

A Decade Of Medical Progress

GRADUATION of the first senior classes from the new four-year medical and dental schools at the University of North Carolina marks the end of one era and the beginning of another in this state's dramatic drive for good health.

It ends an era of a full decade, dating back to the 1944 report of the Poe Commission to the late Gov. J. M. Broughton recommending the creation of a Medical Care Commission and the launching of a Good Health Program.

Prompted by this report, Gov. Gregg Chery asked the 1945 General Assembly to create the commission and to adopt as a policy the expansion of the university's two-year medical course to four years. Then came the statewide Good Health Program, spearheaded by Kay Kyser. In 1946, the authorization by the 1947 and 1949 General Assemblies of money for the Division of Health Affairs at the University of North Carolina; and the construction, on a matching grant basis, of hospitals, nurses' homes and health clinics across the length of North Carolina.

Expansion of the medical and dental schools came late in the decade—after

the new Memorial Hospital and other facilities at Chapel Hill came into being.

And now North Carolina moves into a new era of medical progress. It is significant that of the 226 students in residence at the medical school, 222 are North Carolinians. And of the 34 members of the first class of dental students, all except those entering military service will practice in North Carolina.

When the Good Health Program was launched, North Carolina ranked fourth from the bottom in the number of persons per physician. The supply of dentists was similarly low.

By providing additional medical and dental education facilities for young North Carolinians, and by encouraging the graduates to practice in their native state, the University's Division of Health Affairs will help materially to match the demand for their services. Coupled with the expansion of hospitals and health clinics, the greater supply of doctors and dentists will give North Carolina the well-rounded health program that the members of the Poe Commission envisioned ten years ago.

David Lawrence Reappraises Allies

EDITOR-COLUMNIST David Lawrence has had a distinguished journalistic career. But a few years ago he grew—or at least his articles indicated that he had become—quite bitter. Democrats of the Stevenson variety, and leaders of the left, particularly those of western Europe, drew increasingly vitriolic condemnation from him.

Recently Mr. Lawrence went to Europe. His editorials in U. S. News & World Report, and his regular newspaper columns, have since then reflected what appears to be a sharp change in his estimate of America's allies.

With what appears to be a manly gulp of crow, he reported from London that "whatever impression the outside world may have received heretofore that the British are unaware of the dangers of a policy of vaccination with respect to the Geneva Conference can certainly be erased now as unrealistic."

And, this from Paris, in an editorial entitled "The France We Don't Know."

"Do we in the United States really understand the France that only nine years ago was liberated from a five-year mili-

tary domination by a conquering country? Do we know what five years of military occupation by a foreign army does to a nation? Do we know what it means to lose in two world wars more than two millions of the nation's finest men, with millions more hobbling along the streets, the rest of their lives and with hardly a family untouched by the casualty lists?"

He went on to report the stupendous size of the French loan in Indochina, the diminishing Communist strength at the time. He found in France a basic faith that the country will rise itself.

"These are tough times for France. But her spirit has not been broken."

Travel, of course, is broadening it may be that Mr. Lawrence, on his trip, has been able to dispel some preconceived ivory tower notions that persistently plague those of us who are in the opinion-writing business.

But the important thing is that the many persons who have long looked Mr. Lawrence's previous opinions, in support of their own views and prejudices, should at least reflect upon the conclusions reached by the "new" David Lawrence.

Highway Death Toll Still Dropping

SLOWLY but surely, Motor Vehicles Commissioner Ed Scheidt and the 530 Highway Patrolmen under his command are winning the war against highway fatalities.

At the beginning of this week, the death toll for 1954 stood at 367. On the same date last year, the death toll was 451. That's a reduction of 94 fatalities, or 21 per cent.

The decrease is all the more impressive when two other factors are considered:

1. It is the first time that the highway death rate has held a sustained downward trend since 1945.

2. Registration of passenger vehicles and trucks continues to climb.

Scheidt has used all the tricks in the books, plus a few of his own invention, to slow down the speedsters, speed up the slow-pokes, and generally make drivers conscious of highway regulations.

Let's Not Label Judge Ervin—Yet

POOR SAM ERVIN. Less than 24 hours after he had been named to the Senate seat of the late Clyde R. Hoey, Judge Ervin was declared to be a "conservative liberal."

We are not quite sure what a "conservative liberal" is. Possibly he is not unlike a "liberal conservative," whatever that is.

Americans love to label their legislators, most of whom get assigned to the "liberal," "conservative" or "middle-of-the-road" category early in their law-making careers.

One would suppose that a conservative liberal is supposed to inhabit the ill-defined area between the middle of the road and the left-hand ditch, and that a liberal conservative is equidistant from the center line on the other side of the road.

From Harper's Magazine

He has used radar spotters, electric speed watches, unmarked patrolling, camera cars, unmarked Highway Patrol cars, high-speed interceptor automobiles. He has posted the highways with thousands of signs warning the would-be speeder. Out-of-state motorists who cross the North Carolina line in the eastern section of the state are handed printed folders explaining the safety program.

Proof that the program is working can be found right on the highways. The driver who sticks right at the 55 mph speed limit may for many miles before encountering another automobile passes him. A year or two ago, they swished by every few hundred yards.

Most of the credit must go to Commissioner Scheidt, who brought imagination and determination to a campaign that had become bogged down in routine through the postwar years.

Yet, some extremely right-wing thinkers are being billing themselves lately as the "liberal conservatives."

And Adlai Stevenson, as we recall, labeled himself a conservative in a 1952 speech. Certainly the Democrats' campaign slogan, "Don't Let Them Take It Away," epitomized a conservative philosophy.

All this would indicate that political labels don't mean much.

And when a seemingly conflicting label is pinned onto a man who has been on a high court and out of politics for years, as Judge Ervin has been, it is meaningless.

Let's give Sen. Ervin a chance to make a few speeches and cast a few votes before labeling him.

"And what was this subversive organization?"

"The Second Alabama Cavalry, Confederate States of America—and to hear him tell it, they used considerable force and violence."

"Do you now, or have you ever, belonged to any organization seeking to overthrow the government of the United States by force and violence?"

"No, sir—but one of my close relatives did."

"Ah ha. And who was that?"

"My grandfather, sir."

If Oppenheimer Is A Risk, So Are Many Others

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

SINCE Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer has been judged devotedly, impeccably, discreet, and an invaluable public servant, the heart of the case against him is his alleged lack of "enthusiasm" for the hydrogen bomb.

To understand just how astonishing this case is, it is necessary to know the history of the origins of the hydrogen bomb project. Here, briefly, are the essential facts.

The debate about the bomb began when Dr. Edward Teller, the great thermonuclear expert, came to Washington immediately after the explosion of the first Soviet atomic bomb in September, 1949. His purpose was to gain support for a crash program to make super, as the purely hypothetical hydrogen bomb was then called. To this end, Teller buttonholed Lewis Strauss, then a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Strauss in turn urged the commission and President Truman to give consideration to the kind of program Teller wanted. The problem was thereupon referred to the AEC's general advisory committee; and this committee met in late October, 1949, in hours-long debate, under the chairmanship of Dr. Oppenheimer.

CRASH PROGRAM OPPOSED  
On Oct. 29, 1949, the advisory committee reported to the White House and the AEC. The committee majority opposed a crash program to build super, at least for the time being, but did not foreclose the idea of such a program in the future. This group was headed by Dr. Oppenheimer, and included Dr. James Bryant Conant and Lee DuBridge (who wrote the majority report); Hartley Ross of the United Fruit Company and Oliver Buckley of the Bell Telephone Laboratories.

Dr. Conant, of course, is now President Eisenhower's Ambassador to Germany, and Dr. DuBridge is the President's personal scientific adviser. It is also interesting to know that the "moral objections" to the H-bomb, which Dr. Oppenheimer has been so much criticized, were quite emphatically shared by the supposedly hard-headed businessmen, Rowe and Buckley.

The minority of the general advisory committee went even further than Dr. Oppenheimer and his fellow-members of the majority. They declared that the H-bomb would be a weapon so horrible it should never be made under any

circumstances. They advocated an American pledge never to make it, with the proviso that a Russian hydrogen bomb test, on being detected, would be treated as an act of war.

The two men who took this interesting position were the great physicists, Dr. Enrico Fermi and Dr. L. I. Rabi. Dr. Rabi, whose "lack of enthusiasm" was so much greater than Dr. Oppenheimer's,

now holds Dr. Oppenheimer's former place as chairman of the general advisory committee. As such, he is Adm. Strauss's chief scientific mentor.

After the advisory committee reports were received, the AEC acted. On Nov. 9, all five members of the AEC sent their views to the President in a curiously tortured document. It said, in effect, that Strauss and Gordon Dean inclined towards an all-out effort to make super, while Chairman Lil-

lenthal, Sumner Pike, and Dr. Henry Smyth shared the doubts of the scientists. But, it concluded, the final decision was the lonely and terrible responsibility of the President.

Dean, Lilenthal, Pike, and Smyth appended their individual opinions to this overall report. For some reason Strauss did not. In the meanwhile Truman had ordered special studies of the problem to be made by the State and Defense Departments.

State reported categorically that there was not the slightest hope of achieving control of the new weapons by agreement with Russia. In late December, Strauss belatedly sent his individual memorandum to the President, and for the first time came out flatly for super. By late January, 1950, all five commissioners, questioned in executive session by the McMahon Committee, also came out for super. The President then ordered the bomb to be made.

LESS THAN CANDID  
There are two points to note about this slice of history. First, it is certainly true that Strauss performed a useful public service in the debate on super. But the picture which has been so often painted of Strauss—brilliant and single-mindedly failing the nation's designs of an equally single-minded Oppenheimer, is hardly accurate. These two points have put about this version of events have been, to borrow a phrase from the Gray report, "less than candid."

And the chief putter-about has been none other than Adm. Strauss himself.

Second, if "lack of enthusiasm" for the terrible hydrogen weapon is to mark a man as a security risk, who then is secure? Dr. Teller, no doubt, is safe. So, doubly enough, is former secretary of State Dean Acheson, also a strong advocate of super from the start. For the rest, certain of this country's most respected businessmen and virtually all its leading scientists, must now be marked security risks.

There were cogent technical reasons why so many scientists at first doubted the wisdom of going all-out for the hydrogen weapon. But in almost every case the basic reason was moral. Perhaps this is very reprehensible. But scientists are also human beings. And surely these are strange times, when it is a suspicious act to go to work because about a weapon which may one day write finis to the history of the human race.



Readers Discuss Reactions To Segregation Ruling

Why Consider Soviet Reaction To Ruling?

Charlotte  
EDITORS: The News: SOMETIMES by the action in Washington we wonder why our President and the federal government is bending over backward to please the Russian government and the Association for the Advancement of Colored People in their demand for the ending of segregation in our tried and well-proven way of life that has worked so successfully for both the white and colored people of the South up until now.

The national administration claims that segregation gives the Russians good propaganda weapons against us. But this sounds like a poor excuse on the part of the administration.

How, for example, can the pot throw up black to the kettle? How then can Russia point an accusing finger at us for having segregation when hundreds of millions of her own people do not have anything near the rights of our Negro people?

They say that segregation makes our colored people second-class citizens. If our colored people, and we, the white people, lived in Russia we would all be fourth-class citizens! So, why do we end segregation because of Russia, the chief traitor-maker of the world today?

Why should we end segregation to please the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People? What has that organization ever done except agitate ill-feelings between the white and colored people by making demands beyond sense and reason for the people it is supposed to represent?

If the rank and file of our col-

ored population demands the end of segregation, then it should be put up to the Congress to change existing laws and not put up to the Supreme Court, to use the description of the Court, as spoken by former President Franklin D. Roosevelt. And, in that way nobody could cry that segregation was ended in a dictatorship-like manner by a group of men fewer than those who run things in the Kremlin in Moscow.

To me, it seems that the Supreme Court has erred badly in not allowing Congress to make a decision so vital to the peace, harmony, and unity of the American people. With the situation as it is, no one seemingly will be too happy over it in the end, and that goes for both white and colored people who will have to try to adjust their children and themselves to a new social order never before known to the South.

To me, it seems that our government is guilty of preaching unity and peace abroad, while practicing disunity and a form of dictatorship at home.

—RALPH CONNELLY

Pinebluff

Violent Reactions To Decree Helps Reds

Editors: The News:

I AM WRITING this letter, because one important point seems to have been overlooked in discussing the new ruling on segregation. Whether we like the ruling or not, we can take comfort in the fact that on the world scene, the Court decision goes far to destroy one of the most potent weapons of the Communists.

Their cold war against democracy is being waged largely in

Asia and Africa where people are colored. And in this war they have played up segregation in the U.S. as proof positive that the white people of America discriminate against the Negro and feel superior to him.

No matter how we feel personally at the present moment about the new ruling, we must remember that any violent dissatisfaction we express publicly against the decision are being picked up abroad by the Communists as propaganda for their purposes of exploiting the needs of the people. When a southern man or woman, who has had little preparation of mind or spirit for the change, writes the newspaper that he or she will never see a son or daughter go to school with a colored child, the Soviet press seizes on that statement and

prints it in capitals under banner headlines or screams it forth on their loudspeakers. How do you think this affects the colored people abroad? If there is no real or free freedom about democracy, they decide, then they may as well join forces with the Communists.

We may find it hard to adjust to the new conditions but Americans have always been famous for being young-at-heart, forward-looking, and marvelously adaptable.

The time for Untouchables in civilized, Christian America is long past. If we are troubled about it because of past training and conditioning we could not help, let's pray about it and ask ourselves how Christ would have felt about it. He said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not."

—MRS. E. H. FOSTER

Stands With Byrnes On Segregation Issue

Chew, S. C.

Editors: The News:

STANDING behind our Gov. James F. Byrnes on the segregation question. I disagreed with him and could not have put up with his attitude in the present administration. But I will support him on keeping the South as it is on all questions pertaining to segregation of races in Dixie.

God did not intend integration or he would have made all one color and would not have put in different parts of the world. None of you Yankees can deny that, or Communists either. We are not accepting it regardless of who says we must do so, now or in the future.

—J. A. GRAHAM

Liberace Murders The Old Masters

By MACK REIL, Editor

Bertie Ledger-Advance

YOU can sooner triplicate on The Flag and spit upon it than say an unkind word about Liberace. I have discovered Liberace, in case you've been at the North Pole for the last year and a half, is a so-called piano player with long way hair who has illusions that he can sing and burns up a lot of candles.

A lot of people think that Liberace is wonderful. In fact, he's hiring Madison Square Garden with the confident expectation that he can win it—the first pianist who's tried to fill that enormous hall since Paderewski. For some reason, not connected with pianistic ability, he has captivated the millions—particularly the old ladies—and is in the million dollar class, according to reliable authority.

I've read a lot about this great national idol, but hadn't had the opportunity to see him and hear him last week. What a phony! He's a long way from being a great piano player. I dared to mention this and I almost had to deal with the fan letters and ridden out of town on a rail. He has strong patrons.

Mind you, there's plenty of banging and plenty of flourishes, cross hair movements, full keyboard trills and hands being flung up in the air, but is it art? I submit that Liberace's first name is George—is a fair popular-song piano player, but everything else is flash, bang, showmanship and work of a first-class hair dresser.

And what he does to the classics should call for warrants served, bond fixed and trial ordered immediately. There have been some mighty desecrations upon serious music in our time—Tchikovsky and Rachmaninoff have been pulled inside out and returned to the dustbin of "Liberace and Full Moon and Empty Arms," but wait till you've heard Liberace.

I had the pleasure of hearing him last week, and if you could call it that—of Chopin works, by candlelight, yet, because, as he says, Chopin, who was a great pianist, was a pianist by candlelight. (Liberace is Italian-Polish.)

What a mish-mash it was; no ancestry, just a heartless picking of Chopin's music from his études, mazurkas and Polonaises, hoking it all up with a lot of cross-hand playing and "Liberace" trills.

This fellow, I thought, is making a million dollars for that and poor Morar, the greatest musical genius of the western world, was buried in a pauper's grave. Old ladies may think Liberace is "a dream." I think he's a drip.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round Evidence Shows Teamsters Took Bribes

Painters' Pay-Offs

What the committee was about to explore in Washington was a series of pay-offs to local painters' unions to undercut their own unions, break union contracts and in some cases use spray guns instead of brushes.

Specifically, the committee had Representative Robert L. Dwyer, D-N.Y., and Senator Charles McNichols, D-Ill., who had been paid by contractors to R. C. Lowry, secretary-treasurer of Painters District Council No. 51, C. H. Rhodes, financial secretary of Local 368; John E. Sullivan business agent for the District Council, and Archie Moore, also a business agent.

The evidence was developed because Moore had secretly sealed all his bribes in envelopes, recorded the circumstances under which they were paid, and communicated this information to nine other union officials in an effort to clean up the racket.

He was none other than cantankerous, unpredictable Clarence Hoffman of Michigan who in Detroit had demanded that the probe of the teamsters be continued. But in Washington last week, he voted the other way.

Washington, and which made a deal on Sept. 12, 1951 to make six monthly payments of \$500 in order to avoid labor troubles. The money, according to Moore, was divided between Lowry, Rhodes, Sullivan and himself.

Also at Andrews Field, Moore personally collected \$500 from Michael Restuccia, a tapping contractor, who wished to avoid labor trouble. The money was split, \$168 each, with Lowry and Sullivan, and the contractor hastily signed up.

Painting Capitol Dome  
At one time, trouble arose over painting the Capitol dome. The Capitol architect, David Lynn, had signed with a contractor who imported painters outside the District of Columbia. Painters' union leaders threatened to fly helicopters around the Capitol with signs reading "unfair to organized labor," the contractor hastily signed up.

The House committee also has evidence that Lowry had negotiated another pay-off from Robert M. Minte, president of Edward W. Minte Co., who wanted to spray the Forest Glenn Hospital. Lowry paid Minte from the Southern Hotel in Baltimore while Moore was in the room.

Democratic congressmen who balked at further committee investigation last week said they were not opposed to going into the matter of painters' playing payoffs; that this was a relatively small matter, did not represent the great majority of honest labor unions, and that the chairman Bender's committee has been unfair and anti-labor in its overall approach.

Simultaneously, top leaders of both the CIO and AFL have taken the initiative in trying to clean out racketeering. Dave Beck, international head of the teamsters, responded some time ago, top Michigan leaders after learning of racketeering in the Detroit area.

And George Meany, acting with Beck and Paul Hayes, head of the Seafarers union, precipitated the clean-up of the New York waterfront after most of the big shipping companies had shown a preference for dealing with old, gut-ridden longshoremen's union.

It is because some employers would rather make pay-offs than live up to fair labor standards that causes racketeering, AFL-CIO spokesmen contend.

Labor Union Funds

Democratic congressmen who balked at further committee investigation last week said they were not opposed to going into the matter of painters' playing payoffs; that this was a relatively small matter, did not represent the great majority of honest labor unions, and that the chairman Bender's committee has been unfair and anti-labor in its overall approach.

Simultaneously, top leaders of both the CIO and AFL have taken the initiative in trying to clean out racketeering. Dave Beck, international head of the teamsters, responded some time ago, top Michigan leaders after learning of racketeering in the Detroit area.

And George Meany, acting with Beck and Paul Hayes, head of the Seafarers union, precipitated the clean-up of the New York waterfront after most of the big shipping companies had shown a preference for dealing with old, gut-ridden longshoremen's union.

It is because some employers would rather make pay-offs than live up to fair labor standards that causes racketeering, AFL-CIO spokesmen contend.