

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

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1954

Forcing The Issue Is Dubious Strategy

WHEN the Supreme Court handed down its recent opinion declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional, it delayed issuing formal decrees. This left in a kind of legal void not only state and local statutes governing schools, but also segregation by law and by custom in many other areas of human relations.

It was in this atmosphere that a test was made this week of the policy of segregating diners in the new restaurant at Municipal Airport. Yesterday a spokesman for a group of Negro residents of Charlotte appeared before the City Council and said that his group had been refused service in the main dining room and coffee shop at the airport restaurant.

Since the immediate question is one of law, the Council properly referred the matter to City Attorney John Shaw.

It will be interesting to see what opinion Mr. Shaw comes up with if the City of Charlotte were operating the restaurant. It is doubtful that discrimination because of race would be legal. However, the restaurant space is leased to a private operator. And the legal question is whether his authority as a private restaurant operator is diminished because the space he leased is public property, having been paid for jointly by the City of Charlotte and the federal government.

In this incident may be seen the forerunner of many problems that will beset the South in the years ahead. The more impetuous leaders among the Negro race will not be inclined to wait for court clarification of the segregation laws. They will probably try to force the issue in all public and quasi-public services. That may be a profitable short-range strategy, but over the longer period it will make it far more difficult for reasonable men of both races to try to resolve the longstanding differences. To that extent, it will delay the very objectives sought by those who force the issues.

Terminal Relocation Movement Grows

THE Chamber of Commerce and the City Council merit a vote of thanks for throwing their combined weight behind a move to encourage the Southern Railway to relocate its freight terminal at the fringe of the city.

Secretly before the members of the freight terminal fire had grown cold last week, The News suggested that the fire had given Charlotte the opportunity of a lifetime to do something that would benefit the railroad, the city, and the general public.

The relocation of the terminal, (1) the opening up of 3rd and 1st streets, now dead-ended at the Southern tracks, (2) the adoption of setback ordinances for all streets in the area bounded by E. 4th St., S. College St., Independence Blvd., and S. McDowell St. (3) the long range development of new commercial property in the area, and (5) use of the railroad right-of-way to develop multi-story parking garages.

The Chamber of Commerce resolution read to the City Council by President C. W. Gitchrist did not cover all these points, and it substituted the resolution

any plan of using the railroad's right-of-way for the construction of a north-south thruway. But it generally covered the same concept of converting what has been an area of great congestion into useful and desperately needed traffic facilities.

Officials of the Southern, already beset with the innumerable problems growing out of the disastrous terminal fire, quite understandably have had nothing to say about the relocation of the station. Reports, however, they have long been interested in moving their freight operations out of the heart of the city. And there is no reason to believe they will not favor some general plan like that proposed by the Chamber of Commerce and the Council.

Owners of property within the area described ought to interest themselves in the proposal. To their investment will become immeasurably more valuable if the area is made accessible to heavy automobile traffic by opening up the bottlenecks at the railroad tracks and widening all streets within the area.

An Opportunity For The Commissioners

NORTH CAROLINA'S antiquated justice of the peace system has finally received due attention from the N. C. Bar Association. It directed the State Judicial Council, which is composed of lawyers and judges, to find a way to eliminate abuses into the jaypee system, paying particular attention to the jaypees' handling of traffic cases.

In addition, the lawyers pointed out an opportunity for Mecklenburg's Board of County Commissioners.

The association noted that a 1949 law permits county commissioners to limit the number of magistrates in a county, and put them on a salary instead of the present fee basis. Mecklenburg is one of the 26 counties granted his authority.

But so far no county has availed itself of the opportunity to do away with the fee system, which has been a main cause of the jaypee system's abuse. Mecklenburg commissioners have an opportunity here to lead a desirable reform.

Beyond that, we would like to emphasize that the State Judicial Council should not become so engrossed in maladministration of traffic cases that it neglects other inadequacies in the jaypee system.

These inadequacies are illustrated by attention to during the trial year. In Edgecombe County, for instance, 49 couples who thought they were married found out they were not. The commission of the jaypee who married them had expired before the ceremonies were performed.

In Craven County a cab driver was illegally thrown in jail because a jaypee exceeded, or didn't know the limitations on, his lawful powers.

In Yadkin County a jaypee skipped town, taking with him funds that should have been turned in months previously.

The point is, the whole system of minor court justice needs thorough scrutiny, followed by recommendations to the General Assembly. That is what the people of North Carolina expect from the State Judicial Council.

From The Salisbury Post

A MYSTERY SURVIVES

TO THE BEST of our knowledge the appellation "S.O.B." was used in a staff-writer story for the first time in a Salisbury Post just a few days ago.

It had appeared previously in copy written out of town—notably in the late unpleasantness between former President Harry S. Truman and Drew Pearson. But Post writers, until now, had resorted to the familiar "employed ordinarily by the major news syndicates in necessity for direct quotation."

The phrase has long been generously current in the American language, and not even yet has it taken on the affectionate undertones which simple "bastard" has won in effete cocktail circles of the metropolitan East and the painting-hardened outposts of Florida and California.

Often when we hear it, or see it in print, we are reminded of the special appearance of the late Laurence Stallings as a lecturer for a UNC English composition class one morning back in 1928.

Stallings, famous at the time as author of WHAT PUZZE GLOVE, one of the pioneer war-equals-profanity-absolutely-and-blasphemy novels, limped in, took a stance and began his lecture with: "A human is a biological impossibility."

He apparently wanted to startle his listeners into immediate attention, and he did; there were four or five graduate coeds in the class of 25 or 30 students; so in that callow day, everybody concentrated on being embarrassed for the first five minutes of the lecture.

The remainder of it, as we recall, was very profitable. We can't remember, however, that

Q—In the simplest terms, Dr. Hammond, how many years may a heavy smoker shorten his life? Is he cutting off one year or five years from the normal span?

A—We don't know that because we have only had this restricted age group in the study so far. In addition, these findings are very, very new, and I haven't had time to study them with as much care as I want to from that standpoint. I can tell you that the death rates among regular cigarette smokers are the same as the death rates among non-smokers—people who never smoked—who are five years older.

Q—But you might be adding five years to your life by not smoking?

A—Something like that. You might say that smoking ages a man around five years.

Q—Do you feel that the sample that was taken is adequate to support the conclusions drawn?

A—I think it is adequate to support all the conclusions we've drawn from it.

Q—What, in everyday language would you say these findings suggest?

A—I think these findings very strongly suggest that smoking increases the death rate, at least among white males between the ages of 50 and 69, which is the group we studied.

Q—Does that mean the smoking they did prior to the time they were 50 is responsible, or that the smoking that they do between 50 and 69 is responsible?

A—That we do not know. Two diseases are primarily concerned—one is cancer and the other is heart disease. If I had to make a guess on it, I would guess that the cancer is a long-term effect. That is, it takes many years of smoking to produce the result. On the other hand, I would be more inclined to say that the effect on the heart disease was more acute—that is, recent smoking would be more important for this disease. But that is only a guess, we don't really know that.

Q—What if you stopped smoking at 50. If you had smoked from 20 to 50—would that be helpful?

A—My guess is that it might be helpful, but again there is no proof one way or the other. The statistical evidence we have does

The Effect Of Smoking On Cancer, Heart Disease

(Editors' Note: The following is excerpted from a copyrighted interview in "U. S. News & World Report," an independent weekly news magazine published in Washington. The editors of the magazine put the questions, which are answered by Dr. E. Hammond, of the American Cancer Society. He has been conducting one of the most extensive research projects in medical history on the health histories of 157,746 smokers and non-smokers.)

not hear on that subject, mainly because there are so very few men who smoked cigarettes heavily in their youth and then gave up—no-entirely, recently. It gave it up because they had some serious disease and their doctor told them they had to stop smoking. Naturally they are going to die sooner.

Q—Were you surprised by the fact that so much of the data indicates that the heart and the heart are related to smoking?

A—No, I was not. Before the studies began I was just as suspicious of the data as you are. Q—But has it been generally accepted heretofore that diseases of the heart are related to smoking?

A—Oh, there is a great deal of experimental evidence that smoking has an effect upon the heart. This work has been done by a number of different investigators and is well summarized in a paper by Dr. J. H. Weatherly. Twenty or 30 people have checked the heart rate, the blood pressure and the effect of smoking on the small blood vessels. Smoking a few cigarettes causes a rise in blood pressure, a rise in heart rate and a constriction of the small vessels.

Q—What I mean is, how widespread is that theory being put into your study?

A—Well, I've heard few people express any doubts about it. Q—Has the public been thinking in terms of cancer?

A—I think that is fair to say. It is very dangerous to say what the general opinion is because different doctors have different opinions, but it is my impression that the great majority of doctors for many years have told their patients that they've got to stop smoking. That has been the general opinion for a very long time.

Q—What has been the average person's reaction when a doctor has told his patient to stop smoking—has it been one of skepticism?

A—No, I don't think so. Q—Is this latest statistical finding of yours the most conspicuous piece of proof we've had on the relationship between smoking and a heart condition?

A—Statistically, this is the only direct proof I know of. The idea that smoking is dangerous to somebody who has had a heart attack, I think, has been widely accepted by the medical profession. But there was no previous statistical proof of it.

Q—So that your findings are important and significant evidence in relation to heart conditions for much as they are significant evidence in relation to cancer?

A—Oh, the heart findings are at least as interesting as the cancer findings.

Q—What is your theory as to that?

A—Because many more deaths



Regular Cigarette Smoking May Age A Man Five Years

'I've Switched To A Pipe' Said Dr. Cuyler Hammond

But It Would Be Better 'Not To Smoke At All'

are involved—well over half the total number of deaths were related to coronary heart disease. Let me say it this way: The relative effect was not as great in heart as in cancer—that is, the chances of somebody dying of coronary attack was increased 35 per cent by heavy cigarette smoking. The chances of dying of cancer were increased by 155 per cent.

Q—But they are both pretty big so far as the layman is concerned.

A—Yes, they certainly are. Q—So that actually your findings say, do they not, that a greater number of people actually die as a result of cigarette smoking in its association with heart conditions than the number of people who die in the association of cancer to cigarette smoking?

A—Oh, yes. Q—Therefore, in order to provide some corrective or some means of eliminating the deleterious substance from cigarette smoking, it would mean that far more lives would be saved if we could find the secret of that substance in so far as heart conditions are concerned than would be the case with respect to cancer?

A—I think that is almost certainly true, yes. Probably removing all the nicotine would be more important than anything else.

Q—Could cigarettes give pleasure to the person who does the smoking if the nicotine were removed completely?

A—Oh, yes. Well, I hope they do. I am not against cigarette smoking if it can be made safe. I hope the tobacco companies can find a solution.

A—For fear there is a great deal of evidence that it is nicotine. Now, we can't rule out the possibility that it's carbon monoxide.

ide, but it certainly appears that it's nicotine. There are two effects—the increasing heart rate and increasing blood pressure, and the constriction of small blood vessels—which are, as far as we can make out, entirely to a nicotine.

Q—What about the tars?

A—Well, there has been a lot of discussion about the word "tar." People have made the distinction between the word "tar" and the word "nicotine." Actually, when experimental workers talk about "tar," the word merely means a mixture of substances, for example, material that can be collected by the condensation of cigarette smoke.

It's not a scientific term. It doesn't identify any particular substance—it simply means a mixture of substances.

Q—Does it make any difference whether a person inhales Q or not?

A—We did not ask that question of the men we studied because many people inhale unknowingly and could not have answered the question correctly. Therefore, we had no direct statistical information on that. It would be my guess that inhaling is more dangerous than not inhaling.

Q—What do you think a heavy smoker should do under all these circumstances? Is it wise to cut down on his smoking, or give it up altogether?

A—Well, I can tell you what I've done—I've switched to a pipe. Q—That would be your own apprehension, but when you are giving advice to others, what kind of advice would you give—based on the study?

A—If somebody asked my advice, I'd suggest that he didn't smoke.

Q—All or not heavily?

A—I would say it would be better for him not to smoke at all, but smoking heavily is worse. A pipe is less dangerous than a cigarette.

Q—There is no doubt but that pipe and cigar smoking are less dangerous than cigarettes, is that right?

Q—Do you have any evidence that shows that persons who use a filter-tip cigarette are perhaps less susceptible to adverse effects

from smoking than others? We have no information on that.

Q—What is your guess as to that?

A—I hate to make a guess on it. Q—Well, does the filter actually exclude the nicotine?

Q—Why would a pipe be less dangerous than a cigarette? You get nicotine out of that, too, don't you?

A—All that I know is that the death rates were a lot lower. Beyond that I can only guess. What these two types of tobacco used in the pipe stem. You know, almost all pipes have condensers in them, and even if they are not, they get a filter that lets through the good taste part—that what we want to smoke for—and cuts down the danger.

Q—What about a pipe, he less dangerous than a cigarette? You get nicotine out of that, too, don't you?

A—All that I know is that the death rates were a lot lower. Beyond that I can only guess. What these two types of tobacco used in the pipe stem. You know, almost all pipes have condensers in them, and even if they are not, they get a filter that lets through the good taste part—that what we want to smoke for—and cuts down the danger.

Q—What about a pipe, he less dangerous than a cigarette? You get nicotine out of that, too, don't you?

A—All that I know is that the death rates were a lot lower. Beyond that I can only guess. What these two types of tobacco used in the pipe stem. You know, almost all pipes have condensers in them, and even if they are not, they get a filter that lets through the good taste part—that what we want to smoke for—and cuts down the danger.

Q—What about a pipe, he less dangerous than a cigarette? You get nicotine out of that, too, don't you?

A—All that I know is that the death rates were a lot lower. Beyond that I can only guess. What these two types of tobacco used in the pipe stem. You know, almost all pipes have condensers in them, and even if they are not, they get a filter that lets through the good taste part—that what we want to smoke for—and cuts down the danger.

Q—What about a pipe, he less dangerous than a cigarette? You get nicotine out of that, too, don't you?

A—All that I know is that the death rates were a lot lower. Beyond that I can only guess. What these two types of tobacco used in the pipe stem. You know, almost all pipes have condensers in them, and even if they are not, they get a filter that lets through the good taste part—that what we want to smoke for—and cuts down the danger.

Q—What about a pipe, he less dangerous than a cigarette? You get nicotine out of that, too, don't you?

A—All that I know is that the death rates were a lot lower. Beyond that I can only guess. What these two types of tobacco used in the pipe stem. You know, almost all pipes have condensers in them, and even if they are not, they get a filter that lets through the good taste part—that what we want to smoke for—and cuts down the danger.

'Happy New Fiscal Year'



Llew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

IT was Harry Truman's determination never to let down a friend, even a controversial friend, that contributed in part to his illness.

His doctors didn't advertise it, but for some time the ex-President has been somewhat under the weather. To them his sudden seizure in the wings of the "Call Me Madam" performance was not entirely a surprise. They had tried to get him to curtail his activities, and strongly advised that he cancel a night he had made with his old friend James O'Connell, head of the musicians' union, to attend the musicians' annual convention in Milwaukee.

Months ago Petrillo had invited Truman to be the union's guest of honor and to play a little piano-trumpet dittie together with the band.

However, when Truman's doctors told him he would have to curtail his activities until cooler weather, he reluctantly said Petrillo his regrets. The show, he said, was off.

People's Platform

The Danger Lies In Thought Domination

Myrtle Beach, S. C. Editors, The News

IN the past few years we have had our confidence shaken from time to time by a system of communistic infiltration of our government. Sen. McCarthy has arisen in the national platform to browbeat and insult generals, secretaries and even the President. He has made many statements and permitted many to be made which were without facts enough for a conviction in court of law and made irresponsible as regards the victims' rights.

Now the facts are these: During the period of World War II the President and his advisors actually allowed much material to be carried out of our nation officially that should have stayed here and if anyone didn't steal these secrets, they were freely given to them, under consular and diplomatic seal in many cases on our own planes.

Then the style changed. People who formerly were doing as they were told are now being classed as subversives and browbeaten for possibly mistaken ideas and ideals.

It is not a brief for any of this procedure. None of this data should have left our nation and no great liberties should now be taken with our secrets. But remember this, when we let a

Truman Is Forever Loyal To Friends

raised a little money to hire a bodyguard for his days as ex-President, but Harry hadn't needed him, doesn't want him, and if anyone around Kansas City ever thought of touching a hair of Harry Truman's head, no police could ever protect him. HST

Small of the Kansas City News Press the reason why he didn't have any mind air cooling. "I don't mind air cooling," he said, "but if I had it in here people would stay too long." It was Mrs. Truman who overruled her husband's oft-repeated views on air cooling the other day and insisted that the hospital move him from Kansas City's 100-degree heat in an ornate room into an air-conditioned room.

When I was in Kansas City last January interviewing the former President for television he told me something that illustrates his ideas about gratitude and friends. He also shows some comparisons with the McCarthy committee.

It is not exactly a secret that for a long time President Truman had no

great regard for me, but it was not known how far he sometimes carried that "lack of affection." Once, however, he almost turned me down on Claydon Fritchey for a position on the White House staff because Fritchey knew me.

I had known Fritchey first when he was on the Cleveland Press, later as editor of the New Orleans Item, later as public-relations adviser to the Secretary of Defense. It was when Fritchey came up for appointment as a White House secretary, Howard McGrath, then attorney general, warned the President that Fritchey was a close friend of mine (McGrath's Justice Department had been tapping my phone).

So Harry Truman asked Fritchey how well he knew me. He said Fritchey was a friend of mine, Clayton replied. "But that isn't going to interfere with my work. You have your friends too, some of whom I may not approve of, but I'm not going to ask you to give up your friends."

Truman's loyalty to friends of course was what caused him more trouble than anything else in the White House. Clayton got the job.

When I was in Kansas City last January interviewing the former President for television he told me something that illustrates his ideas about gratitude and friends. He also shows some comparisons with the McCarthy committee.

It is not exactly a secret that for a long time President Truman had no

great regard for me, but it was not known how far he sometimes carried that "lack of affection." Once, however, he almost turned me down on Claydon Fritchey for a position on the White House staff because Fritchey knew me.

I had known Fritchey first when he was on the Cleveland Press, later as editor of the New Orleans Item, later as public-relations adviser to the Secretary of Defense. It was when Fritchey came up for appointment as a White House secretary, Howard McGrath, then attorney general, warned the President that Fritchey was a close friend of mine (McGrath's Justice Department had been tapping my phone).

So Harry Truman asked Fritchey how well he knew me. He said Fritchey was a friend of mine, Clayton replied. "But that isn't going to interfere with my work. You have your friends too, some of whom I may not approve of, but I'm not going to ask you to give up your friends."

Truman's loyalty to friends of course was what caused him more trouble than anything else in the White House. Clayton got the job.

When I was in Kansas City last January interviewing the former President for television he told me something that illustrates his ideas about gratitude and friends. He also shows some comparisons with the McCarthy committee.

It is not exactly a secret that for a long time President Truman had no

great regard for me, but it was not known how far he sometimes carried that "lack of affection." Once, however, he almost turned me down on Claydon Fritchey for a position on the White House staff because Fritchey knew me.

I had known Fritchey first when he was on the Cleveland Press, later as editor of the New Orleans Item, later as public-relations adviser to the Secretary of Defense. It was when Fritchey came up for appointment as a White House secretary, Howard McGrath, then attorney general, warned the President that Fritchey was a close friend of mine (McGrath's Justice Department had been tapping my phone).

So Harry Truman asked Fritchey how well he knew me. He said Fritchey was a friend of mine, Clayton replied. "But that isn't going to interfere with my work. You have your friends too, some of whom I may not approve of, but I'm not going to ask you to give up your friends."