THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

Thomas L. Robinson ..... *President and Publisher*
Brodie S. Griffith ..... *General Manager*
R. J. Alander ..... *Advertising Director*
Cecil Prince ..... *Associate Editor*
Thomas G. Fesperman ..... *Managing Editor*
W. W. Sirmon ..... *Circulation Manager*

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1955

Intramurals: Athletics For Everybody

THE number of Charlotte junior high schools is increasing. The student population of each is decreasing. The money to support interscholastic athletic programs, derived chiefly from student ticket sales, consequently is being reduced, so much so that junior high school principals recommend that interscholastic programs be supplanted by intramural activities, confining inter-school events to senior highs.

It is a good plan now. It would have been a good plan even before the money problem inevitably edged in. This is not to say that interscholastic programs are faulty. But intramurals can do for the many what interscholastics do for the few. And if the City School Board must provide more funds for physical education the money ought to go into a program that will benefit the most students.

Eastway Junior High Principal J. D. Gault put it succinctly: "I can't see there's any question when it's a choice between a program that benefits 50 students at a school or one that benefits hundreds, the majority of the student body."

Even if money was not at issue, interscholastic events should not be emphasized to the exclusion of an adequate, varied athletic program that would encourage participation by all students. The latter should be the prime goal of the principals and the school board.

Intramurals can offer all the qualities of interscholastics—physical development, competition, excitement, teamwork, school spirit—and they can offer it to more. If the choice must be made, and the principals say it must, it shouldn't be difficult.

Civic Responsibility: Embarrassing

IT IS a slightly ludicrous commentary on the state of municipal morality when city councilmen feel they must publicly promise to do their duty and obey the law.

This was precisely the sense of Councilman James S. Smith's resolution pledging each member of the city's governing body to "put his own house in order with regard to smoke abatement" and "back up the enforcement of any smoke abatement ordinance now in existence or may be hereafter adopted."

It was adopted unanimously — after some grumbling about newspaper smokestacks by Councilman Herbert H. Baxter.

Perhaps a formal resolution was necessary, in view of the lack of enthusiasm some councilmen have for the enforcement of smoke abatement measures. But we can't help thinking that it is a little like making a postman swear that he will deliver the mail or asking a fireman to promise to fight fires instead of lolling around the station house when the alarm goes off.

Public office is said to be a public trust. When individuals assume that trust willingly they are expected to live up to all of the accompanying responsibilities. They are expected to support the law too—just like the common people.

It is too bad that certain rather glaring civic responsibilities are so little understood that they must be recommitted to memory—and to paper—by the Council at this late date. There must have been something terribly embarrassing about the whole thing.

Coach Barclay: The Forgotten Adage

IF DRAMATISTS rather than alumni charted futures of football coaches George Barclay might save his UNC job by pulling off a magnificent upset of Duke at Chapel Hill tomorrow. You know—coach in trouble, team inspired, scores great upset, carries coach on shoulders, his contract renewed, his wife smiling again, happy ending and all that. But there's more than the turn of a TV dial between soap opera and football. The one turns trouble into happiness, the other defeat into unemployed coaches. One's make-believe, one's business.

Although we do feel some of the sympathy Coach Barclay says he doesn't want, we are in no mood to sing sad songs for him. True, the coach is of good report. He's popular with his students, takes a healthy interest in campus affairs, sees that his charges play hard, and, as the DAILY TAR HEEL said about this time last year, he gets to work on time.

It's also true that he had to play what he terms a "murderous" schedule, including Oklahoma, Notre Dame and Maryland against whom it is almost impossible to win even a moral victory.

But his team didn't WIN, WIN, WIN, WIN, WIN, WIN, WIN, WIN, WIN. So far this year it's been WIN, WIN, WIN, and LOSE, LOSE, LOSE, LOSE, LOSE, LOSE. And Saturday, barring an upset, it will be LOSE again. This is no way to run a business.

Coach Barclay, in his plight, must remember the ancient alumni adage:

When the Great Old Grad comes to write against your name—He marks—whether you won or lost—not how you played the game.

A Stamp For Grandma Moses?

GRANDMA MOSES, a grand old lady in years, but a fairly young figure in the art world, had an exhibition of her work Nov. 27 in New York. WIDE WORLD, Dave Garroway's able television vehicle, put a couple of its 72 cameras on the scene. As they ground away, the famous artist was interviewed by actress Lillian Gish. Suddenly, in the course of conversation, Miss Gish suggested brightly that the Post Office Dept. issue a stamp commemorating Grandma's contribution to the nation's cultural heritage.

It was and is a delightful idea. Historical events, various organizations and U.S. heroes have had stamps issued in their honor. These commemoratives include everything from a salute to poultry to solemn acknowledgment of the first flight to Basra, Iraq. Unfortunately, many of the stamps have been outrageously garish and unimaginative. An issue commemorating the work of a significant American artist—and using one of her own canvases as the basis for its design—would be particularly refreshing.

Grandma Moses is a "people's artist" in every sense. Her bright and colorful primitives sing out with Americana. The simple way she applies brushes to canvas, the homey subjects she uses, strike a happy chord of nostalgia and warmth. There are over 1,000 paintings by Grandma and many of her winter scenes would be suitable reproduction as a Yuletide salute. Let Congress take note when it reconvenes in 1956.

From the Gastonia Gazette

'THEY SAY . . . .'

ALL TOO frequently you hear people begin a statement with . . . "They say . . ."

Where it ends, no one can tell.

Neither can anyone tell what damage such a statement can do.

Facts are facts and opinions are opinions, and, as such, can be judged for just what they are. But what does one do with generalization? Generalizations are opinions, stated as facts, based usually on a few actual incidents in the writer's or speaker's experience—and mostly on presumption.

Generalizations, though they seem to hypnotize a lot of people into belief, can be punctured like toy balloons by anyone who hasn't let his thinking apparatus run down.

If more people used "I believe" or "it is my opinion" or "it is sometimes true" instead of "it is so" and "it is always true," there would at least be a little less trouble in the world. And possibly fewer gullible people.

Every human being is an individual—each cast from a little different mold—each reacting a bit differently to situations and even, sometimes, themselves reacting in various ways to the same situation at different times. That makes rather impossible statements like "all Democrats are warmongers," or "all Republicans are money grabbers," or "all children are reflections of their parents."

It would be a dull life if there wasn't any variety in it.

Generalizing is a way of saying there isn't.

More and more kinfolks turn up on the congressional payroll, and the cure for that is going to be difficult. Congress passing a law forbidding a congressman to have relatives would be something! —NASHVILLE BANNER.

Local schoolboy visiting with his class in Washington, D. C., noticed this sign in a restaurant: "In case of atomic attack, keep calm. Pay check, then run like mad."—HIGH POINT ENTERPRISE.

Don't be too worried about these mechanical brains making man obsolete. Like all other great inventions—from the cigarette machine to TV—they still need somebody standing by to kick them when they won't work."—LEE COUNTY BULLTIN.

"See that man across the street? He spent nine years of his life running for public office." "What does he do now?" asked the friend. "Nothing. He finally got elected."—CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS.

Noting that many of the television headliners, like Edward R. Murrow and Ed Sullivan, are newspapermen, Jasper Shaw of the News staff asks: "I wonder when they have the time to get the paper out."—MOORE COUNTY NEWS.

—FOREIGN POLICY: A POLITICAL TINDERBOX—

Pious GOP Attitude Inflames Demo Memories Of 1952

By DORIS FLEESON

WASHINGTON

THE TOP Republicans who are trying to put foreign policy out of bounds in the 1956 campaign are giving the Democrats credit either for complete loss of memory or a truly unlimited capacity for Christian charity.

As a political maneuver their efforts are a flop. Democrats are inflamed by their pious attitudes, and observers are recalling with relish the proficiency shown by these same Republicans with foreign policy brickbats in 1952, 1953 and 1954.

GEORGE RETREATED

President Eisenhower first picked up approvingly a statement by Democrat Senator George of Georgia that foreign policy ought to be nonpartisan in an election year. Vice-President Nixon chimed in, supporting Eisenhower. Then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles got into the act, just as George was beating a retreat with the stand that "constructive criticism" was okay.

Dulles lustily called on both Republicans and Democrats to abstain from "partisan debate" in the coming campaign. He incautiously added that Republicans had an excellent record in this regard.

SECRETARY DULLES
A Lofty Plea

That did it. Democrats regard Eisenhower as an echo and Nixon as an imitator of whatever tactic seems most likely to succeed at the time. But Dulles in their view is the architect of what they call the slander that their failures in foreign policy were tainted with treason.

It was Dulles who wrote the foreign policy plank of the Republican platform in 1952 which charged that Democrats were carrying on the Korean War "without will to victory." The day Democrats in power in 1952 forget that phrase will be when they are carried out feet first to their eternal rest.

SPELLING

The Dulles plank spelled out the charge in many ingenious ways.

It said that Democrats had "shielded traitors to the nation in high places . . . they abandoned friendly nations . . . they substituted on our Pacific flank a murderous enemy for an ally and friend." The Truman Administration was attacked for "disloyalty in public office" and the Republican promise made that "we shall substitute . . . men of proven loyalty.

A special section was devoted to "communism." It featured "notorious infiltration of Communists and fellow travelers in key agencies." Again deploring the Truman administration's "tolerance of people of doubtful loyalty" it promised that "a Republican

SENATOR GEORGE
A Hasty Retreat

president will appoint only persons of unquestioned loyalty."

President Eisenhower backed this plank with his famous promise in Detroit: "I shall go to Korea." He said his purpose would be to "bring the Korean War to an early and honorable end." "The old administration," he charged, "cannot be expected to repair what it failed to prevent."

Vice-President Nixon made it personal. He attacked Democratic nominee Stevenson as "Adlai the appeaser. . . . A Ph D. graduate of Dean Acheson's cowardly college of Communist containment." He also called Stevenson a "dupe" who never regretted his action in defending Alger Hiss.

TELECAST

Nixon followed up the GOP victory with a memorable telecast in which he said: "And isn't it wonderful, folks, to have a secretary of state who will stand up to the Russians?" This, too, is engraved upon the hearts of many Democrats besides the immediate target, Acheson.

Still undaunted in 1954, Nixon spearheaded the Republican campaign for the Congress with imputations of softness toward communism on the part of Democratic candidates for the Senate and the party generally.

All this provoked former President Truman to some meaty epithets, shedding heat, not light, but avoiding the brand of treason. The most Stevenson could bring himself to do in 1952 was to remind Nixon in an indignant broadcast that one of the Ten Commandments forbade false witness.

Candidates' Character To Set Character Of Campaign

By WALTER LIPPMANN

NEW YORK

ALTHOUGH words like "moderate, constructive, non-partisan" are hard to define, it does not follow that they do not mean something important. There is in fact every indication that these adjectives express qualities which a preponderant majority are looking for in the next president. We need not boggle too much over the definitions. There are lots of things in this world which are hard to define in the abstract and yet are obvious enough in the concrete.

TAKE AN EGG

Take, for example, an egg. There is hardly an egg-eater in the country who could tell a press conference what a good egg is. But it is no problem at all to recognize a bad egg. It is just about as easy to recognize an immoderate, destructive, and partisan politician.

If, as we all hope, there is to be an honest, serious and public-spirited discussion of foreign affairs, there is only one way to go about getting it. That is to see to it that each party nominates the kind of man who does not and who will not stoop to extremism, violence, and demagoguery. If either of the candidates is the kind of man who thinks that he is entitled to do anything to win, no amount of pious talk now will save us from a poisonous campaign. The character of the coming campaign, will, in short, be determined by the character of the candidates.

REVISION NEEDED

During the months to come the country, regardless of the campaign, will be hearing a great deal about foreign affairs. That is because a re-appraisal, looking to a revision and a reinforcement in several sectors of our foreign policy, has become necessary. Our basic commitments to the United Nations, to our allies in NATO, to our neighbors, are not in question. But there is little doubt that we shall have to re-examine and to debate such matters as our German policy, which is perilously near being at a dead end, and certain aspects of our containment policy in the Middle East and South Asia.

The overall characteristic of the for these policies that have not situation is that, as of now, there is no clear issue on which Americans are divided and can take their stand and argue their side of the case. The old bi-partisanship consisted of a coalition of Republicans and Democrats who were for the United Nations, who were for the Marshall Plan and NATO and the like. The crux of the present situation is that the policies are not yet formed, that the policies have still to be hammered out, around which a bi-partisan coalition could be rallied.

This peculiar situation lends itself all too easily to aimless and irresponsible political talk. We shall not avoid that kind of talk by exhorting one another to be constructive. The bottom fact of the matter is that neither party and none of the candidates now has the answer to the questions that need to be answered. They are all seeking, or ought to be seeking, answers that have not yet been found.

PARTY LEADERS

The character of the campaign on foreign affairs will in the main be determined by the way the party leaders approach the search. The primary responsibility is with the administration, with the party in power. If they choose to stand pat, as Mr. Dulles seemed to be doing this week, they will precipitate a severe Democratic assault on the record of the results. Our position abroad has in fact deteriorated. It is easy to prove it. It is known to every disinterested observer. Mr. Dulles will be making the mistake of his life if he stands pat on his policies and the record.

The alternative is for the Republicans to take the lead in recognizing that the world situation has changed and is changing, and that United States policies must be adapted to these new developments. This is not only a sound approach, it is the best political approach. For if the Republicans stand pat, the Democrats have only to criticize. If the Republicans re-appraise, review, and prepare to revise, the Democrats have to be "constructive," have, that is to say to propose answers to the unanswered questions.

On the Democratic side, the question is also whether they choose to stand pat or whether they put themselves in the position of looking honestly for the answers to the new developments. Standing pat and pretending that everything was going splendidly until the Republicans came in. In my view, the acid test of whether a Democrat is being unpartisan and "constructive" is whether he admits that at least some of our worst problems today originated in mistakes made by the Democrats.

I refer, for example, to the premature attempt to re-arm Germany in 1950 which has ruined the promising movement towards a European community, to the irreparable mistake of crossing the 38th parallel in Korea which turned a U. N. police action into a Chinese-American war, to the over-militarization of the containment policy which has jeopardized our relations with India and several other uncommitted nations.

Perhaps we should add to our specifications, saying that in addition to moderation, constructiveness, non-partisanship, we are looking also for some self-criticism and that most unpolitical of all qualities, a saving humility.

Real Facts Vs. Rosy Picture: The Debate Will Go On

By THE ALSOPS

WASHINGTON

THE ROW about bi-partisanship in foreign policy has thus far involved Adlai Stevenson, Averell Harriman and the Democratic National Committee on one side, and on the other, Senator Walter George, Harold Stassen, John Foster Dulles and the President himself.

In short, this is already a very majestic row indeed. But it is quite certain to continue and to grow worse unless the Eisenhower administration decides to resolve the glaring contradiction between the rosy picture of affairs that is given to the public, and the real state of affairs in the world.

PERILOUS

It is not criticism of the administration; it is a simple statement of fact, to say that the present state of affairs in the world is both perilous and ominous. All you have to do is make what the diplomats call a "tour of the horizon" in order to see that this is so.

The same papers that carried the President's call for a return to bi-partisanship also carried on-the-spot reports that Afghanistan is on the way to becoming a Soviet satellite, and that Burma, which used to be one of the most hopeful countries in Asia, is now being deeply penetrated by Soviet economic influence.

NEUTRAL DRIFT

The position in the Formosa Strait is uglier than ever. The position in Indo-China is a little better than six months ago, but still dangerous in the extreme. The position in Malaya, where a Communist take-over in Singapore is now a serious possibility, has grown worse than anyone could have foreseen. Even in Thailand, once so strongly allied to this country, a strong trend towards neutralism has lately been reported on good authority.

In the Middle East, meanwhile, the Soviet arms sales to Egypt and the other Arab states are only the opening gambit in a campaign to expel Western influence from this whole strategically vital area. Secretary of State Dulles himself has privately characterized the Soviet drive into the Middle East as an event potentially "more serious" than the original aggression in Korea.

In Germany, there is increasing danger that the grand nightmare of Western diplomacy will become reality in the fairly near future. As high an authority as George F. Kennan has already predicted that the Germans will finally abandon their alliance with the West, in order to buy from the Soviets.

In Japan, a similar reversal of alliances will clearly become probable, if further Communist victories in Southeast Asia convince the Japanese that the bandwagon is traveling in the Communist direction.

Add to all this, finally, the state of affairs most recently symbolized by the new Soviet H-bomb test. Remember that in all critical categories of arms, the Soviets are now catching up to this country. Remember further that in certain important categories, such as jet fighters and long range guided missiles, the Soviets have actually drawn ahead. Consider the total impact of this change in the weapons balance when added to the threatened changes in the world strategic balance listed above. The addition is not encouraging.

TWO TEAMS

Furthermore, besides stimulating Messrs. Stevenson and Harriman to view with alarm, this same melancholy addition had already another result that may prove even more significant. In effect, it has caused the Eisenhower team to split into two teams.

And the viewpoint of the first team nonetheless differs very widely from that of the second team. At present the second team comprises an astonishingly large number of men on the higher staff levels of policy-making in both the State and Defense Departments, and even the White House itself. The second team of the Eisenhower administration adds up the world situation just about as it has been added up in this report. And the second team is already convinced — very passionately convinced — that most urgent measures are now needed if the worst sort of trouble is to be avoided.

Thus far, several key figures of whom Secretary Dulles is by far the most significant, have not finally chosen which team they will play on.

'We Want To Spread Technical Know-How'

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

White House To Ditch Dr. Scheele

WASHINGTON

IT isn't supposed to be known outside the White House, but Assistant President Sherman Adams has decided to ditch the embattled surgeon-general and scapegoat of the Salk snafu, Dr. Leonard Scheele.

Adams already has Scheele's successor in mind—Dr. Jack Masur, chief of Public Health's medical services.

Bad Batches

Dr. Scheele became a front-page figure during the controversy over the Salk anti-polio vaccine. Oveta Culp Hobby, then secretary of health, education and welfare, tried to pin the blame on Scheele for the bad batches of vaccine that hit the public.

While the Public Health Service was responsible for testing the vaccine, the fact is that Scheele had urged Mrs. Hobby to begin preparing months before. At the last minute she was responsible for rushing the Salk vaccine to the public and actually got sore when newsreels and photographers were not able to take pictures of her on schedule because Scheele urged more time.

Term's Up

Before the controversy died down, however, Scheele's name was dragged through the headlines, and now he'll be dropped as public health chief when his term expires in March.

Meanwhile, Scheele has got wind that he may lose his job, and is doing his best to ingratiate himself with the Republicans. For he attended a ceremony in Kansas City to watch some subordinates receive annual Lasker Foundation Awards for outstanding medical service.

Ex-President Truman was invited by the foundation to make a non-political speech and Scheele was so nervous about appearing on the same platform with Truman that he ducked out of the ceremony before his subordinates were honored.

If this was supposed to make him a hero to the new secretary of health, education and welfare, it backfired. Secretary Marion Folsom, when he heard about Scheele's hasty exit, was not pleased.

No Tax Cut

If you're trying to figure out your tax cuts for the end of this year and are wondering whether taxes will be lower next year, you can write it down as almost certain that there will be no change.

Congress is sure to talk a lot and perhaps vote for a tax cut, but President Eisenhower has given a very private but definite assurance to Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey that there will be no tax cut. In brief, Ike has promised to veto any tax reduction voted by Congress.

Humphrey's great ambition is to get the budget balanced, and he expects to pull the Treasury out of the red by June 30. Only after this happens will Humphrey consider cutting personal income taxes which will come ahead of corporate or excise tax reductions.

Propagandists for school segregation who are mailing out speeches by Sen. Eastland of Mississippi may get in trouble with the Justice Department.

It's against the law for someone else to use a congressman's frank, and he has no power to transfer it. Justice Department officials are looking over 39 U. S. Code, Sec. 335, and 18 U. S. Code, Sec. 1718, which state that a senator cannot "lend said frank or permit its use by any committee, organization, or association, or permit its use by any person for the benefit or use of any committee, organization, or association."