THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1954

Sears Resignation Was Inevitable

THE Boston lawyer, Samuel P. Sears, had no choice but to step out of his role as counsel for the investigation subcommittee. As Sears himself said, the test was not whether he felt he could be objective and unbiased; it was whether he was "believed to be unbiased."

Certainly he would have started out the investigation with two strikes against him—to adopt the parlance of the current season.

1. Although Sears had told the subcommittee originally that he had never taken a position publicly or privately about McCarthy, newspapers at Harvard University and in Boston dug out quotes from Sears highly praising the Wisconsin senator and endorsing his work. To attribute this discrepancy to a lapse of memory on Sears' part is to put the kindest possible interpretation on it. In any event, it discredited him in the eyes of everyone who expects an objective handling of the case.

2. Sears had actively sought the job, and this appeared doubly strange after his admiration for McCarthy was made known.

Unfortunately, the resignation of Sears means the loss of still more time in getting the investigation under way. It has already been delayed so long that the intense public interest is beginning to cool. Unless the acting chairman, Sen. Mundt, comes up with a new and satisfactory candidate for chief counsel soon, he will lay himself and his Republican colleagues open to the suspicion that they don't really want to air the McCarthy-Army dispute.

A New Kind Of Political Morality

WE'RE RATHER inclined to agree with the RALEIGH NEWS & OBSERVER that Democratic National Chairman Steven Mitchell overspoke himself in publicly denying party endorsement for two congressional candidates instead of merely withholding endorsement.

Perhaps the distinction is a fine one, but it's there nonetheless. Public denial of endorsement tends to prejudge a man; withholding endorsement would imply disfavor with his past actions, yet express a willingness to await the orderly processes of justice.

That having been said, it is refreshing to find a national political party show some concern over the morals and the loyalty of the candidates who seek office under its label.

In the case of James Roosevelt, who is involved in charges of gross immorality, the Democratic Party and the nation would have everything to lose and nothing to gain in his election to Congress. The case of Rep. Robert L. Condon is not so clear-cut. He has denied former membership in the Communist Party, but he is still regarded as a security risk by the Atomic Energy Commission, which has excellent intelligence resources. Until Condon is cleared, Mitchell was justified in withholding party endorsement.

The voters in the two California congressional districts will, of course, finally decide whether they want to be represented by Roosevelt and Condon. Neither, however, will be able to drape himself with the mantle of party support. Had the Republican Party adopted Mitchell's example in the 1952 Wisconsin election, it might not today be saddled with the responsibility for Joe McCarthy.

A Canadian Raises A Pertinent Point

THIS WEEK the North Atlantic Treaty Organization celebrates its fifth birthday. The occasion is being duly noted by the President and the secretary of state. However, the most significant comment comes from a Canadian, Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent. His observation is gently phrased, but it raises a pointed question regarding American policy.

That policy has been to neglect NATO, to concentrate instead on getting European parliaments to ratify the European Defense Community, which would unite the military forces of the Benelux countries, France, Italy and West Germany. Prospects for ratification by all parliaments are not good. Small European powers understandably fear that Germany would dominate such an organization, unless the United Kingdom and the U. S. are also in it to balance German power.

Mr. St. Laurent holds that "European unity in itself" may not "furnish an answer to the problems that face western Europe." He believes it may be time to step up integration "within the larger framework of the North Atlantic community", to unite the Atlantic community militarily and economically, instead of the European community militarily.

The continued preservation of freedom and peace and even survival depend, he believes, "upon our ability to look beyond national barriers and to make them somewhat less artificial. . . More particularly, many of us believe the peoples living about the great basin of the Atlantic Ocean might well seek the solution to their problems of economic betterment, political stability and self-defense in this closer integration of their national resources and their machinery of government."

What he is saying is that perhaps all people in this Atlantic community had best consider sharing some of their sovereignty. The U. S. repeatedly urged Europeans to share their sovereignty, to transfer control of European defenses from the several countries to the supranational EDC. But the U. S., while giving lip service to NATO, has shown no inclination to practice what it preaches and consider putting its military forces in Europe into the EDC.

There is an inconsistency here which many Europeans—and some Americans who have bothered to think about it—find difficult to understand. Certainly this whole matter of international relationships deserves reappraisal in view of the recent H-bomb developments.

The Grand Old Maestro Steps Down

AS THE FINAL chord of DIE MEISTERSINGER wafted through Carnegie Hall Sunday the baton slipped from the old maestro's grasp. It was handed back to him. He walked slowly off the stage and shut himself in his room. The audience applauded for several minutes unavailing. Then the lights were turned up and the listeners left, sensing that they had witnessed what was probably the end of one of the greatest musical careers of all time, that of Arturo Toscanini.

Mr. Toscanini's career as a conductor covers, almost incredibly, a period of 68 years. As a lad of 19, he left his cello, when a conductor failed to show up in Rio, and conducted AIDA. Since then he helped introduce, from pit or podium, some of the world's greatest music. He was in the pit at La Scala when his friend Verdi's OTELLO had its world premiere. Toscanini conducted world premieres of LEONCAVALLO'S PAGLIACCI and Puccini's LA BOHEME, introduced to his native Italy some of the great German works like Wagner's GOETTERDAEMMERUNG.

Fortunately for Americans he started conducting in this country shortly after this century began, first at the Metropolitan Opera House, later for the New York Philharmonic Society. Then, with over half a century of conducting behind him he embarked on what was probably his greatest career. In 1937 the NBC Symphony Orchestra was created especially for him. Since that time he taught millions of listeners, here and abroad, to appreciate good music. A taskmaster and perfectionist, but withal a cheerful champion of the music he loved and knew as no other man, Toscanini ranks with the masters of the ages.

From The Raleigh News & Observer

STAMP

NO ONE will be surprised at the zeal of Congressman Charles Jonas, up for re-election, in urging the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the Battle of Ramsour's Mill in Lincoln County. North Carolina Congressmen of all parties should be vigilant about contemporary attitudes towards the state's past such as that involved in a proposal by a committee named by the Republican Secretary of Interior that Moore's Creek Battleground be abandoned as a national military park. However, in the case of the Battle of Ramsour's Mill that event is described even in the North Carolina State Guide as "a Revolutionary skirmish." In fact, in North Carolina the battle is so little known that North Carolina historians are divided as to how the name is spelled. Historian Ashe spells it "Ramseur" while historians Connor and Hill use the spelling "Ramsour."

Maybe it would not help Rep. Jonas in the Tenth District but it might profit North Carolina if it would say to this Republican administration and Republican Congress leave Moore's Creek alone and we'll somehow manage to get along without a stamp commemorating Ramsour's Mill.

An Oklahoma girl advertised for a husband and landed one within a short time. The advertisement cost $3.00. She paid the wedding expenses—$9.00. In less than a year the husband died and left the widow $11,000-insurance policy. Now will you admit it pays to advertise? —GREENEVILLE (TENN.) SUN.

". . . and then McCarthy counters to the countercharge with a countercharge . . ."

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.

Truce In Indochina Would Be A Munich

Davidson

IT IS not surprising that Secretary Dulles made the assertion, approved beforehand by the President, that the U. S. Government feels that the possibility of Communist domination of Indochina "should not be passively accepted, but should be met by united action." Here the secretary of state clearly avoided mentioning any specific measures that we might take, but in view of the prevailing situation he certainly seems to be saying that if the U. S. deems it necessary and vital to the security of the "whole free community," American military forces in the form of both men and material may be sent to the Indochinese theater.

As yet, there seems to have been no great hue and cry from the American people about sending American fighting men to the other side of the globe, to a country which is pretty nearly as far away from the U. S. as any place on earth, but we may expect to hear such a cry if it ever appears that we may have to send troops to aid the French in their struggle against the forces of Ho Chi Minh and his rebel Vietminh forces.

If the turn of events is such that direct intervention by the U. S. becomes necessary, we may expect the opposition to such a move to take two principal stands. Those opposed to intervention will probably say first that a truce can and should be made with the Communists and that American intervention is not absolutely necessary; secondly they will assert that we cannot possibly attempt to hold the line against Communist forces all over the world, and that the security of Indochina is not so vital to us that we should send American forces to that theater.

While agreeing that we cannot afford to scatter our military forces so far and wide that they would be ineffective, I nevertheless submit that the second argument proceeds on false premises, and I believe that any military analyst of the day would agree that Indochina is a vital position in our defenses against Communist expansion. With full possession of Indochina the Communists easily move westward into weak Thailand, and thus nence Burma and India; and they would have a spearhead into the Southwestern Pacific area, which includes Malaya (which is already experiencing a great deal of trouble with Communist rebels), Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. It is difficult to see how anyone could realize that the security of this whole territory would be endangered by Communist domination of Indochina and still maintain that we should not take the necessary steps to prevent it.

As for the first possible argument stated above, it should be obvious that any truce negotiated with the Communists in Indochina now would have to be on terms named almost entirely by them. The Communists know the French are getting fed up with the endless fight there; they will surely hold out for such terms as will give them what would actually amount to a victory. We should realize by now that the Communists would not stop with the conquest of Indochina. Their plan calls for world domination, and every move they make is calculated to put more and more territory under Communist rule.

In short, any truce in Indochina at the present would merely be a repetition of the now-despised Munich appeasement of 1938, and if we do not realize this we will be deceiving no one but ourselves.

— RICHARD F. ROPER

Opposes Tax Aid For Community Colleges

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

I HOPE YOU will give space in your paper for this little gripe. I am talking about the two cent levy on the taxpayer for the support of the two colleges here in Charlotte.

If passed, it will be one of the worst cases of taxation without representation this fair city has had. The low salaried man has no one to go to bat for him. He puts in his time trying to make a living. The poor fellow is taxed already so much he can hardly carry the load but our city fathers still want him to carry more.

A man making $50 or $60 per week (a great many are not making that) cannot feed and clothe a family of two or more and live, eat, or wear anything better than the lowest priced items he can find. He most certainly cannot save and afford to send his children to college on this salary.

Why should he be forced through this unjust taxation to pay for another man's childrens' education, when he cannot afford his own children the opportunity of getting a college education?

If these colleges are getting on the red side of the ledger, then let them increase their tuition and resources where they have in the past been getting operating expenses. Then let the man who is able and fortunate enough to make enough money to send his children to college pay for it. Not the poor man who can ill afford it. The poor man if lucky sends his children through high school, which is a public institution. But he does not make the kind of money to send them to college.

I say, if a man can afford to send his child to college then he should certainly be willing to pay the price, not cry on the poor man's shoulder and ask him to help educate his child by passing an unjust tax levy on his meager earnings.

I earnestly wish every child could have the privilege of going to college. But we will never solve the problem by making laws that are only for the man with ample means. The little man deserves something too.

The ordinary working man does not have much time after work but I hope every one of them will take time off just long enough to put in their vote against this unjust levy.

—H. E. FEIMSTER SR.

Recreation Program Aided By The News

Lowesville

Editors, The News:

I JUST want to write and thank you and John Borchert and all the good folks at The Charlotte News for your interest, your editorials, and your articles on recreation. Largely with your help, the county commissioners agreed to appropriate $5,000 out of next year's budget toward a survey to find out the county's recreation needs.

It is understanding, kindness, and cooperation like yours that make men willing to undertake civic projects and responsibilities. I promise you we will not let you. The Charlotte News, nor the good folks of Mecklenburg County down.

—CHARLES M. LOWE

Ike Has Not Developed Into A Political Leader

By DORIS FLEESON

WASHINGTON

THAT President Eisenhower detests political manipulation is by now accepted as a fact here. Whether he has any talent for it is not known, since he won't try it; his distaste for it is repeatedly displayed.

Any realistic appraisal of the chances for the Eisenhower program must always take this circumstance into account. The President will afford leadership for those members of Congress who are prepared to accept it. Dissident Republicans will not be punished and the Democrats must come along or not, as their conscience or political expediency dictates.

It became clear very soon after the election that the President had a concept of himself as a head of state rather than the political manager of the country and his party. Some quarters expected that when his program was developed past the study stage and its success became in doubt, he would change his mind about the political aspects of his job.

This hasn't happened. Republicans now managing the crucial mid-term election campaign, which is expected either to enlarge or destroy their fragile control of Congress, readily admit that they themselves are making all the creative political decisions regarding it.

POLS ARE IN CHARGE

The White House is described by them as cooperative. The President readily makes himself available for such interviews and appearances as the campaign managers think important. He has offered them no ideas of his own and takes the wisdom and propriety of theirs for granted.

The situation would be more clearly evident if Republicans firmly controlled the House and Senate and the strong-minded chairmen of the standing committees could do as they liked. But since the winning votes on all issues must come from Democrats or the lone independent, Sen. Morse, who prefer the Eisenhower leadership to that of his party, the President generally looks stronger than he is.

The primaries should soon be shedding light on just how much Republican victories, if they occur this fall, will affect this situation. It could be that the newly active Citizens for Eisenhower, who are concentrating on congressional districts where the President pulled heavily in 1952, will influence the make-up of the House. But the nine states in which Republicans have a chance to displace Democratic senators usually nominate conservative Republicans.

The President's reluctance to maneuver in the political field is applauded in some quarters, and no doubt sincerely. As the election nears, the feelings of Congress are beginning to be mixed. It is the old story that what you gain on the swings, you lose on the roundabouts.

Having coped so long with "strong" Presidents, Congress thought it wanted a change and did enjoy it at first. But when the result is found to be that a McCarthy monopolizes the headlines and the record seems slow in building, doubts arise.

STRONG TAFT RECALLED.

Republicans are rather wistfully reminiscing about the late Sen. Taft and his strong individuality, his astringent and absolute assurance which made him a symbol of Republicanism.

The Eisenhower concept of the presidency owes much to those politicians who told him in Paris that all he had to do was to lend his illustrious name. He has found out that it is not that simple, but he still avoids political leadership. What he will do if and when Democrats take over Congress this fall should be interesting.

Actually, he is potentially the ideal leader of a coalition. He is a hero, personally popular, truly nonpartisan in international issues. New in politics, he has no legacy of extremism to defend. So far, though, he just won't coalesce, even when his program is in trouble.

U. S. Fetish For Bigness Does Us No Good Abroad

By ROBERT C. RUARK

I RECKON it's all right to be so big, but it seems to me we have made a fetish of it in recent years, and earned considerable dislike both at home and abroad in the process. You can overdo size, as they've overdone it in Texas, where everything has to be bigger than anything else, anywhere, and where — as some irreverent soul once remarked, getting stoned for it — even the midgets stand six feet tall.

I was just noticing an official California pamphlet on the olive industry. There seems to be no such thing as a small olive any more. They range in grade from select, or standard, to medium, large, extra-large, mammoth, giant, jumbo, colossal, super-colossal and special super-colossal. I should imagine to approach the special super-colossal, a man would first have to rent a sawmill to cut it up, and then attack the slices with both hands, as in watermelon-eating.

ENOUGH LUNG-CANDY

Everything is big, and bigger. You buy a salami-sized tube of toothpaste in the "large economy size". You are urged to buy your beer in the handy family-size, containing enough liquid to founder an average man. Your shrimps are jumbo, and any cigarette that isn't king-sized seems slightly furtive these days, although I must admit I don't need that much nicotine in one serving. I get enough of the lung-candy out of the three or four packs of normal-sized ones that I destroy daily.

We have never made any real effort to put out a very good small car in America, when the indication is that they'd be gobbled up. You can't call a Ford or Chevvie "small," not in the sense that the Fiat or Citroen or any number of British cars is "small", with the result that the small-car trade goes to Europe.

We have the greatest show on earth, the biggest merchandise, the superest — colossalest movies, the minkiest mink, and, possibly, the biggest and dumbest dames, who will buy anything if it's talked at 'em enough. We seem to have the biggest crime and the biggest corruption, and the tallest trees and the dirtiest back yards and the most insolent waiters and the surliest servants. Good or bad, it's the "fustest with the mostest," and not necessarily on the ball.

I have never quite understood how this fixation for size got so firmly implanted in the public consciousness, unless it was that the country was so sprawling and there were so few of us in it in the beginning that the broad loneliness made us nervous. Certainly, the advertising business has fostered the idea that to be good it's got to be big, which ain't necessarily so.

OVERSEAS IRRITATION

But we are so inbred with the biggest and bestest that we have more or less unconsciously peddled the idea of giantism to our overcrowded allies. And this has formed one of the basic sources of anti-American irritation by the people who take the money and snarl behind our backs. And to our faces.

I have been overseas a lot in the last dozen years, and if anybody wishes to delude himself that we are beloved he is strictly kidding himself. You have only to talk to the last tourist off the boat to determine some of the self-consciousness, self-pitying scorn and active dislike that surrounds our relationships with our neighbors.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Jenner Plans Probe Of Primaries

WASHINGTON

SEN. McCarthy of Wisconsin and Sen. Jenner of Indiana both are good friends and fellow Red-hunters. But the other day they got just a little miffed at each other over the question of this writer.

When this column carried an advance story on how Jenner's committee was going to use ex-ambassador Spruille Braden as a star witness against Alger Hiss and the State Department, McCarthy blew up.

He claimed that Jenner's committee had been infiltrated. "Pearson," he claimed, "had planted a spy" inside the committee.

Sen. Jenner also got worried, began to talk about the possibility of a "secret Harold Ickes" being on his committee staff. The liberal Republican he suspected at first was Charles Grimes, new counsel for the Internal Security Committee and a former Dewey crime-buster.

This writer had praised Grimes as fair-minded, so Jenner immediately suspected that he was the "Pearson spy," and even enlisted the services of the FBI to track down the leak.

I can assure you, however, Senator, that Mr. Grimes was not the source of my advance story on your operations. And just to prove that he wasn't, here is further secret information about another phase of your activity, in the Rules Committee, which has nothing to do with Mr. Grimes and which I am sure he knows nothing about—until he reads this. Here is the next move you are contemplating:

Democratic Primaries

The secret minutes of Jenner's Rules Committee show that he is planning to repeat his political strategy of 1948 and investigate Democratic primaries this year, then publicize Democratic "election scandals" on the eve of the general election.

In the past, it has been the committee's practice to keep out of party primaries, investigate only final elections. Only exception to this came during the GOP 80th Congress, when Jenner headed the Senate Elections subcommittee, at which time he rushed around investigating Democratic primaries, trying to dig up dirt against Democratic candidates before the general election. Simultaneously he ignored Republican primaries, including a smelly GOP scandal in Rhode Island.

However, behind the closed doors of the Senate Rules Committee Jenner announced that he would ask the Senate for $75,000 to investigate primaries again.

The secret minutes quote Jenner's announcement as follows: "Thirty-five senators will be up for re-election this year. Thirty-four will be running in primaries during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September, Delaware alone will hold a convention.

"Many of these contests are expected to be close and result in hard campaigning," the minutes continue, quoting Jenner. "The experience of the committee in the past has been that primary elections demand equal attention from the privileges and election subcommittee.

"For this reason, a compact staff should be established at the end of March to undertake spot investigations arising out of complaints which may be made in the forthcoming primaries, and for which there is adequate precedent on the committee records," Jenner adds, neglecting to mention that the only precedents were set by himself in 1948. "If these primaries result in more contests than could be expected, the Senate can raise the ante sometime in July or August before it adjourns."

Democratic senators agreed this might be a good idea—provided Republican as well as Democratic primaries are investigated.

Brownell's Wire-Taps

Attorney General Brownell has been literally begging for someone to introduce his wire-tap bill on the Senate side of Congress. So far, only Sen. McCarthy has offered to sponsor the bill, and Brownell just doesn't like the idea of having McCarthy's name on it.

The attorney general tried to persuade McCarthy's colleague, Sen. Wiley of Wisconsin, to introduce the bill, but Wiley insisted that the question of whose phones were to be tapped should be left up to the courts, not the attorney general. So he said no. Meanwhile Brownell's wire-tap proposal is lying in Vice President Nixon's office, waiting for some senator—other than McCarthy—to pick it up.

Note—The Brownell proposal would make wire-tap evidence admissible in the courts retroactively; in other words wire-tap evidence taken illegally several years ago would now become admissible. McCarthy's Democratic friend, Sen. McCarran of Nevada, is vigorously opposed to the wire-tap bill. He suspects his own phones have been tapped.

Washington Pipeline

Vice President Nixon told friends privately that "McCarthy has finally gone too far. He's hanged himself." This comes from the former peacemaker between the White House and McCarthy.

Government storage bins are so jammed with surplus foods that the Agriculture Department won't be able to store the surplus from this year's harvest. The experts are gloomily predicting that over 200 million bushels of grain will have to be dumped on the market at cut-rate prices or else left in the fields to rot—unless Secretary Benson gets busy now providing more storage space.

Postmaster General Summerfield has privately backed down on his plan to increase first-class mail from three to four cents. He has called key congressmen and offered not to demand four-cent stamps if they in turn will increase second- and third-class rates. (However, it's a safe prediction that the postal rate increases will remain bottled up right where they are in the House Rules Committee.)

Four big gas and oil companies—Sinclair, Sohio, El Paso Natural Gas, and Peoples Production Co.—will form a joint venture to explore for underocean oil in the Gulf of Mexico off Texas and Louisiana.