THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

EDITORIAL PAGE

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

THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 1955

Police Censorship: Wrong In Principle

CHARLOTTE Police Department is to be congratulated for conducting its "cleanup" of crime and horror books along voluntary lines. Fortunately, Chief Frank Littlejohn has been receiving the full cooperation of local magazine distributors.

Circumstances could be different. Officers could very well be descending upon Charlotte newsstands brandishing one of the most objectionable laws ever enacted by the North Carolina General Assembly.

The legislation, passed this year, makes it unlawful for any person or firm to sell "crime comic books" or publications which through the medium of pictures may portray, among other things, "mayhem."

Despite the vagueness of the statute's language, the effect of the new law is, purely and simply, government censorship.

It is just the sort of a law Sen. Kefauver's subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency said should *not* be enacted at the federal, state or local levels.

Specifically, Sen. Kefauver had this to say in an interim report to the Senate Judiciary Committee last March 14:

> The subcommittee flatly rejects all suggestions of governmental censorship as being totally out of keeping with our basic American concepts of free press operating in a free land for free people.

The shifting of the responsibility for taste and moral influence from the producer of reading material to police agents is wholly wrong. The police agent can and should guard the citizenry against obviously pornographic and obscene material. But he is not equipped to decide the subtle differences between material which may or may not be injurious to the ethical development of the child. The use of the power of censorship by persons who are not competent to use it is imprudent and impertinent if not un-American.

To our minds, the elimination of crime and horror comic books from Charlotte's newsstands is the responsibility of parents, assisted by citizens groups and competent experts in the field.

As Sen. Kefauver suggests, children can be guided away from the purchase of crime and horror stories. Complaints directed to the vendor and wholesaler, if repeated, will frequently result in the removal of particular publications from the newsstands. Civic organizations can do a worthy job by calling the attention of parents to those materials offered for children's reading that fall below the American standard of decency.

Within the industry itself, the primary responsibility for the contents of each comic book rests squarely on the shoulders of the publisher. Full recognition of this responsibility came last year, with the establishment of the Comics Magazine Association of America and the appointment of New York's Judge Charles F. Murphy as code administrator. But comic books bearing the association's seal of approval have recently carried some rather hair-raising material (a horse is urged to stomp a man to death, a man is prepared for a bath of molten steel, a corpse is tossed in a river, someone is brutally kicked in the jaw—hardly edifying for young or old).

There is no doubt about it: Comic books can be harmful to impressionable people—and most young people are impressionable. But we cannot help but agree with Dr. John R. Cavanagh's recent comment on the subject: "Any undesirable comics would disappear off the newsstands if parents took sufficient interest to look over the comics their children read and to direct their reading."

The Endless Cavern Of Bureaucracy

WHEN bureaucracy is firmly in the saddle, governmental processes seem deliberately designed to make it difficult for anybody to do anything. There is, for instance, a premium on negativity—20 chances of saying no to every one of saying yes.

This is certainly the case in the interminable and costly procedures involved in dealing with the United States government over Charlotte's television Channel 9.

Just to the right, under the heading BUREAUCRACY IN ACTION, we present the chronology of events leading up to this week's decision by Federal Communications Commission Examiner Gifford Irion recommending that the channel be awarded to Piedmont Electronics and Fixture Corp. Diagramming the long, torturous process would be a little like drawing a Rube Goldberg cartoon.

This bureaucratic nonsense has several regrettable aspects. One is that, during the nearly eight years it has taken to get this far, the community has been denied the enjoyment and variety of a second VHF television station.

In addition there is the matter of expense.

A rough estimate of the cost of these proceedings to the three applicants has been offered: $100,000 apiece. The cost to U. S. taxpayers is fully as large.

The transcript of oral testimony consists of 36 volumes containing 4,297 letter size typewritten pages.

The presentation of the direct case of WSOC, and cross-examination thereon, consumed five days and the transcript comprises seven volumes of 942 pages.

The hearing was in progress 38 days stretched over a period of eight months.

This matter has by no means been determined and disposed of. The examiner has merely issued an "initial decision." The case now goes before the seven-member FCC, which may uphold or reverse the examiner. This process is expected to take the greater part of another year.

That should, but needn't, end it.

Any one of the parties has the right to appeal the FCC's decision to the federal district court on points of law only. The question of what is a valid point of law can be determined only by the district court, so that the appeal automatically brings further deferment. However, the poor applicants are by that time so worn out that they seldom appeal.

A thorough examination of such requests is necessary and proper. What we object to is the *needless* delay. There is powerful evidence that many of the delays encountered so far have indeed been needless and therefore preventable.

This sort of red tape, bureaucracy and foot-dragging is part of the larger problem of inefficiency in government. It shows graphically just how badly the nation's political machinery is in need of repair.

Flowing Oratory

ALL THE other senators wanted to call it quits.

One by one they walked out of the Senate Chamber, happy over adjournment and headed for home.

But Sen. Wayne Morse, the filibuster champ and former Independent Party of one, stayed on, reading a long speech on federal aid to education. Farewell handshakes with fellow senators slowed him not a whit. He kept on talking.

President Eisenhower, it is hoped, will forsake any idea of calling a special session to deal with highway legislation. A simple request doubtless would keep Sen. Morse in session to deal with highways or any other matters that might need Congressional attention between now and January.

H. G. Ashcraft, The Master Farmer

MECKLENBURG lost an important link with its illustrious past this week when H. G. Ashcraft passed away at 82.

He had been a resident of the county for nearly half a century. Although he represented Old Mecklenburg in the minds of many newcomers, he was without doubt one of the truly distinguished builders of New Mecklenburg.

At times, however, his influence stretched over the county's borders and across the entire state.

He was, in every sense, a "master farmer" (a title he won from N. C. State College in 1936.)

His special field was dairy farming but his knowledge and ability spanned many fields. He was, for instance, appointed to the N. C. State Vocational Board by the late Gov. Clyde Hoey and to the Soil Erosion Board by the late Gov. O. Max Gardner. Dr. Frank P. Graham, when president of the University of North Carolina, named Mr. Ashcraft to the board which helped formulate farming policies at N. C. State College.

In addition, he was a former president of the State Farmers Convention. For 16 years he served as a member of the Mecklenburg Sanatorium Board and he was long active in Baptist Church affairs.

Mr. Ashcraft's influence—so powerful through the years—will continue to be felt in Mecklenburg and in North Carolina. It will serve as a fitting memorial to a fine citizen.

It's a sign of an increased public interest in world affairs, we suppose, that almost as many customers at the Bit O' Erin Bar and Grill know just what they'd do if they were Eisenhower as know what they'd do if they were Leo Durocher.—FLORIDA TIMES-UNION.

Taking note of a scientist's claim that it is impossible for beer to be intoxicating, a Thomasville minister points out that according to science's law of aerodynamics a bumble bee can't fly, either.—TALLAHASSEE DEMOCRAT

A poll of Ph.D's show that a few years back 33 per cent would like to enter government service, while now only 8 per cent would do so. These Ph.D's may be smarter than we thought they were.—LEXINGTON HERALD.

It's strange how going without stockings became popular with women despite the fact that it isn't expensive.—MATTOON (ILL.) JOURNAL-GAZETTE.

Bureaucracy In Action: The Struggle For Channel 9

Editors' Note: The inner, torturous workings of federal bureaucracy is dramatically outlined in this skeleton chronology of events between the filing of the first application for Charlotte television Channel 9 and the first tentative decision on allocation of the channel. The first application for the channel was filed with the Federal Communications Commission in February, 1948. On Tuesday, almost eight years later, an FCC examiner made his recommendation.

(SEE EDITORIAL)

TIME
A Small Concern

Dec. 1947—WSOC decided to proceed to apply for television permit.

Feb. 5, 1948 — Application filed by WSOC with FCC for Channel 9 television station in Charlotte. Subsequently, two other applications filed for Charlotte television station. Surety Broadcasting Co. (WIST) filed Feb. 26, 1948, for Channel 9. Intercity Advertising Corp. (WAYS) filed for Channel 11.

March 11, 1948 — FCC decides hearing will be required to determine which of three applicants will be given permits.

April 2, 1948 — FCC designated June 23, 1948, for start of hearing to be held in Charlotte.

May 6, 1948 — FCC proposes to add Channel 13 to Charlotte, in addition to Channels 3, 9, 11 already assigned.

June 7, 1948 — FCC indefinitely postponed hearing on Charlotte television applications.

Sept. 30, 1948 — FCC imposes "freeze" on all new or proposed television stations in order to work out additional channels.

July 1949 — FCC proposes new TV channel plan.

March 22, 1951 — FCC proposes a different TV channel plan including "UHF" channels, and assigning Charlotte channels 3, 9 and 36 with Channel 42 reserved for non-commercial educational television in Charlotte. Channel 3 already being assigned to WBTV.

April 11, 1952 — FCC finally adopted a new television channel allocation plan and lifted the "freeze" on new applications for television stations. It also established a schedule for conducting hearings to consider all of the backlog of applications on file and for those which might be filed later. Applications for cities having no television service will be considered first. Charlotte, therefore, falls somewhat far down the list, being No. 19.

June 2, 1952 — Broadcasting Company of the South, Columbia, S. C. (operators of Radio Station WIST, Charlotte) filed application for Channel 9, Charlotte, in opposition to WSOC. This was formerly Surety Broadcasting Corp.

July 1, 1952—WSOC refiled its application as required by FCC upon their lifting of freeze.

Aug. 26, 1952—Application filed by Dan Nicholas of Salisbury for Channel 9 television in Charlotte. Later withdrawn.

Sept. 21, 1952 — Intercity Advertising Corp. (operators of WAYS Radio, Charlotte), modifies its application to specify Channel 36 (UHF)

Sept. 11, 1952 — Piedmont Electronics and Fixture Corp. files application for Channel 9 television station in Charlotte in opposition to WSOC.

Oct. 14, 1953 — FCC announced new plan of procedure for conducting television hearings, intended to speed up the processing.

Nov. 5, 1953 — FCC notifies WSOC and other Charlotte television applicants that hearing will be held on their application.

Dec. 15, 1953 — Carolina's Tele-Company of the South (WIST) withdrew its application for Channel 9 television in Charlotte.

Dec. 15, 1953 — Carolina's Television Corp. a new company, filed application for Channel 9, in Charlotte, opposing WSOC.

Jan. 13, 1954 — FCC designated Feb. 12, 1954, as the date to start hearing, to be held in Washington, on applications of WSOC, Piedmont Electronics & Fixture Corp. and Carolinas Television Corp. for Channel 9 television station in Charlotte.

Feb. 12, 1954—At this pre-hearing conference the three applicants proposed to the FCC that they would agree to take five days for the presentation of each case, 15 days in all, close the hearings at that point and let the hearing stand completed. The Commission declined to agree to any limitation.

March 8, 1954 — Further pre-hearing conferences held in Washington.

March 23, 1954 — FCC examiner directed the start of taking testimony on April 7, 1954.

April 2, 1954 — Broadcast Bureau of FCC disagreed with FCC examiner on the procedure proposed.

April 5, 1954 — FCC examiner ordered indefinite postponement of taking of testimony until the matter was resolved within the commission and an interpretation of the FCC procedure was agreed upon.

May 7, 1954 — Matter was resolved but because of other cases having started in hearing, the taking of testimony was further delayed.

May 11, 1954 — FCC Examiner orders start of taking testimony on July 8, 1954.

July 8, 1954 — Hearing began with taking of testimony.

July 30, 1954 — Hearing recessed for examiner's vacation.

Sept. 13, 1954 — Hearing scheduled to resume.

Sept. 2, 1954 — Resumption of hearing postponed from Sept. 13 to Sept. 15, 1954, at request of Piedmont Electronics Fixture Corp.

Sept. 15, 1954 — Hearing resumed.

Oct. 5, 1954 — Hearing recessed

Oct. 22, 1954 — Hearing resumed. Recessed by examiner until Nov. 15, 1954.

Nov. 10, 1954 — Examiner indefinitely postponed resumption of hearing at request of Piedmont Electronics Fixture Corp.

Dec. 23, 1954 — Examiner designated Jan. 19, 1955, to resume hearing.

Jan. 17, 1955 — Examiner postponed resumption of hearing from Jan. 19 to Feb. 2, 1955 at request of Carolinas TV Corp.

Feb. 2, 1955—Hearing resumed.

Feb. 3, 1955—Hearing recessed until Feb. 23, 1955

Feb. 9, 1955—Examiner moved date of resumption up from Feb. 23 to Feb. 11, 1955.

Feb. 11, 1955—Hearing resumed. Hearing recessed until March 4, 1955.

March 1, 1955 — Examiner postponed resumption of hearing from March 4, 1955, to March 8, 1955.

March 8, 1955 — Hearing resumed.

March 9, 1955 — Taking of testimony closed. Hearing record held open.

March 21, 1955—Record of testimony closed.

April 18, 1955 — Date designated for all applicants to file briefs of proposed findings.

April 6, 1955 — Examiner postponed date for filing proposed findings to April 26, 1955.

April 20, 1955 — Examiner postponed date for filing proposed findings to April 29, 1955.

April 29, 1955 — Examiner postponed date for filing proposed findings to May 2, 1955, and the date for filing reply findings to May 16, 1955.

May 16, 1966 — Proposed findings filed.

May 10, 1955 — Examiner postponed date for filing reply findings to May 20, 1955.

May 20, 1955 — Reply findings filed.

Aug. 2, 1955 — Examiner recommends Channel 9 be granted to Piedmont Electronics and Fixture Corp.

People's Platform

Some Plain Logic About The Bible

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

CONCERNING the question of the existence of a God, and the authority of the Bible, I would like to present some plain logic, and if anyone can present proof that I'm wrong I want to hear it.

The atheist holds that there is no God, no heaven, no hell, and no life after the grave.

On the other hand, the Christian says there is all of that, an ever-present God, a heaven and hell, and life after death, and accepts the Bible as God's book of rules to gain His promises.

Let us suppose that the atheist lives out his life rejecting this teaching, refusing to accept the teachings of the Bible, and opposes it to the end. He then dies, and after death he discovers he has made a dreadful mistake. He finds there is a God, and a heaven and hell, and that everything is just as the Bible said.

And at the same time, I live my life according to the teachings of the Bible. I believe in God, and heaven, and hell, and by trusting God I expect life everlasting. And also, while doing this, I find that this way of life gives me the joy, peace and satisfaction I have always sought. And like the man who didn't believe, I too die. And I made a mistake. None of it was true, no God, no heaven, no hell, no life after the grave, so the results are I will know nothing of my mistake. Now after death, which of the two of us are the worst off?

— J. A. MARTIN

Children Responsible For Care Of Parents

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

I TAKE issue with the assistant state health officer as to children sticking their parents in nursing homes. A child that would do this is just mean in my estimation.

Knowing what I do—and I know what I am talking about—before I would place my parents in a place like that I would give them both an overdose of sleeping powders. Personally, I would rather be a dog in a countryman's back yard eating corn pone than to go to one of those places. I am afraid the doctor only knows about some very high-priced nursing homes. I just don't see how he as a health officer can advocate a thing of that kind.

Take the hand that rocked the cradle and the body that slaved to bring his children up, denying himself many times to let them have food, clothes, shoes, schooling, medicine. And then let misfortune hit their parents as age crawls up on them stick them off in a place like that. And perhaps have a dog eating the finest of food, getting baths, riding around in cars, etc. A child, a son or daughter that would do that is mean as hell.

I am past 76 years old. If one of my children should mention such a thing to me I would order him or her out of the house, and, if they did not go, knock them out the door with the first thing I get my hands on.

Pleasure? There is no pleasure for old people in such a damnable place. Most of them go against their will.

Were my parents living, before I would do that I would steal to feed them if I had to. If two old people have children, that is the children's responsibility and it is their duty before God and man to "honor thy parents that thy days may be long upon the land, which the Lord thy God gave thee."

Before I would go to such a place, or go live with any of my children, and I love and worship them all, I would put myself up a large box and put a sign on it reading: "I am in the dog house now."

I thank God I was born with backbone, independent. No one is sending me to such a place.

—WM. C. McINTIRE

Ervin And Scott Together On All But One Key Vote

By CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

WASHINGTON

NORTH Carolina's Democratic Sens. Sam J. Ervin Jr., and W. Kerr Scott split on only one of nine Key Votes in the first session of the 84th Congress.

SEN. ERVIN

The Key Votes were selected and the North Carolina senators' stands tabulated by Congressional Quarterly.

Ervin and Scott split on the Upper Colorado reclamation project. But they stuck together on such controversial issues as income tax cuts, reciprocal trade, foreign aid, and highway and housing programs.

Scott joined 30 Democrats and 27 Republicans in the vote for passage of the $1.1 billion Upper Colorado project. Ervin, 14 Democrats, and eight Republicans were on the short end of the 58-23 roll call.

The North Carolinians both opposed five Key Vote proposals:

An amendment designed to confine to Formosa and the Pescadores the President's authority to use U. S. armed forces to protect the Chinese Nationalist-held islands.

An unsuccessful effort to delete tightened "escape-clause" provisions from the bill extending the reciprocal trade program.

An amendment restoring $420 million sliced by the House from the foreign aid program.

Another amendment, which was rejected June 7, designed to limit public housing starts to 35,000 units a year for two years.

Administration highway construction financing proposals, which would have been substituted for a Democratic "pay-as-you-go" plan.

Ervin and Scott both voted for:

A Democratic-sponsored proposal to grant a $20 income tax cut while extending excise and corporate taxes.

An unsuccessful attempt to override President Eisenhower's veto of an 8.59 per cent postal pay boost.

An amendment boosting the strength of the Marine Corps in the face of Mr. Eisenhower's military manpower cuts.

KEY VOTES—SENATE

Here, in the order in which they occurred, are the nine Senate roll calls selected by CQ as the Key Votes of 1955. The numbers correspond to those in the accompanying table. In all instances, "yea" votes are cited first.

1. **Formosa Resolution**—In January, President Eisenhower asked Congress to adopt a joint resolution authorizing him to use U. S. armed forces to protect Formosa, the Pescadores and "related positions and territories." The latter were presumed to include the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, located a few miles off the coast of mainland China. Before adopting the resolution, the Senate Jan. 28 rejected, 13-74, an amendment to confine the President's authority to the protection of Formosa and the Pescadores. Party division: Democrats, 11-32; Republicans, 1-42.

2. **Income Tax Cut**—An administration bill extending for one year existing excise and corporate income taxes was amended by the House to include a $20 tax cut for individuals — an item opposed by the President. Faced with Senate opposition to the $20 cut, Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson (D-Tex) offered a substitute which would have extended excise and corporate rates 27 months, while retaining the tax credit for individuals. This the Senate defeated March 15, 44-50. Party division: Democrats, 43-5; Republicans, 1-45. Later the Senate voted to eliminate the $20 credit.

3. **Upper Colorado** — With administration backing, the Senate April 20 passed, 58-23, a bill authorizing a $1.1 billion reclamation program in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Party division: Democrats, 31-15; Republicans, 27-8. However, the House failed to act on the measure.

4. **Reciprocal Trade** — A bill to extend for three years the (reciprocal) Trade Agreements Act, passed by the House, was amended by the Senate Finance Committee, which added, among other items, the following provisions: To require immediate publication of Tariff Commission findings in escape-clause proceedings, to permit use of escape-clause if imports "contributed materially" to a threat of serious injury to a domestic producer, and to permit one segment of an industry to seek escape-clause protection. A move to strike these three provisions from the bill was defeated May 4 by the Senate, 21-67. Party division: Democrats, 21-21; Republicans, 0-46. The Senate thus retained provisions intended to make it easier for domestic industry to obtain relief from foreign competition.

5. **Postal Pay Veto** — President Eisenhower May 19 vetoed a bill giving postal workers an average 8.59 per cent pay increase, and urged a lower figure. The Senate May 24 voted 54-39 to override the veto, but the roll call fell eight votes short of the two-thirds majority needed to override. Party division: Democrats, 46-2; Republicans, 8-37. Later Congress passed and the President signed a bill providing an 8 per cent pay increase.

6. **Highway Program** — The Senate Public Works Committee rejected the administration's plan to finance a long-range highway program by bonds, and reported instead a Democratic-sponsored "pay-as-you-go" program to be financed by appropriations. Before passing the bill, the Senate May 25 rejected, 31-60, a move to substitute the Administration plan. Party division: Democrats, 1-47; Republicans, 30-13. Later, the House killed both plans.

7. **Housing Program** — President Eisenhower asked Congress to authorize construction of 35,000 public housing units a year for two years, but the Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported a bill calling for construction of 135,000 units annually until the 810,000 total authorized in 1949 was reached. The Senate June 7 voted 38-44 to reject an amendment substituting the Administration-backed limit of 35,000 units per year for two years. Party division: Democrats, 6-35; Republicans, 32-9.

8. **Defense Appropriations** — In requesting $32 billion for the Defense Department, President Eisenhower incorporated plans to cut back the number of men in uniform in all services except the Air Force. Before passing the appropriation, the Senate June 20 adopted, 40 - 39, amendments to add $46 million to provide for 22,000 more Marines than the President wanted. Party division: Democrats 37-2; Republicans, 3-37. Later, Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson said the $46 million would be impounded pending "another look."

SEN. SCOTT

9. **Foreign Aid** — The President originally requested $3.5 billion for foreign aid in fiscal 1956, later cut this to $3.2 billion. The House July 11 voted $2.6 billion. The Senate July 22 voted $3.2 billion after accepting, 50-38, a committee amendment to add $420 million to the amount allowed by the House for military assistance. Party division: Democrats, 21-23; Republicans, 29-15. Sum finally agreed to by both Houses was $2.7 billion.

"It says here that Russia has opened several cities to tourists . . . would you like to get 'brain-washed' on your vacation . . .?"

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Rayburn Oil Maneuvers Miff The Veep

WASHINGTON

Two of the most distinguished members of Congress are Sen. Alben Barkley of Kentucky, betug known as the Veep, and Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas, known affectionately to many as Mr. Sam." The other day, Barkley remarked a bit plaintively:

"I am getting awfully tired of passing legislation chiefly for the benefit of Texas and Oklahoma."

What he referred to was the ramrod tactics used to pass the Harris Bill through the House and the proposal to jam it through the Senate—a bill of great help to Texas and Oklahoma because it exempted natural gas producers from federal regulation when shipping gas north in interstate commerce.

That bill, rammed through the House of Representatives by a narrow 209-203 squeak, was a great personal triumph for Sam Rayburn. But as his friend, the Veep, hinted, it almost split the Democratic Party in two.

This, together with the school bill, which Sam Rayburn would not pass, exposed to the public in ugly detail the basic cleavage within the Democratic Party.

It's a cleavage its leaders don't like to show and sometimes won't admit. But when "Mr. Sam" throws the weight of his great prestige into the well of the House and asks fellow Democrats to stand up and be counted for or against him and Texas, while simultaneously sidetracking the school bill, then the cleavage really stands out.

It was a cleavage that had the Democratic leader of the House, John McCormack of Massachusetts, voting against and working against the speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn.

It was a cleavage that caused Rayburn to call the House into session two hours earlier in order to pass his natural gas bill, while keeping the school construction bill waiting another long year.

And it's a cleavage that the Democrats will have to do something about if they even begin to think about electing a president in 1956.