact of America on this continent has certainly been felt.

To retrace again the Canadian analogy makes itself apparent. The sentimentalists persist, but the old childish reliance on Great Britain has been replaced by a fresh confidence.

I noticed with interest that in the recent meeting of the finance ministers one Australian

editor asked R. A. Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer, if England were aware of this transition, to the disconcert of several representatives present. Chancellor Butler answered that it was true that the country had struck off on its own, and had lost a great deal of its old dependence on England. It is more or less as if a large but young child had suddenly wined confidence and chopped the apron strings.

There is a stirring here that is more felt than seen, almost smelt, as a matter of fact. There was something of the same at the end of the war in Canada, at the start of its big boom. I imagine we in the States had something of the same thing in the start of the century, when we really began to roll.

The discovery here of oil, and of uranium, and the change in government cannot be entirely responsible. Nor can the attitude of the migrants, although undoubtedly they are all components of the whole. What I really believe is that a certain shock resulted from the war, and that it took several years to recover from it. And with those years came a realization that Australia was in its lone some own out here, and must stand on its own, with much less dependence on England than formerly.

AMERICA'S IMPACT

It would be wrong to say that Australia looks more to America than England for guidance, but it certainly looks less to England than formerly, and the impact of America on this continent has certainly been felt.

To retrace again the Canadian analogy makes itself apparent. The sentimentalists persist, but the old childish reliance on Great Britain has been replaced by a fresh confidence.

I noticed with interest that in the recent meeting of the finance ministers one Australian

From The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

SNIP THOSE STRINGBEANS

DR. EARNEST A. HOOTON, the Harvard anthropologist, is worried by the tendency of tall, thin women to marry tall, thin men and have tall, thin children. He wants tall men to marry short girls, and tall girls to avoid tall men, so that their babies will avoid the extremes and be middle-of-the-roads, so to speak. No more "stringbeans," as Dr. Hooton calls them—but no butterbeans, either.

It strikes us that Dr. Hooton has his work, as the saying goes, cut out for him. Tall women shun short men the same way they shun vertical stripes, and for the same reason. Short men accentuate the vertical. Short men shun tall women because the comparison makes them look unimpressive, or so they feel; and if a man can't look impressive he'd just as soon not look. (It is exceptionally easy for short men to shun tall women because the tall women are already shunning them.)

An extra-tall woman (or man) alongside an extra-short (or woman) always reminds somebody of Mutt and Jeff. The result of all these fixed notions as

to what human beings look best or function together is, as for most people in scientific terms, that more than 22 per cent of the 50,000 G. Is he examined were of the elongated type. Nine per cent were classified as extreme types—"thin, non-muscular and elongated." Dr. Hooton has our best wishes for success in trying to persuade people who should go with whom. But we doubt that many parents of present-day 16-year-old daughters or 18-year-old sons are going to have much faith in his outcome.

Again, now that a jet airman has flown from Los Angeles to New York in 4 hours, 8 minutes and 5 seconds, we renew the observation that it is entirely too fast.—LEXINGTON HERALD.

Patent has been issued for an electric chair which will run for six months at a time. No more current from a tiny flashlight battery—but it isn't guaranteed to get the habitually late there on time.—MEMPHIS PRESS-SCIMITAR.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON

THOUGH the nation's business, the testimony now being given before the joint Congressional Committee on the Economy Report is in secret. A parade of economists, officials and unofficials, beginning with the President's top economic adviser, Dr. Arthur Burns, is trying to spell out what's behind the current recession.

Though they haven't said it in those exact words, many of the economists agree that the basic reason boils down to this: When you take 10 billion dollars in defense orders out of the economy, you have to replace it with something else.

Spelled out in more detailed terms, the 1953 budget called for 60 billion dollars of new defense orders. The 1953 budget calls for less than 50 billion dollars. This is basic hardware. This represents millions of dollars worth of tanks, ships, planes, and other military equipment.

And when you take that big chunk out of government orders, you have to replace it with schools, housing, bridges, roads,

or something else. Otherwise the economy is bound to slump.

Ike Warned

Inside fact is that Dr. Burns has been giving private warnings for some time that business was slipping. Burns is the ex-Columbia professor, born in Austria, who was named chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors last spring after the White House at first said he didn't need any economic advisers.

The President, however, was reminded that it was up to Congress, not him, to decide whether he needed economic advisers, and that Congress required him, by law, to have three advisers for the purpose of helping him head off depression.

Like therefore acknowledged, appointed Dr. Burns, but didn't get around to appointing the other two economists required by law until late last summer.

Now the council is working over time.

They do not agree with Ray Henle, commentator for big Republican conservative Joe Pess and the Sun Oil Co. that to war of a

business recession is Communist propaganda. On the contrary, they believe that to head off recession you have to examine the economic factors carefully, as they did in Ike's own economic message to Congress. Furthermore they do not agree with some of the bucksters immediately around the President that the way to prevent a recession is to repeat over and over again: "We cannot have a recession."

The present recession is probably nothing to worry about provided it isn't permitted to go deeper. The best way to prevent it, they suggest, privately, is to make sure that the axing of government spending is not too sudden and to replace defense spending with at least some peacetime spending.

Like therefore acknowledged, appointed Dr. Burns, but didn't get around to appointing the other two economists required by law until late last summer.

Now the council is working over time.

They do not agree with Ray Henle, commentator for big Republican conservative Joe Pess and the Sun Oil Co. that to war of a

business recession is Communist propaganda. On the contrary, they believe that to head off recession you have to examine the economic factors carefully, as they did in Ike's own economic message to Congress. Furthermore they do not agree with some of the bucksters immediately around the President that the way to prevent a recession is to repeat over and over again: "We cannot have a recession."

The present recession is probably nothing to worry about provided it isn't permitted to go deeper. The best way to prevent it, they suggest, privately, is to make sure that the axing of government spending is not too sudden and to replace defense spending with at least some peacetime spending.

Like therefore acknowledged, appointed Dr. Burns, but didn't get around to appointing the other two economists required by law until late last summer.

Now the council is working over time.

They do not agree with Ray Henle, commentator for big Republican conservative Joe Pess and the Sun Oil Co. that to war of a

business recession is Communist propaganda. On the contrary, they believe that to head off recession you have to examine the economic factors carefully, as they did in Ike's own economic message to Congress. Furthermore they do not agree with some of the bucksters immediately around the President that the way to prevent a recession is to repeat over and over again: "We cannot have a recession."

The present recession is probably nothing to worry about provided it isn't permitted to go deeper. The best way to prevent it, they suggest, privately, is to make sure that the axing of government spending is not too sudden and to replace defense spending with at least some peacetime spending.

Like therefore acknowledged, appointed Dr. Burns, but didn't get around to appointing the other two economists required by law until late last summer.

Now the council is working over time.

They do not agree with Ray Henle, commentator for big Republican conservative Joe Pess and the Sun Oil Co. that to war of a

business recession is Communist propaganda. On the contrary, they believe that to head off recession you have to examine the economic factors carefully, as they did in Ike's own economic message to Congress. Furthermore they do not agree with some of the bucksters immediately around the President that the way to prevent a recession is to repeat over and over again: "We cannot have a recession."

The present recession is probably nothing to worry about provided it isn't permitted to go deeper. The best way to prevent it, they suggest, privately, is to make sure that the axing of government spending is not too sudden and to replace defense spending with at least some peacetime spending.

Like therefore acknowledged, appointed Dr. Burns, but didn't get around to appointing the other two economists required by law until late last summer.

Now the council is working over time.

They do not agree with Ray Henle, commentator for big Republican conservative Joe Pess and the Sun Oil Co. that to war of a