



# THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher  
J. E. DOWD, General Manager  
B. S. GRIFFITH, Executive Editor  
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1955

# The Russian People: How Deep Is The Change?

By STEWART ALSOP

**T**HERE has unquestionably been a change here in Russia. Everyone is in a position to judge isolationism and dogmatism, but it changed and it survived.

What of the Democrats? Agitated by a President who stole their thunder, have they stuck to the traditional obstruction and partisanship of the out-of-power party. The answer is that partisanship has reached new plateaus in Washington and the pattern of government is being set by an effective, if reluctant, alliance of leading Republicans and Democrats.

The key to the overall behavior of both parties is change—change to fit with the two-party system, but its life does depend on a measure of party discipline and a political leader like Mr. Shivers knows that very well, indeed. The life of a party does not require a pledge of loyalty, as the Democratic leadership long ago discovered, but it does demand good faith from those who participate in it.

Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

fine party. According to those who should know, nothing like it has ever happened before—certainly not in Red Square.

The next night, an even finer party had obviously been anticipated. The word had got round that dancing in the dawn in Red Square was the thing to do, and by midnight there were long lines of teenagers grouping on the hill past the Kremlin. A small knot of boys even juggled the heavy instruments of a brass band on the hill, and set them up in front of the tomb.

WTF BLANKETS  
But somebody in authority had presumably decided that the thing had gone too far. The night before, there had been no security police. Now there were a good many. They moved quietly and politely. It was the crowd playing the role of wet blankets with splendid efficiency. Little groups hung on till daylight, but the heart had gone out of the party. Without playing a note, members of the band sadly juggled their instruments down the hill again.

Yet there were surprises on this less happy second night as well. A long line of boys and girls were sitting on a wall near the tomb, giggling. A youngish cop walked along the line, gesturing to them to stand up. The boys and girls stood up, one by one, with exaggerated smartness, as he came up to them—and then sat down again, laughing fit to kill, the moment he had passed.

When an older, tougher cop showed up, looking grim, they got off the wall for good. Even so, one of the older boys made an

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

fine party. According to those who should know, nothing like it has ever happened before—certainly not in Red Square.

The next night, an even finer party had obviously been anticipated. The word had got round that dancing in the dawn in Red Square was the thing to do, and by midnight there were long lines of teenagers grouping on the hill past the Kremlin. A small knot of boys even juggled the heavy instruments of a brass band on the hill, and set them up in front of the tomb.

WTF BLANKETS  
But somebody in authority had presumably decided that the thing had gone too far. The night before, there had been no security police. Now there were a good many. They moved quietly and politely. It was the crowd playing the role of wet blankets with splendid efficiency. Little groups hung on till daylight, but the heart had gone out of the party. Without playing a note, members of the band sadly juggled their instruments down the hill again.

Yet there were surprises on this less happy second night as well. A long line of boys and girls were sitting on a wall near the tomb, giggling. A youngish cop walked along the line, gesturing to them to stand up. The boys and girls stood up, one by one, with exaggerated smartness, as he came up to them—and then sat down again, laughing fit to kill, the moment he had passed.

When an older, tougher cop showed up, looking grim, they got off the wall for good. Even so, one of the older boys made an

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

The party goes found this reporter and other visiting firemen a welcome addition. Communication was quickly established somehow. So was the fact that we were Americans. They were soon surrounded, like so many two-headed eagles, by large groups of politely giggling teenagers. They asked questions about how we liked Moscow or what life was like in America, and there was an occasional reference favorable to peace.

SPECTACLE  
Although the conversations were not memorable the spectacle was—the dancing and singing and cavorting in Red Square, before the handsome Kremlin and around the low dark tomb, in the early, bright Moscow dawn. It was a

WONDERFUL FUN  
At any rate, they are wonderful fun—or at least the first one this reporter dutifully attended was. Every one was obviously having a marvelous time, with much singing, dancing, balalaika-playing, say handshaking and bold ogling.

## Gov. Shivers: Man Without A Party

TEXAS GOVERNOR ALLAN SHIVERS went up to New York last week and delivered a sweeping attack on the two major political parties.

His peevish was that "change is their natural enemy. . . they have a vested interest in the status quo. . . through all of the rush of postwar progress, these political organizations have responded least among our national institutions to the change sweeping the land."

Mr. Shivers also belabored the worst phase of the loyalty oath and made the strange remark—for a Texan—that his first loyalty is to the nation.

All this sounds like bunk to us and not the kind of bunk that all good Texans sleep in. We also suspect that Mr. Shivers knows better and is merely invocalized by or making plain his own political cynicism. What kind of change does he want?

The obvious fact is that the two-party system in America has survived and provided stable government because the parties are capable of change, and there have been some graphic examples in recent months.

Take the Republican Party, for example. Many of its orators manifested during the 1952 campaign that all the New Deal reforms must be wiped away, America had to withdraw from the world and shake off its alliances. These were phrases born in the sectionalism and traditionalism that Mr. Shivers also complained of, but once in power and facing the realities of government the Republican Party gradually but surely put down its radical rightists. The low water mark came last week when the rightists could muster only four votes in a move to play the President's cards at the Big Four conference. As for the New Deal, the Republicans snipped away a few threads,

but they have not dared to openly touch the hems and seams. Certainly the party was reluctant to forsake its devotion to isolationism and dogmatism, but it changed and it survived.

What of the Democrats? Agitated by a President who stole their thunder, have they stuck to the traditional obstruction and partisanship of the out-of-power party. The answer is that partisanship has reached new plateaus in Washington and the pattern of government is being set by an effective, if reluctant, alliance of leading Republicans and Democrats.

The key to the overall behavior of both parties is change—change to fit with the two-party system, but its life does depend on a measure of party discipline and a political leader like Mr. Shivers knows that very well, indeed. The life of a party does not require a pledge of loyalty, as the Democratic leadership long ago discovered, but it does demand good faith from those who participate in it.

Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

It is Mr. Shivers, who helped to choose the nominee of one party and supported the candidate of the opposition, willing to pledge good faith to either party? Or does he want to play one against the other to gain his individual prizes, while denouncing the major course of both?

## The Pentagon Puts Out Another Guide

SUCCESSFUL military "public information" officers generally exercise a marvelous mixture of conviviality and caution.

That is to say they are quick to offer the grip, but seldom does any news fall out of the palm. Most often, they make bring around a ream of brass polishes calculated more to flatter the commanding officer than to inform the public.

Still, the PIOs deserve some sympathy. All great men must have heralds to proclaim the doings of greatness, and the heralds must speak at the great one speak. Seldom are they allowed to answer on their own initiative the simplest question posed by a reporter, unless they themselves are top ranked officers.

Last any PIO be so bash as answer a question forthrightly, the administration has now sent some Army field commands printed guides for informing the public.

Now when a reporter asks a question, the PIO man is to get out a balance sheet that comes with the guide. He takes the question and weighs it—we don't know whether in his mind or on a market scale—against the "net effect" publishing the answer would have on military power, industrial power, military morale, "other strategic angles" and "anything

you can think of." He makes marks on the balance sheet, adds up his marks, and there's his answer to whether to answer or not to answer the question.

This novel substitute for thinking grows out of Defense Secretary Wilson's ruling that the public is to have only "constructive" information about the military. It was fathomed by Assistant Defense Secretary R. Karl Honoman who contends that no information should be released unless it is "useful" or "interesting."

The guide is not concerned with secret information. Neither is the press. The guide is concerned with non-secret information which the press and the public are also concerned. Use of the guide apparently assures that PIOs won't say anything beyond "good morning" in the future.

The administration says the guide was prepared "in consultation with principal trade and business publications." The chairman of the executive committee of the Society of Business Magazine Editors said he didn't "know anything about it."

We would ask our favorite PIO who did concoct the thing, but he's not very good at mathematics and we don't want to get him involved with all those check marks on the balance sheet.

## Music Vs. Sound: How Hi The Fi?

EVER since the high fidelity craze took root in America's living rooms, music has been losing ground.

True hi-fi fanatics don't tune their phonographs to hear the notes anymore. Oh, no. They set their vacuum-tube voltmeters, cathode ray oscilloscopes, ohmeters and audio-signal generators to pick up the assorted pings, plunks, thumps and rattles which accompany the notes.

In fact, the rustic of Piatagorsky's sleeve or the snare of Mendelberg's shoes interest them far more than a perfect rendering of Beethoven's Missa SOLEMNIS.

These, by the way, are the same people who like Haydn's Military Symphony merely because it offers four or five minutes of nothing but triangles and cymbals in the second movement.

Music is somehow secondary. The quest for "absolute truth" (their term for faithful reproduction of sound—no sound) is first and foremost.

Evidence of just how far things have gone: The appearance of a new 12-inch long-playing phonograph record on some Charlotte music shelves. It is called THRU

THE SOUND BARRIER WITH McINTOSH. What's in it?

Well, the first side contains a jet aircraft soaring over the sounds of three sonic booms and the Red Sox hitting home runs at the White Sands proving grounds in New Mexico. On the reverse side are the noise of IRT Subways in New York City, alarm clocks, machinery sounds and a 20-inch aircraft cannon.

The future for this sort of thing is unlimited. The record industry, we predict, will be having off in all directions in search of noises. How about the subtle nuances of a typhoon hurrahing in off the China Sea? Or a collection of U. S. locomotive whistles? Or New York taxi sounds, a smattering of striped gears, spiced with honking horns, screeching brakes and the restless whine of the rubber on concrete? Or possibly even an evening of steam hammers?

By about 1955, music will disappear completely. "The Three Bs" will still be represented in all fine record collections. Not as Bach, Beethoven & Brahms, however, but as Blare, Bellow & Blast.

Branch Rickey used to praise the snifter as a natural pitch which puts far less strain on the vocal cords than the snifter as sliders, screwballs and hanging curves. Because it was so useful, he says, men like Stan Coveleski, Burchish Grimes and Johnny Quinn were regular starters for the better part of twenty years.

Okay, bring back the spiball. We don't work behind the plate.



"I'll keep him from becoming 'too bookish'. . . We don't want him to become 'too bookish', do we . . ."

## People's Platform Invitation To Augusta Kids Protested

Augusta, Ga. Editors: The News.

ACCORDING TO articles appearing in your local newspaper several Augusta boys were invited to participate in the Soap Box Derby race in Charlotte. In view of the cancellation of the derby in Augusta as the result of protest against the action of the local derby committee in permitting the entry of two Negro boys. The latest news articles published in both the Augusta Chronicle and the Augusta Herald this week indicate that an Augusta boy won the race in Charlotte.

We have been informed that your paper, The Charlotte News, sponsored the Soap Box Derby in Charlotte and we assume, therefore, that the invitations to the Augusta boys were issued by your paper.

In all candor, representing the States' Rights Council of Georgia Inc., we feel that this action in inviting Augusta boys to participate in a racially-mixed derby in Charlotte was inappropriate and an unwarranted interference with the efforts of the white people of this community, who pursuant to the laws and customs of the state of Georgia, are trying to prevent the mixing of the races in the schools, recreational facilities and elsewhere.

For your information, it was the States' Rights Council of Georgia Inc. which initiated the protest against the entry of Negro boys in the Soap Box Derby. I enclose copy of letter and memorandum which was forwarded to approximately 175 parents of white boys who had entered the Derby

and the sponsors representing business firms of Augusta. You may be interested to learn that the many responses received from our parents and sponsors by our council there was not one negative vote indicating that the writers wanted to participate in a racially-mixed derby. The local derby committee also sent out a letter to the parents and subsequently when the responses were all in the committee cancelled the derby.

We are of the opinion that your readers are entitled to have all the facts in regard to this matter involving the entry of Augusta boys in your Soap Box Derby race and we, therefore, request that publicity be given to this communication.

HUGH G. GRANT  
President  
States' Rights Council of Ga.

## Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round Why Ike Retreated On Dixon-Yates

WASHINGTON THE sudden Eisenhower decision to re-examine the dynamic-laden Dixon-Yates contract was preceded by a secret, highly important meeting at the White House.

It took place on the morning before he issued his statement indicating the Dixon-Yates retreat, and was attended by Adm. Lewis Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Attorney General Brownell later called it for consultation. What worried them was possible violation of the criminal code as charged by Sen. Kefauver when he discovered that Adolph Wenzell of the First Boston Corporation, which helped arrange the Dixon-Yates contract, had sat in on the super-secret Budget Bureau-Atomic Energy sessions.

Limp Alibi  
Though an alibi had been issued that the First Boston Corporation took no fee for arranging the Dixon-Yates financing, the criminal code which Sen.

Kefauver cited does not rest on the actual taking of money. Brownell was consulted. Also working Adm. Strauss and the Attorney General. Sen. Clinton Anderson of New Mexico, chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, had subpoenaed the records of the Atomic Energy Commission showing what visitors had called on Adm. Strauss during the Dixon-Yates talks.

Back Door Exit  
The AEC kept a careful record of every visitor entering the building. He has to sign his name, tell whom he is going to see, and assign a number to take him to the appropriate office. Furthermore, the record shows what material, brief case, etc., every visitor carries.

And the AEC records subpoenaed by Sen. Anderson showed that on Jan. 20, 1955, Adm. Strauss assigned an escort, none other than Adolph Wenzell, vice president of First Boston, had called on Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy

Commission with him, believe it or not, was Edgar Dixon, partner in the Dixon-Yates combine, plus Paul Miller, also of First Boston.

Furthermore the AEC visitor's record mysteriously shows that Mr. Wenzell left by the back door carrying a large envelope.

In contrast to this official record in the hands of Democratic senators, the President had stated at his press conference that Mr. Wenzell "was never called in to advise a single thing about the Yates-Dixon contract."

Conflicting Evidence  
In further contrast to the President's denial, Dick Cavett, assigned to the Atomic Energy Commission, had admitted under oath on June 8 before the AEC that Wenzell attended meetings at the AEC which considered Dixon-Yates in January.

In addition, Chairman Strauss himself was placed in a rather embarrassing position by the written record of visitors to his own AEC.