



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

Thomas L. Robinson President and Publisher
 Brodie S. Griffith General Manager
 Robert H. Lampe Advertising Director
 Cecil Prince Associate Editor
 R. L. Young Jr. Managing Editor
 Huey Stinson Circulation Manager

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1956

Think Hard And Think Fast, America

IN Charlotte and across the land, there should be silence tonight.

The strident cacophony of parting political shouts ought really to be replaced by a quiet interval of contemplation.

Suddenly, the citizen needs time to think.

Instead, what began as a moderate campaign has ended in a crescendo of angry rhetoric.

Excitement has reached fever pitch and some of the final speeches and vote-getting appeals have sparked the sort of ugly passion that amped sober onlookers and makes them tremble for national unity.

Perhaps it is true that American life is so poor in pignacancy that these four-year emotional binges are needed as a release from boredom. But man is often not at his best when swept up in emotion.

We are standing on the threshold of a period marked "critical" on all of the world's calendars. The prospect is not pleasant. It is one of wary reappraisals of policy and momentous decisions. America cannot be content with half answers to hard problems, with mediocrity, with stagnation.

It will take all of the intellectual resourcefulness we can muster to pull us through. Most of all, we will need en-

lightened leadership.

The American voting public will decide on that leadership tomorrow. In a highly personal way, each voter will participate in the direction of the most powerful nation in the world.

It is an awesome responsibility and one which will require all of the gumption a citizen can muster in the midst of raucous rant, easy promises and much political pugacity.

Those who have set made up their minds will have to think hard and think fast to make their decisions.

The obligation to vote has never been stronger.

In 1952, more than 62 million Americans thronged to the polls in an inspiring demonstration of lively, responsible citizenship. It was the biggest election in U. S. history. But still it indicated only 63 per cent of the nation's adult population cared enough about the political destiny of the country to mark a ballot.

In contrast, recent statistics indicate that 95 per cent of the electorate votes in Belgium, 94 per cent in Italy and 90 per cent in Austria.

Are Americans less interested in democratic rule than some European nations?

In the important 1954 congressional elections, fewer than 44,450,000 Americans went to the polls—less than 82 per cent of the adult population.

Tomorrow will be a new test of the political conscience of the nation. The people of America must not fail it. They must vote in even greater numbers than ever before.

Penetrate the rant and the confusion and the fuzzy name-calling. Do not be misled by the mad flights of political gibberish and "things that go bump in the night." Know your candidate. Know your party. Know the issues. Then... vote.

See you at the polls!

lightened leadership.

The American voting public will decide on that leadership tomorrow. In a highly personal way, each voter will participate in the direction of the most powerful nation in the world.

It is an awesome responsibility and one which will require all of the gumption a citizen can muster in the midst of raucous rant, easy promises and much political pugacity.

Those who have set made up their minds will have to think hard and think fast to make their decisions.

The obligation to vote has never been stronger.

In 1952, more than 62 million Americans thronged to the polls in an inspiring demonstration of lively, responsible citizenship. It was the biggest election in U. S. history. But still it indicated only 63 per cent of the nation's adult population cared enough about the political destiny of the country to mark a ballot.

In contrast, recent statistics indicate that 95 per cent of the electorate votes in Belgium, 94 per cent in Italy and 90 per cent in Austria.

Are Americans less interested in democratic rule than some European nations?

In the important 1954 congressional elections, fewer than 44,450,000 Americans went to the polls—less than 82 per cent of the adult population.

Tomorrow will be a new test of the political conscience of the nation. The people of America must not fail it. They must vote in even greater numbers than ever before.

Penetrate the rant and the confusion and the fuzzy name-calling. Do not be misled by the mad flights of political gibberish and "things that go bump in the night." Know your candidate. Know your party. Know the issues. Then... vote.

See you at the polls!



Civil Service: An Error Is Corrected

FOR restoring educational requirements for fire and police department employment, Civil Service commissioners deserve a renewal of public confidence.

Their action reasserts the city's will to maintain a policy of strengthening the quality and efficiency of municipal services. Ways can be found by making the jobs more attractive.

The commissioner's earlier action of abolishing the requirements perhaps would have made the jobs more attractive to more applicants, but not to persons best qualified to maintain the present high performance of the departments. That action also would have lowered the prestige and morale of Civil Service employees who have met the educational requirements and are proud of the improved standards of city employment.

Although the commissioners did not

explain their action at the time, it turns out that some action was needed to attract applicants. Fortunately the problem was never brought out into the open, and the quite proper course of examining the city pay scale has been taken by the City Council.

Quality costs, to be sure, but it also pays in the long run.

Cities never could afford operation of services without high standards of employment. They did it for many years during a time when the city payrolls were regarded as political gravy trains, and most often were such in fact. But city services were not carried out efficiently, and the public did not hold its employees in high esteem.

Educational standards have been the main bulwark in reversing that situation. We're glad to see them restored in Charlotte, and we thank the Civil Service Commission for bringing them back.

Tarheelia, Stronghold Of Plain Talk

WE NEVER thought the day would come when a South Carolinian (a South Carolinian, mind you) would poke fun at the way Tar Heels talk. Everybody knows North Carolina is the haven of concise, plain talk. Why, the only reason the General Assembly adopted a state motto in Latin ("Esse Quam Videri," meaning "to be rather than to seem") was that "it would require at least six English words to express the same idea."

Now, along comes the editor of the GREENVILLE (S. C.) PIEDMONT who suggests that our latter day statesmen converse in gobbledeygook, of all things.

To illustrate, he tells of a recent conference held in Raleigh to study plans for the expansion of public facilities in the Great Smoky Mountains. Our critic quotes one Tar Heel official thusly:

We should agree on the general highlights of the report, the element of emphasis and the limits to which we can logically go into evaluations of potentials.

That's nothing. We would like to explore more of the Carolina friend to some real gobbledeygook.

Realization has grown that the curriculum or the experiences of learners change and improve only as those who are most directly involved examine their goals, improve their understandings and increase their skill in performing the tasks necessary to reach newly defined goals. This is the focus upon the teacher, lay citizen and learner as partners in curricular improvement and as the individuals who must change, if there is to be curricular change.

It is credited to (you peeped?) a South Carolina educator.

Next case.

A NOTE ON NEMESIS

PAPA, what is nemesis? Huh, papa? Child, I will tell you what nemesis is. Nemesis is fate, nemesis is what happens to all men. Like what, papa?

Son, you go out to the golf course and you see the clouds, and you see the wind is blowing them in the opposite direction and so you say what the heck and you go up to the first tee and you drive off, and you approach well and you are having a good day on the greens, you can tell that from the way the ball behaved on the first green, and you drive off on No. 2 and it is straight and reasonably true considering your habitual slice, and you haul out your No. 3 wood and you whaley away and the ball goes looping high in the air, straight for the green. Then it is nemesis, son, because it starts to rain and it continues to rain and rain, until finally you give up and trudge back to the clubhouse, leaving your ball where it landed, and you are cold and wet and disgusted, and that is nemesis. For nemesis, son, is sudden rain on No. 2 of the front nine.

Next case.

Realization has grown that the curriculum or the experiences of learners change and improve only as those who are most directly involved examine their goals, improve their understandings and increase their skill in performing the tasks necessary to reach newly defined goals. This is the focus upon the teacher, lay citizen and learner as partners in curricular improvement and as the individuals who must change, if there is to be curricular change.

It is credited to (you peeped?) a South Carolina educator.

Next case.

Some Last-Minute Opinion On A Great Decision

Mooreville
 The News
 N... been such a dearth of able men as the GOP offers today, as against the array of able men who carry the banners of the opposition, an array of men who by reason of their ability could have availed themselves of the prestige of the U. S. in the impending struggle.

Clear in the minds of all is the brigandage of Egypt in seizing the Suez Canal under the noble and exalted pretext of national sovereignty, a scorching strip of desert sand made valuable by the effort of France and England. The impudence and attitude of the U. S. is plainly visible to all at this too late date.

The spectacle of an aged man coming here to vote in a vain effort to cajole the complexes of a people into an area of understanding and a decent regard for the principle of living and letting live, a people for the most part who have bred themselves out of their environment and seek to correct their condition by imposing on other peoples more fortunately situated.



HARRY S. TRUMAN
A Mantle Rejected

When candidate Eisenhower announced during the 1952 campaign, that he would go to Korea if elected, with the implication that he would stop the war, he made one of the most contemptible bids for votes in the annals of American history.

The Korean action was in defense of the freedom of South Korea and in guaranty of her territorial integrity.

A commitment had been made by both the United States and the United Nations to South Korea. Dwight Eisenhower knew it. The publisher of The News knew it. And the voters knew it. Therefore, the government of the United States and our associates of the United Nations were determined that the Korean action should be held to its original high and noble purpose. President Truman, with perspicacity and honor, withstood all cunning, conniving and even cowardly attempts to undermine this government and our allies in the high purpose of that issue. With dogged patience Mr. Truman withstood the rabid ravings of the appeasers on the one hand, who would hang the yellow mantle of shame over the shoulders of Uncle Sam by pulling out, and, on the other hand, he resisted the vicious outcries of the followers of the great military hero of the Pacific, Gen. MacArthur, to spread the war.

The Korean action was a righteous action. Every man and woman in public life in America, who expressed himself or herself, said so and every responsible newspaper agreed with

the world were set at naught.

Peace without the stigma of appeasement? The people of every little nation in the world and of every big nation too terrified with a paralyzing shock that a mutation was occurring in the U. S. The great and powerful American government had quit the plow in mid-furrow. Peace at any price was now the vogue in Washington. Thus began the great fall away from the U. S. Desperate to stem the administration sought to stem the tide.

Mr. Editor, do you know what the administration is doing all unwittingly? They are creating the setting for another war. Distrust and confusion are growing all over the world. Where once the people could look to the U. S. as "the shadow of a mighty rock in a weary land," they now know that in Washington there is a President who was elected on a peace-at-any-price pledge and who is so afraid of defeat in the upcoming election that he cannot develop any foreign policy but appeasement.

—LACY RANSOM.

There should be no doubt in the mind of the greatest of all citizens in this district as to who can best serve all the people and who has the ability and experience to do so. In fact, he should all feel highly honored to have such an outstanding congressman as Mr. Jones represent us.

—WILLIAM G. CALDWELL

There should be no doubt in the mind of the greatest of all citizens in this district as to who can best serve all the people and who has the ability and experience to do so. In fact, he should all feel highly honored to have such an outstanding congressman as Mr. Jones represent us.

—WILLIAM G. CALDWELL

The Democrats Lack Firm Foreign Policy

Maiden
 Editors, The News:
 THINK seriously before you cast your ballot. Think about the 20th Century. Fifty six years of its enactment, 28 under the Republicans, 28 under the Democrats.

They are not the war party, but the party of peace. The Republican party is the party of a positive foreign policy. Read the President's statement about the Middle East controversy. He takes a positive stand, and serves notice on all nations that he will not be involved.

We have so many people that look at the past and not at the future. We if it is any consolation to the Democrats to look back at the Hoover administration, I will suggest that you look a little further back at the Cleveland administration, then at the Wilson administration that was the war that was kept out of us — then look at the Roosevelt administration who said, "I have said it before and I will say it again and again and again: No American boys will fight on foreign soil. The purpose of defense is to defend the home." Then look a little later at the Truman debacle. Did you find anything in their record to be proud of...?

We have a leader in Dwight D. Eisenhower who has proved he can deal with these problems without getting us involved in war and let's be sure we keep him there. The most highly respected person in the United States and the world today, and he has won that respect by his honesty and integrity, and he has restored respect to the high office which he now holds. Also Richard M. Nixon has proved himself a man very popular with certain people in the country whom you hear criticizing him. What has he done wrong or against the American people...?

— D. H. ABERNETHY

them, including The Charlotte News. The people of every little nation, trembling in fear under the shadow of the impending Red invincibility, took courage. This was the world situation on that dark day when, a unit then, spotless knight in shining armor let a cheap, thoughtless, cunning and thoroughly dishonest and reckless group of power hungry political advisers sell him a tawdry bill of goods. This, they told him, is a tight election; there are millions more Democrats in America than Republicans. You have got to be the magician. Take this rabbit. Go out before the mothers of America and pull it from your campaign hat and you are in.

I showed the greatest fall in his character, the desire to win at any price.

The Korean War was stopped — yes, stopped on Red terms. At what cost an American presidential election? At this cost: the blood and treasure expended there with honor and respect before all the world was made to appear as a thing of shame. The sacrifices of the fighting men who had brought the Reds to the bar of justice before

One Act Justifies Re-Electing Jones

Rt. 3, Lincoln
 Editors, The News:
 FOR ONE citizen of Lincoln County, an unjust proof of the fact that the fine representation that we have had in Congress for the past four years has come from our town and county, but most of all from one of the greatest men ever known in the Tenth District in America — our own Charles Roper Jones.

While his two terms in office have meant much to all the people of Lincoln County in many ways, I will mention only one thing he did and that alone should be enough reason to return him to Washington, U. S. 3rd Congress, second session, Mr. Jones introduced Public Law 768, H. R. 623, better known as the "Jones

Newly Formed Party Will Appreciate Nixon

Charlotte
 Editors, The News:
 VICE President Richard Nixon is an unpopular candidate. There is not a Communist on earth who likes him. Every Communist newspaper blasts him. Nor do the people who have seen his name mentioned. The Socialists do not like him.

The same element that destroyed the party of the great of all generals, Douglas MacArthur, will, if possible, destroy Nixon and our good senator from Mississippi, James O. Eastland, and our good party succeeded.

The only thing against Richard Nixon is that he is a patriotic American citizen who is not afraid to oppose all left wing Socialist and Communist fellow travelers. A new party, the Constitution Party, has already been organized, so I understand, in 23 states, and by 1960 can carry the election.

—PARKS A. VANDLE

Vote For John Doe, Instead Of Liberals

Monroe
 Editors, The News:
 NO ONE can describe a "liberal" more accurately than another "liberal." The nation therefore, is indebted to candidates Eisenhower and Stevenson for their remarks concerning each other in the presidential campaign.

"Liberal" Stevenson of "liberal" Eisenhower: His assurances "have been tragically false and in truth," he has made statements that are "manifestly untrue," he has used "deception," he has been engaged in a "campaign of deceit" unmatched in U. S. politics.

Says "liberal" Eisenhower of "liberal" Stevenson (without mentioning his name): The price-fixing program he supports is "mockery and deceit," he has talked "wicked nonsense" and "half-truth," he has used the "hit-and-run" statement, and put to new use the rubber yardstick by which "vice" sense and nonsense become happily confused.

Our nation has suffered by being denied a choice between a liberal and a conservative candidate for president. It has been rewarded however by the liberals' descriptions of each other.

In conclusion, I could not vote for either "liberal." My vote, in protest, goes to "John Doe."

—PETER J. KING

Eisenhower Record: Steady Appraisal

Huntersville
 Editors, The News:
 THE expected has occurred. The Republican publisher of The News has again pushed his paper into a campaign in support of his party. However, it must have done so with tongue in cheek, for says The News: "The President has brought the peace without stigma of appeasement, prosperity without cata-

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON
 HERE are the facts, as I have been able to check them, regarding reports that the National Security Council had agreed to enter negotiations with Russia for banning H-bomb tests but reversed that position after Adlai Stevenson proposed it.

Information to this effect came to my attention about ten days ago. I knew it would be denied. I didn't write the story. At that time I was causing headaches to my editors by getting one rather well publicized denial from the White House, and being human I wasn't anxious to get another.

Report

Several days later, Oct. 29, The New York Times published a cautious "report" that the National Security Council had decided to try to ban H-bomb tests prior to the Stevenson proposal.

To see how the White House would react, Jim Hagerty's office was queried. He was not in. His assistant, Murray Snyder, was. He refused to comment.

Sentators Ask

Later, four Democratic senators specifically queried the White House, citing among other things a statement made by William T. Frye, Chairman, Science Monitor reporter for the United Nations. Following this, the White House issued a categorical denial. Reports that Eisen-

Ike Once Favored H-Bomb Test Ban

hower advisers recommended a move to ban H-bomb tests, it was stated, are entirely wrong.

The Facts

However, careful checking with sources has convinced me that the following facts are correct. They have been denied. But I write them on this extremely important subject as what I regard to be the truth.

On Sept. 11, the National Security Council held an informal meeting at the White House. It was described later as an ad hoc meeting. Not all the members were present.

At this meeting Secretary of State Dulles argued that a moratorium on H-bomb tests would win friends for us abroad. It would give us the diplomatic initiative and help convince the world that we are more peace-loving than Moscow.

Stassen Okay

Harold Stassen, a specialist on disarmament, supported him. He felt that a ban on H-bomb tests would offer dramatic evidence that President Eisenhower was seeking peace.

Secretary of Defense Wilson, however, and Admiral Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, were vigorously opposed. They warned that Russia might violate the agreement and test

Final Voting

In the final voting, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey sided with Dulles and Stassen. The President himself concurred. As is customary, the decision was finally made "unanimously" and it was agreed "in principle" to explore means of obtaining a ban on H-bomb tests.

Details Left

Details as to when the proposal should be made to Russia, what weapons should be banned, and how the agreement should be enforced, were left to be worked out later.

Warning

Approximately one week later, political advisers to the President warned that Stevenson had made speeches as early as last April proposing to ban H-bomb tests, and had mentioned this again in speeches in the first part of September. His idea had not caused much public comment when the National Security Council acted on Sept. 11, but White

Let Mr. Pearson Feud In Private

Charlotte
 Editors, The News:
 WHY continue to air the dirty linen of Drew Pearson and Jim Hagerty in the public press? Aside from Pearson and Hagerty, who cares which one said what? Pearson writes it today; tomorrow Hagerty writes about so why waste time, effort and space in your paper printing such trash? Of course there is no law which says I have to read it, and mostly I don't, but if Pearson can't find anything more important to write about than the feud between Hagerty and himself, why not just leave the space blank, or put a trivial article in the space occupied by Pearson's column?

—Z. J. TALLEY



Win Friends

At this meeting Secretary of State Dulles argued that a moratorium on H-bomb tests would win friends for us abroad. It would give us the diplomatic initiative and help convince the world that we are more peace-loving than Moscow.

Stassen Okay

Harold Stassen, a specialist on disarmament, supported him. He felt that a ban on H-bomb tests would offer dramatic evidence that President Eisenhower was seeking peace.

Secretary of Defense Wilson, however, and Admiral Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, were vigorously opposed. They warned that Russia might violate the agreement and test

Small Bombs

small bombs without our knowledge, though they admitted we should be able to detect large hydrogen bomb explosions.

Final Voting

In the final voting, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey sided with Dulles and Stassen. The President himself concurred. As is customary, the decision was finally made "unanimously" and it was agreed "in principle" to explore means of obtaining a ban on H-bomb tests.

Details Left

Details as to when the proposal should be made to Russia, what weapons should be banned, and how the agreement should be enforced, were left to be worked out later.

Warning

Approximately one week later, political advisers to the President warned that Stevenson had made speeches as early as last April proposing to ban H-bomb tests, and had mentioned this again in speeches in the first part of September. His idea had not caused much public comment when the National Security Council acted on Sept. 11, but White

House Political Advisers

House political advisers urged that it would be a mistake to play into Stevenson's hands.

The full details of their arguments to the President are now known. But it is reported that the unprecedented victory in Maine plus the fast pace Stevenson and Kefauver were setting worried the President and he reluctantly agreed to reverse the H-bomb stand.

Attack

Finally, on Sept. 19, Eisenhower came out with a vigorous statement attacking Stevenson's H-bomb proposal as "a theatrical gesture." Following this, and as the story of the Oct. 11 meeting began to leak, the President became so worried over the leak that he asked the FBI to investigate.

Angry Lecture

On Oct. 26, the President stormed into the National Security Council meeting angrily lectured them about leaks. He said he had been told that the Oct. 11 decision had become known to people outside the Security Council and as a result he was ordering a full FBI investigation.

Note — It is possible that the White House denial of the above story is based upon the excuse that the National Security Council meeting of Sept. 11 was not a formal meeting, in that the top members sat down with the President without the staff members who normally attend regularly scheduled N.S.C. meetings.

Angry Lecture

House political advisers urged that it would be a mistake to play into Stevenson's hands.

The full details of their arguments to the President are now known. But it is reported that the unprecedented victory in Maine plus the fast pace Stevenson and Kefauver were setting worried the President and he reluctantly agreed to reverse the H-bomb stand.

Attack

Finally, on Sept. 19, Eisenhower came out with a vigorous statement attacking Stevenson's H-bomb proposal as "a theatrical gesture." Following this, and as the story of the Oct. 11 meeting began to leak, the President became so worried over the leak that he asked the FBI to investigate.

Angry Lecture

On Oct. 26, the President stormed into the National Security Council meeting angrily lectured them about leaks. He said he had been told that the Oct. 11 decision had become known to people outside the Security Council and as a result he was ordering a full FBI investigation.

Note — It is possible that the White House denial of the above story is based upon the excuse that the National Security Council meeting of Sept. 11 was not a formal meeting, in that the top members sat down with the President without the staff members who normally attend regularly scheduled N.S.C. meetings.

Note —

House political advisers urged that it would be a mistake to play into Stevenson's hands.

The full details of their arguments to the President are now known. But it is reported that the unprecedented victory in Maine plus the fast pace Stevenson and Kefauver were setting worried the President and he reluctantly agreed to reverse the H-bomb stand.

Attack

Finally, on Sept. 19, Eisenhower came out with a vigorous statement attacking Stevenson's H-bomb proposal as "a theatrical gesture." Following this, and as the story of the Oct. 11 meeting began to leak, the President became so worried over the leak that he asked the FBI to investigate.

Angry Lecture

On Oct. 26, the President stormed into the National Security Council meeting angrily lectured them about leaks. He said he had been told that the Oct. 11 decision had become known to people outside the Security Council and as a result he was ordering a full FBI investigation.

Note — It is possible that the White House denial of the above story is based upon the excuse that the National Security Council meeting of Sept. 11 was not a formal meeting, in that the top members sat down with the President without the staff members who normally attend regularly scheduled N.S.C. meetings.