



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher
J. E. DOWD, General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH, Executive Editor

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1955

Vote 'Yes' For Charlotte Progress

GREAT cities are not carved in cameo. They are the products of broad, imaginative planning. Realistic objectives, aggressive action, big tools—these are the basic requirements.

The history of civic progress in Charlotte has been one of sharp contrasts. Usually success has come to the big ventures while smaller undertakings have dawdled. But occasionally the tendency has been to ponder, wrangle, raise objections that might be overcome by aggressive action—wait—then forget, or come in with too little too late. That is when Charlotteans have shirked their responsibilities.

Civic responsibilities will hang heavy over the heads of citizens who go to the polls in tomorrow's municipal election.

On two sheets of paper they will have to vote "yes" or "no" on seven big tools designed to carve progress out of promise. These will be seven big bond issues proposed for the construction of new schools (\$5 million), streets (\$750,000),

water facilities (\$6 million), a health center (\$500,000), spastics hospital (\$190,000), a fire station (\$200,000) and completion of the Auditorium-Coliseum (\$988,000).

The choice must be made for progress. Individually, some of the bond proposals are more important than others. For instance, the school and water bonds are absolute "musts." They are vital answers to basic, urgent needs. And certainly Charlotteans have a responsibility to see that work is completed on the Auditorium-Coliseum. But all seven items represent worthy aims and worthy projects. All seven offer unique opportunities to make Charlotte a better community.

Money and blueprints are not all that is needed to build a greater metropolis, however. An aroused and vigorous public consciousness is an obvious basic ingredient. We hope to see not only an affirmative vote for progress—but a large affirmative vote.

Minimum Wage: Adjustment Needed

NEITHER the National Association of Manufacturers nor its North Carolina spokesman distinguished themselves last week in testifying against an increase in the federal minimum wage. Beyond that the Tar Heel spokesman, Thomas O. Moore, chairman of NAM's industrial relations committee, drew unwarranted conclusions regarding the effect of minimum wage legislation. It is particularly important in a state like North Carolina whose legislature has consistently refused to pass any kind of state minimum wage legislation, that the nature and effect of such legislation be clearly understood.

Mr. Moore told a Senate Labor subcommittee that if he had his way, he would repeal the Wage and Hour Law. At least, he contended, coverage should be narrowed instead of widened. New businesses and existing small businesses, he said, "are likely to be hard hit by any legislative and artificial general increase which would surely follow on the heels of any higher new minimum."

Perhaps Mr. Moore should not be singled out for criticism, being but one of many industrialists, particularly in the South, who foresee doom if minimum wages are raised.

They continue fearful even though their predictions are regularly proven erroneous. They feared the 25 cent minimum enacted in 1938, the wartime 40 cents and the 75 cent minimum of 1950.

Actually, "the areas that were most sharply affected by the minimum-wage increase enjoyed a greater growth in manufacturing employment than the rest of the country." That we have on the authority of Dr. Sar A. Levitan, economist on the staff of the Legislative Ref-

erence Service of the Library of Congress.

Furthermore, intensive Labor Department studies on the economic effects of the 75-cent floor, published in the March issue of the MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW, showed that the dire predictions did not materialize, that the wage increase did not decrease employment, that the legislation tended "to improve the position of the employes involved by increasing earnings in the affected industries, and that the relative improvement was substantially maintained."

Additionally, the law had a beneficial effect on wages paid employes not directly covered by the law, but employed in areas including covered workers.

However, according to Dr. Levitan, "in the absence of minimum wage pressure the relative earning position of the low-paid industries has tended to worsen."

The minimum wage principle is sound. But the formula needs adjustment now for several different reasons. First, it has failed to keep pace with the general increase in wages. Second, the minimum wage has lagged behind increases in living costs and productivity. Furthermore, an upward adjustment of the minimum wage is needed to maintain a decent, minimum standard of living for many Americans.

President Eisenhower has been stressing another extremely important point. The law ought to cover more workers. Many millions are excluded from federal and state laws and their earnings are substantially below those in covered industries.

A reasonable increase in the minimum wage will not ruin North Carolina. On the contrary, it is the kind of economic improvement to which Tar Heels are entitled in an expanding economy.

'What This Country Needs....'

SOMETHING is happening in the United States to some old worn-out images. Peter F. Drucker, writing in the May HARVARD, says the middle classes and working people—through pension funds and investment trusts—have replaced the millionaire capitalist as the major owners of American industry.

In the same issue, John Fischer says, "What this country needs is a good five-cent word to describe itself." He maintains that the nation's new society is neither the "capitalism of Adam Smith" nor "free enterprise" as Andrew Carnegie described it.

What we call it doesn't matter. The point is that Americans are finally beginning to clear the air of a lot of ideological nonsense. That goes for the

field of politics as well as economics.

For far too long, a lot of Americans have inherited their viewpoints from "political fundamentalists" who can reduce the shadings of any political and economic problem to a black-and-white conflict between free enterprise and socialism. Theologians of the right have said that we must have complete free enterprise or go completely totalitarian. Theologians of the left have said we must have complete socialism or be overwhelmed by the forces of chaos.

Labels are fine—in their place. But the job for Americans is to break through the 'ologies and 'isms and see their problems in their true dimensions. Then the labels will take care of themselves.

From The Washington Post & Times-Herald

'FRIEND AFTER FRIEND DEPARTS'

A PLEASANT little publication called *WHATSOEVER THINGS* (C. C. Phillips, iv: 8) that comes to us regularly from Stetson University in Florida, contains this month an editorial kindly saying the importance of bringing out the best in our friends and associates. "Think," it urges, "encouraging thoughts, speak encouraging words, and most important of all, adopt an air of confident expectancy toward those you are trying to help. Be genuinely interested in what your friends have to say. Let your words be more eloquent than your words. In this way, you can be in truth, a 'best friend.' There is no happiness quite comparable to the happiness you can get in this way."

We were so much impressed by these sentiments that we were in half a mind to send them along to Mr. Arthur Godfrey, who, as you know, has been having so much trouble with his friends of late that in a good many cases, alas, the friendships have been irreparably broken. Whether the main fault lies with Mr. Godfrey or with the friends is, apparently, a matter of some doubt; but one side of the story is that Mr. Godfrey, with his confident expectancy, his genuine interest and his eloquent attitudes, brought out too much in his friends, including the undesirable traits of vanity and ambition. There was, for example, the affair of Mr. Julius La Rosa, crooner, who was brought out of obscurity into celebrity by Mr. Godfrey's encour-

aging thoughts, words and deeds, only to suffer a progressive diminution of the Christian virtue of humility, or so Mr. Godfrey said when they parted company about a year and a half ago.

Since then Mr. Godfrey has cast forth from his bosom still more of his friends. Among the most recent evictions from his heart were a lady soprano, a barbershop quartet, a Hawaiian hula dancer and singer, and three script writers. They, too, it seems, had lost humility, had become vain, avaricious and materialistic, or, as Mr. Godfrey put it, "they sat around wondering how to get in the big dough. They tried to figure ways of getting attention for themselves. They got off the team."

Well it's all quite distressing but also quite interesting, except for one thing. Mr. Godfrey doesn't seem to have got very much of the promised happiness out of helping his friends to realize their capabilities, or maybe a little more than their capabilities. This point worries us a good deal because, like the editor of *WHATSOEVER THINGS*, we prefer to see everybody as happy as happy can be—and this includes Mr. Godfrey, the Columbia Broadcasting System, the advertising agencies, and the manufacturers of cake-mixes and hair-wave lotions. But perhaps—what with Mr. Disney's competition and all—they are now in need of an encouraging friend to help them realize their best capabilities.

People's Platform

Religious Prejudice On Trial

Editorial on religious prejudice in the *Washington Post* is a wonderful statement of American principles. You are absolutely correct in noting that it appears to prejudice on religious grounds threaten us with something compounded of hate, fear, suspicion and meanness.

I wonder however if your paper will adhere to this statement in the future since it has not in the past. Specifically I refer to the "hate, fear, suspicion and meanness" generated by your use of the religious angle in attacking Sen. McCarthy on July 13, 1953.

In an editorial appearing that day your paper did a most effective job in arousing religious prejudice against Sen. McCarthy. You took the *J. B. Matthews* magazine article, written several months before he began his short-lived job with Sen. McCarthy, and used it as a springboard to launch a despicable attack on the senator.

Labeling the Matthews article an example of the viciousness of McCarthyism you noted that the Protestant ministers accused by Matthews were still in their pulpits. Matthews was on of a job, and you regretted that Sen. McCarthy didn't go too far, since "the two belong together."

This editorial, built on a distorted interpretation of the Matthews' article, was one of the most heinous and baseless attacks it has ever been my misfortune to see.

In reality the article, was in the words of the eminent Baptist clergyman, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, a compliment to the Protestant clergy. He wrote: "J. B. Matthews, a Protestant and former overseas missionary, is even more generous. He stated that not more than 1 per cent of the Protestant clergy were disloyal; indeed, he paid a rather striking tribute to the overall loyalty of Protestant clergymen."

It is deeply regrettable that a newspaper should distort a criticism of 1 per cent of the Protestant clergy, thereby defaming the author of the criticism and then transfer the resultant opprobrium to Sen. McCarthy, who to this day has never uttered one word of criticism concerning the Protestant clergy.

If this tortuous line of reasoning were applied to the case of Judas, then anyone who criticized this disloyal man could also be accused of attacking the apostles since he represented approximately 8 per cent of them.

It is my sincere hope that never again will your paper stoop

to the depths of meanness it reached in July of 1953 when it preyed on the fears of your religious readers, by claiming, justifiably, that Sen. McCarthy had fudged against the clergy.

(Editors' Note: By labeling as "irresponsible" a charge that Protestant ministers constitute "the largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus in the United States today," we were hardly promoting religious prejudice. Quite the opposite. We were condemning it.)

Religious Prejudice & American Heritage

Editorial on religious prejudice in the *Washington Post* is a wonderful statement of American principles. You are absolutely correct in noting that it appears to prejudice on religious grounds threaten us with something compounded of hate, fear, suspicion and meanness.

I wonder however if your paper will adhere to this statement in the future since it has not in the past. Specifically I refer to the "hate, fear, suspicion and meanness" generated by your use of the religious angle in attacking Sen. McCarthy on July 13, 1953.

In an editorial appearing that day your paper did a most effective job in arousing religious prejudice against Sen. McCarthy. You took the *J. B. Matthews* magazine article, written several months before he began his short-lived job with Sen. McCarthy, and used it as a springboard to launch a despicable attack on the senator.

Labeling the Matthews article an example of the viciousness of McCarthyism you noted that the Protestant ministers accused by Matthews were still in their pulpits. Matthews was on of a job, and you regretted that Sen. McCarthy didn't go too far, since "the two belong together."

This editorial, built on a distorted interpretation of the Matthews' article, was one of the most heinous and baseless attacks it has ever been my misfortune to see.

In reality the article, was in the words of the eminent Baptist clergyman, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, a compliment to the Protestant clergy. He wrote: "J. B. Matthews, a Protestant and former overseas missionary, is even more generous. He stated that not more than 1 per cent of the Protestant clergy were disloyal; indeed, he paid a rather striking tribute to the overall loyalty of Protestant clergymen."

It is deeply regrettable that a newspaper should distort a criticism of 1 per cent of the Protestant clergy, thereby defaming the author of the criticism and then transfer the resultant opprobrium to Sen. McCarthy, who to this day has never uttered one word of criticism concerning the Protestant clergy.

If this tortuous line of reasoning were applied to the case of Judas, then anyone who criticized this disloyal man could also be accused of attacking the apostles since he represented approximately 8 per cent of them.

It is my sincere hope that never again will your paper stoop

to the depths of meanness it reached in July of 1953 when it preyed on the fears of your religious readers, by claiming, justifiably, that Sen. McCarthy had fudged against the clergy.

(Editors' Note: By labeling as "irresponsible" a charge that Protestant ministers constitute "the largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus in the United States today," we were hardly promoting religious prejudice. Quite the opposite. We were condemning it.)

The family unit of which I'm a part will not submit to integration. We hope and believe that our southern brethren will stand fast and not submit. We, as citizens simple generations removed from any insidious foreign influence, stand ready to fight hard that kind of a fight which may be necessary to preserve the great American heritage, and the character (sectional as well as national) of the republic which has gloriously stood the test of nearly two centuries.

As "bleeding heart" Murrow would say, Mr. Editor—"This We Believe!"

J. R. CHERRY JR.

(Editors' Note: The News editorial objecting to the use of religious prejudice in political campaigns referred to a petition circulated before the primary which declared, among other things, that the signers opposed "any form of discrimination on the basis of race which denies the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ." A letter accompanying the petition stated: "We must pray for the Rev. Edward A. Cahill, the Unitarian minister, that he may repent of his unbelief, be converted and come to the saving knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ." Appeals to prejudice on religious grounds are not a part of the great American heritage reader Cherry mentions.)

Series On Churches Of Today 'Confusing'

ARTICLES informing people of churches of today are confusing. This denomination said so, that denomination said so, this, don't do this. Please, I ask you, is Christ the author of confusion? One denomination claimed to be the mother of another denomination, another the mother of another.

Why would that make any difference to anyone? I beg and plead, let us go to the Bible and see what Christ said, use it for our guide. He went to Heaven, let's try it.

M. M. FREEMAN

PAUL ROBESON Complete Betrayal

Powell Was Antidote For Red Poison

By ROBERT C. RUARK

MADRID, Spain

I THINK we can all be pretty happy about Adam Clayton Powell's rebuff to the United Nations conference at the Afro-Asian Conference in Bandung, where the troublemakers came loaded, hoping that the Democratic congressman from New York would do the usual Josephine Baker line about lynching, et cetera, in the United States. For a minute I forgot to mention that Mr. Powell is a Negro, and he was proud to announce that his grandpa had been a slave.

PEACEFUL REVOLUTION

Mr. Powell, severely critical of most of the Eisenhower administration, was expected to make a damning report on the situation of the American Negro. Instead he said:

"Racism in the United States is on the way out. Second-class citizenship has been changed. A peaceful revolution has occurred overnight. It is a mark of distinction to be a Negro in the United States. To be a Negro is no longer a stigma."

A JOE LOUIS LICK

I applaud Mr. Powell, because he said that his grandpa, Joe Louis, was a Negro, and he was proud to announce that his grandpa had been a slave.

But I am not quite 40 years old and I can remember that I was raised by a former slave. I can remember race riots in Washington. I can remember complete discrimination in the armed forces in World War II, when if you were a Negro you were sent to the front as a mascot in the Navy or a labor battalion boy in the Army.

CHANGING TIMES

And in practically no time at all, that has changed.

We have the Supreme Court ruling on segregation, and the breaking up of Jim Crow in the armed forces, and the knockdown of segregation in the vital city, Washington. All this we have since I was a boy. I can remember and can remember a lynching in my home town.

ROBESON'S BETRAYAL

Some friends and I were talking in Paris one day, over a dinner which the friends had fixed for me, and it never occurred to me to remember that I was white and that I had never been the subject of Walter White and Paul Robeson came up and I was reared in an age, in a state, in which no white man sat down at table with a Negro. And suddenly I was being an honored guest in a Negro's home, and unconscious of it.

One of the people was saying that it was so wonderful that Walter White, a liberal white man who was so long a leading spirit of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was able to get Paul Robeson in sight, his work well done. And he was saying what a shame it was that Paul Robeson had fallen under the hands of the Communists. I quote him: "completely betrayed us Negroes."

HERO INTO VILLAIN

He spoke on "Robeson had a chance, maybe, to have been the first black President. He was an All-American. He was a magnificent singer. He was a Phi Beta Kappa, and I think he could have been heavyweight champion of the world, if he'd wanted to. I also think he was a lawyer. I'm not quite sure. But let us all down when he started following the Communies, because he had the best chance any Negro ever had, and that includes Ralph Bunche and Walter White." I quote him: "completely betrayed us Negroes."

I said amen, brother, and past the spars, which were fine, and that is why I am glad Mr. Powell referred how to the Reds and surrendered the left.

This time, Viet Nam is going down not because of Communist invasion but because of bungling, neglect, religious rivalry and Franco-American cooperation. All the Communies have to do is sit on the sidelines and applaud our bonehead plays.

'We Interrupt This News To Bring You The Latest Chapter Of 'John's Other Amendment'—'



HERBLOCK © 1955 THE WASHINGTON POST

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Unsung hero of the Salk saga is the Rhesus monkey of India, a flabby-jawed little fellow with a short tail. A friend of the people who monkey around in medical laboratories, he's helped more than one to crack a tough research problem.

Forgotten Roles

Without the ravenous Rhesus, in fact, there might be no Salk vaccine today. Actually it was Harvard's Dr. John F. Enders, 43 per cent paid for by the Salk vaccine's development by discovering that polio virus could be grown in a culture composed chiefly of chopped-up monkey testicles. Later was found that the Indian Rhesus was the most suitable applicant for the honor.

Monkeys: Unsung Heroes Of Medicine

Today, Dr. Enders is little remembered in the midst of all the publicity for Dr. Salk. Nor has anyone proposed an award to the Rhesus for his important role in the conquest of dread polio.

Monkey Motel

Heretofore the job of procuring monkeys for vaccine production has been done by the National Foundation, which runs a monkey motel at Bluffton, S. C., with accommodations for 6,000 guests.

Now, however, commercial producers of the vaccine will step into the picture with monkey farms. They hope to speed Salk vaccine production—if no one throws a monkey wrench into the works.

Viet Nam Going Red

While American politicians and a good part of the public have been worrying about some islands off the coast of China so small they don't show on any map, a sizable chunk of Southeast Asia once described by Eisenhower as vital, is about to go down the Communist drain.

It is southern Viet Nam—the most important of the Indochina left free after the Geneva conference—left free the Reds and surrendered the north.

This time, Viet Nam is going down not because of Communist invasion but because of bungling, neglect, religious rivalry and Franco-American cooperation. All the Communies have to do is sit on the sidelines and applaud our bonehead plays.