

'Why, No—I Didn't Call Him'



Judiciary Needs Congress's Ear

JUDGE JOHN J. PARKER'S suggestion that the Chief Justice make an annual report to Congress on the state of the judiciary strikes us as a proper prescription for the ailing federal court system. It is an idea that won the unanimous endorsement of the Judicial Conference of the Fourth Circuit when first proposed last year by Deputy Attorney General W. P. Rogers.

The loophole in a federal statute that allows this would have been closed by a bill publicly by almost every judge in the land and approved by a House Judiciary subcommittee, but not acted upon by Congress before it adjourned. Judge Parker's point is that these irritating snags in the working of justice constitute a marked injustice to plaintiffs, defendants and judges alike, and that Congress, because it does not as a body hear compelling arguments for reform, does not get around to mending the tattered judicial robes. In the manner of the great lawyer that he is, Judge Parker stated the case concisely:

To the executive has been given the power of the sword and the power of appointment. To Congress has been given the power of the purse and the power of legislation. To the judiciary, however, to which is committed the fundamental duty of administering justice, no power whatever has been given except the power of judgment. Justice, however, in the language of Daniel Webster, "is the greatest concern of man on earth."

And if the judiciary is to discharge effectively this fundamental function of government it must have the support of Congress, and to give that support adequately, Congress must understand its needs.

A speech by the Chief Justice, after the fashion of the President's annual State of the Union address, would bring the plight of the judiciary out of the hearing room and take it on to the floor of Congress where it belongs. It would serve the additional purpose of keeping the state of the courts before the public at large.

For 16 years, the courts have been without direct access to Congress. In Judge Parker's opinion, and in ours, it is time they were granted this access once more.

A Moldering Report

Atoms In Battalion Rank

By JOSEPH ALSOP

SOME TIME ago, the U. S. ambassador to Moscow, the able Charles E. Bohlen, informed the State Department that the Soviet leaders were talking of seriously wanting a measure of disarmament.

Bohlen most emphatically does not share the view that the Soviets are in danger of "imminent collapse." He warned that the apparent Soviet desire for disarmament was not a symptom of grave inner weakness. He said that the Soviets were talking of sacrificing anything they regarded as truly vital in order to get disarmament. But on balance, he declared, the Soviets would rather have some disarmament than not have it. Considerable consequences have since flowed from the carefully qualified report of Ambassador Bohlen's.

It is important, rather than to be completely influenced by the mood in which the White House prepared for the summit meeting at Geneva. Without the encouragement given by the Bohlen opinion, the President might not have made such a high priority of the mutual air inspection to the Russians.

At this moment, moreover, the Bohlen opinion has the most lively current significance. With the President's personal backing, Harold Stassen is leading the American delegation to the United Nations Disarmament Commission in order to do two things at once. He is to resume the general disarmament talks which he has been conducting so long and so fruitlessly. And infinitely more important, he is to start bilateral special disarmament talks with his Soviet opposite number.

Stassen is ordered, in short, to see whether the two giant powers, working alone and together, cannot lay a practical foundation for future disarmament. If the most expert and qualified American observer, Ambassador Bohlen, believes that the Soviets are serious in wanting a measure of disarmament, then these bilateral and special Soviet-American disarmament talks cannot be regarded as a mere empty observance to world opinion.

Such is the favorable side of the picture. On the unfavorable side, alas, there are other points to be recorded. For example, the Kremlin's announcement of a cut of 60,000 men in the Soviet armed forces has lately produced a perfect orgy of wishful thinking. But the explanation of this armed manpower cut that is being made in the quarters of the Pentagon is the very opposite of hopeful. Soviet military journals have given much space, in the past three years, to the adaptation of atomic arms to the war. It is clear, however, that the American army was first with its atomic cannon, the Red army was second. The road to the future will be ahead in the establishment of a new type of war.

of experimental infantry units specially organized and trained for atomic ground war. It is logical to suppose, therefore, that the Soviet program is preparing, so to speak, to atomize a considerable element of their huge ground army of 150 divisions.

To gauge the investment involved in such an effort one need only turn to the similar American program. This was prepared by the Operations and Plans Divisions of the U. S. Army. It is now moldering, neglected and forgotten in the files of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, because of its cost. The trouble is that truly atomizing ground forces is not just a matter of adding a few atomic cannons. A thorough program has to put some atomic arms even in the hands of the battalion. Far more expensive still, a thorough program also demands enormous expenditures on air and ground transport. These are needed because a truly atomized army must be able to disperse and must possess maximum mobility.

Yet one of the Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson's alleged defense economies has been virtually the U. S. program to atomize, over 17 under-strength divisions is estimated to cost no less than \$2,000,000,000 annually for a period of several years, with a heavy maintenance charge thereafter.

If the Russians, then, are really planning to atomize, say, 30 of their divisions, the investment will be very great indeed. On the other hand, atomizing these divisions will greatly increase the Red army's over-all fighting strength. If you are multiplying the fighting power of thirty divisions by a factor of four or five, that could be more logical than to drop another 30 no-longer-needed divisions from the roster. And that is about the effect of the Soviet 60,000-man cut.

THE NATURE of Stassen's facts like those set forth above must mean that the nature of disarmament is all-important. Mere armed manpower limitation, which the Russians have recently proposed, is not only valueless but even potentially very dangerous. Yet there is no agreement whatever within the American government as to the nature of the disarmament plan this country ought to sponsor. And it cannot be too often emphasized that what the Russians want, if they want anything, is not the inspection system that the President talked about at Geneva, but the actual disarmament that Bohlen discussed in his report to the State Department.

WAY OUT Faced with this dilemma, Stassen has apparently tried to find a way out by a method not uncommon in the Eisenhower administration—by calling in experts and naming a high-level committee. Dr. Ernest Lawrence from Berkeley, Benjamin Fairless of the U. S. Steel Company, former Under-Secretary of State W. Bedell Smith and Gen. Lucian D. Truscott are among those who have agreed to serve as Stassen's consultants. It remains to be seen whether all these great minds can find a way around, or over, or under, this grim disarmament problem that human ingenuity has never really solved before.

For 16 Years Pope Pius Unfailing Voice Of Peace

By MARQUIS CHILDS

THROUGH all the alarms of GREAT PRESSURE the cold war when often it seemed that another global conflict was inevitable one voice has spoken out unfailingly and unflinchingly for peace. The pronouncements of Pope Pius XII during the 16 years of his pontificate stress on almost every occasion the desperate urgency of the need to find a way to peace.

When the whole story of the struggle for peace is written the Pope's words broadcast to the world again and again will be shown to have weighed heavily in the balance on the side of a peace negotiated with full realization of the total destruction of modern war. From the appeals he made on the eve of the outbreak of World War II down to the present moment he has condemned mankind's recourse to war, insisting that those who resorted to it could not escape the burden of individual guilt for the incalculable loss and suffering inflicted on humanity.

ARMIS CONTROL In his Christmas message of 1941 he spoke of the need when the war should end to impose a progressive limitation on armaments and on the production and possession of offensive weapons. Earlier he developed the theme he has constantly reiterated which is in essence the concept of the present moment. This is the conviction that all nations are members of "one large human family" and that the basic principles of justice, legality, equity and charity and by mutual pacts that are to be respected with the conviction that true patriotism consists not in denying the rights of other nations but in participating for the greater common good in the family of nations in which each one has a contribution to

make and a place of honor." In 1951 when the cold war was at a peak of intensity the Pope declared that the West was not to take sides in the struggle. His declaration was obviously in response to great pressure to take an active part in the conflict that during the previous 12 months had seemed certain to erupt into a hot war. But in his Christmas message he said that those who wanted to make the church "their ally or the instrument of their political alliances" would "bring her down to the same level on which conflicting temporary interests are locked in struggle."

Again and again the Pope has condemned the materialism of both the East and the West. He has warned, too, of the dangers of reviving nationalism and the threat to peace inherent in the "nationalistic state." As an alternative he has urged European unity putting special emphasis on this in 1953. There still seemed a hope that the European Union would be ratified.

YULE MESSAGE A message in the long Christmas message of 1948 sums up the Pope's convictions on the responsibility of the individual. "A sincere Christian cannot confine himself with an easy and egotistical isolationism when he witnesses the suffering of his brothers; when pleas for help come to him from those in economic distress, he knows the aspirations of the working classes for more normal and just conditions of life; when he is aware of the absence of any economic system which puts money above social obligations, when he is not satisfied with the miserly rationing of an intransigent nationalism which denies or spurs the common bonds linking the separate nations together and imposing on each one of them many and varied duties toward the great family of nations."

Those close to the Pope say that he has never abandoned hope even in the darkest hours of the cold war. While he has not commented directly on the summit meeting at Geneva and the renewed hope of peace that it has brought, the Vatican secretary of state has referred reporters to passages from the last Christmas message in which he had confirmed his view of war as an immoral act resting on the consciences of those who resort to it.

In a front page editorial just before the conference began the Vatican City newspaper, *Osservatore Romano* hailed the summit meeting as an important first step toward ending the cold war and fulfilling the desires of mankind for a rebirth of true peace. The newspaper said that the Pope had received the "greatest satisfaction" from the very fact the conference was taking place at all.

The Pope has often told how Stalin at a wartime conference when reference was made to the views of the Vatican asked how many divisions the Pope had. In the words the Pope has spoken again and again across the world, "I am a poor man, but the Russian dictator could have had no comprehension whatsoever."



POPE PIUS XII Hopeful

C. A. B. Report Encouraging Step

THE limited service ceiling clamped over Charlotte's municipal airport is definitely breaking up. The imperative recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board would give Charlotte competitive one-carrier service to New York and Philadelphia and to New Orleans through extension of Capital routes which now end at Washington and Atlanta. This means the air traveler would have a choice between Capital and the present Eastern service between those points. The resulting competition should improve service, as well as increase passenger volume.

Although the recommendation still must be approved by the C. A. B., the examiner's report is a victory for the Chamber of Commerce and Airport Advisory Committee officials who have faithfully prosecuted the complicated case in Washington. It is by no means a complete victory, however, because the examiner recommended nothing in the way of one-carrier flights to the South-

west and such points as Dallas which were sought in the same proceedings. Charlotte must continue to press for this service as well as faster flights to midwestern centers such as Chicago. As Mayor Van Evers said at a C. A. B. hearing last September, increasing air service is essential to Charlotte's future as the distribution center of the two Carolinas. And New Orleans, New York and Philadelphia are only three points on the vast wheel with which Charlotte ultimately must be connected by rapid flights.

The city should instruct its Washington counsel to explore every avenue toward linking Charlotte with every area having actual or potential trade ties to the Queen City, whenever traffic justifies.

Rails determined the location of the great cities of the present. Air routes are the life lines of future centers of commerce and industry and Charlotte aims to be one of them.

Tar Heel Education Loses A Friend

THURMAN D. KITCHIN came from a family touched with greatness and he kept faith with his heritage. His death at Wake Forest entails Dr. Kitchin in the bright history of leaders who dedicated their lives to the strength and reputation of Tar Heel education.

From 1930 to 1950 Dr. Kitchin led Wake Forest College through the economic straits of depression and disaster in the form of several fires to a high standing among Southern institutions. When he became president, Wake Forest's loss of students was steadily depressing the college's standing. Dr. Kitchin administration erected eight

buildings and an athletic stadium, tripled enrollment and converted the two-year medical school to a four-year medical college. The law school also was greatly improved.

Dr. Kitchin's family included two congressmen—his father, William H. Kitchin, and a brother, Claude—and another brother, W. W., was governor of North Carolina. The zeal they carried to government he contributed to education.

In Dr. Kitchin's death North Carolina education has lost a great friend and friend of Wake Forest alumni feel the loss in a personal sense.

From The Green Boy (Wis.) Press-Gazette

NEED FOR SOUNDING OFF

AN ACQUAINTANCE of the editor remarked recently that every now and then he sits down and writes a letter to his congressman or some other public official to express his opinion about some issue of public policy. "I figure only about one in 10,000 people ever do this," he said. "Therefore my opinion carries the weight of 10,000."

His comment is a shrewd one. Newspapers who cover the workings of legislative bodies often point out that letters from home carry a great deal of influence with the lawmakers—a lot more than most people realize. Of course, a congressman or a state legislator receives every day a great deal of mail from pressure groups, people with axes to grind and others whose opinions have been made up for them by someone else. While these letters have some influence, the legislator naturally discounts them considerably. But the letter that has real influence is the unsolicited one from a voter who simply feels strongly enough about some subject to go to the trouble of writing his congressman.

Writing to one's congressman is something like writing to the People's Forum in a newspaper—some people avoid it, something reserved for complaints. This is a shame, for the very people who avoid writing such letters are often the ones whose opinions are most interesting to both lawmakers and newspaper readers. The small businessman, the merchant, the professional man, the laborer,

the farmer are the types of people who are listened to when they express their opinions; while the man or woman who is constantly sending off letters to congressmen and editors and others because he or she has nothing better to do has little influence.

The processes of our democratic governments would, we are sure, operate better if more people would take the trouble to express their opinions to their representatives. So often, and we would have a better informed public if these same people would take advantage of the letters column in the newspapers to express their opinions for the benefit of their fellow citizens.

A trainer of prize fighters says one of the most important skills of a boxer is footwork. Lacking from some of the bouts we've seen on television lately, they don't teach them much else.—GREENVILLE (S. C.) FREEMONT.

Do-it-yourself projects do more than develop a man's skill with tools. They are apt to enlarge his vocabulary at the same time.—MATTOON (ILL.) JOURNAL-GAZETTE.

The human being is an incurable optimist. He believes he has a pretty good chance to win a lottery prize, but that there is scarcely the slightest chance of his getting killed in a traffic accident.—JACKSON (MISS.) STATE TIMES.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Editors' note — While Drew Pearson is on a brief vacation his column is being written by members of his staff.

WASHINGTON HOUSE hearings on WOC (businessmen serving the government without compensation) became slightly hilarious as Chairman Mansy Celler of the House Committee on Education and Labor, after reading a letter from Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks, in which Weeks was coy about testifying, asked the witness a large number of questions. Weeks, who has a large number of WOC's in his department, was willing to appear "later," if the House committee would let him choose the time. Rep. Celler shook his head perplexedly, said the letter reminded him of the Alice in Wonderland story in which Alice asked the

Congressmen Needle Secretary Weeks

white queen for jam, but was told: "Jam yesterday, jam tomorrow, but never jam today."

Never Today So the secretary probably would appear yesterday and probably tomorrow, but never today, opined Celler, amid titters from spectators. Seeking an appreciative audience, GOP Rep. Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, got into the act with a story about a man on his way to be hanged. The road to the gallows was muddy, causing concern that the execution might be delayed. But the doomed man told his secret. "Now, you fellows don't need to get in a tizzy about this here road. There ain't going to be a hanging till I get there."

Who Taught Carver About The Peanut?

Editors: The News: I would like to direct this letter to the attention of those who are in charge of the People's Platform who are "am" with "knowledge," yet so "empty" of "wisdom."

Both seem to think that their great, white forefathers taught the Negro everything he, shows knowledge of knowing. Now who taught their forefathers? Doesn't a similar position, but I still don't know where he stands."

Another One This reminded Pennsylvania's Scott of another one: "It is like the member of Congress talking for quite a while and someone asked, 'What are you saying about?' Another fellow replied, 'he didn't say.'"

Quote, Unquote

"I bores children to listen to lectures by parents," says a psychologist. Wonder where he got the idea that children listen to lectures by parents.—JACKSON (MISS.) STATE TIMES. Russia boasts its women do a man's work and in this country of perhaps 100 million, that is, that is. That's nothing. In a man's pay women get a man's pay and don't do a better man than I am.—Lauri (Miss.) Leader-Club. Mother (speaking to a school teacher): My Harold is a very sensitive boy. If you could punish him, just slap the boy in the next seat. That will frighten Harold.—GREENVILLE (Tenn.) Sun.



Somehow He Looks Out Of Character

People's Platform

Rep. Jonas Deserves District's Confidence

Morganton THE PEOPLE in the 10th Congressional District are indeed fortunate to have a man representing us in Congress during the vacation he spends each day in each town or county seat keeping office hours at the courthouse where anyone can approach him with their problems. "Charlie Jones is not wealthy enough to maintain an office with an elevator in each county and he won't put the taxpayers to the expense of paying for someone to sit around. In 1956 the 10th show him how much they appreciate his trying to save for the taxpayers."

—MARY G. RODGERS

Who Taught Carver About The Peanut?

Editors: The News: I would like to direct this letter to the attention of those who are in charge of the People's Platform who are "am" with "knowledge," yet so "empty" of "wisdom."

Both seem to think that their great, white forefathers taught the Negro everything he, shows knowledge of knowing. Now who taught their forefathers? Doesn't a similar position, but I still don't know where he stands."

Another One This reminded Pennsylvania's Scott of another one: "It is like the member of Congress talking for quite a while and someone asked, 'What are you saying about?' Another fellow replied, 'he didn't say.'"