# THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

Thomas L. Robinson ..... *President and Publisher*
Brodie S. Griffith ..... *General Manager*
Cecil Prince ..... *Associate Editor*
Thomas G. Fesperman ..... *Managing Editor*
W. W. Sirmon ..... *Circulation Manager*

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1956


## Smog Control: The Eyes Have It

THAT dirty smear of pollution on Engineer Charles Frost's smokescope constitutes a point after touchdown for citizens who succeeded in having the city's air pollution control program revived.

Trusting their own eyes and noses they insisted there was something in the air that shouldn't be. The scientific evidence now available lends abundant proof. During two early morning hours Wednesday air testing equipment registered 82 per cent pollution of the air.

Made earlier, of course, such tests could have quelled Council's indecision on the control program much more easily. As it turns out civic eyes and noses were sharp enough to bring the right decision.

The present significance of the tests is in showing that the scope of the problem has not been exaggerated by the clean air advocates. The city has not embarked on an expensive sea of silliness. The air is polluted. It is unhealthy. It has to be cleaned up.

The test data should root out any lingering indecision in City Hall as to the need for a vigorous program emphasizing education and cooperation, but backed by a willingness to resort to enforcement.

## A Campaign Pledge Well Remembered

IN an age of easy promises and self-adjusting memories, Sen. J. Strom Thurmond's announcement that he will resign and place himself at the mercy of South Carolina's voters this spring is refreshing.

Regardless of the risk involved (and that is negligible), it is a proper gesture.

In the heat of a remarkable write-in campaign prior to the 1954 general election, Mr. Thurmond promised that, if elected, he would indeed step down in 1956 and seek the Democratic nomination fairly and squarely in the primary.

But he won a six-year office. He is under no legal compulsion to brave this year's primary battles. God willing, he could remain in office until 1960.

That he intends to keep his pledge speaks well for the senator's integrity. Lesser men have reneged on larger promises. There is a tradition about such campaign proclamations that is particularly slippery.

The 1954 contest was conducted under unusual circumstances. There were many superfluous issues—involving both party machinery, personal spite and political skullduggery. A new test, when surplus emotion has been drained off and a certain order has been restored, will tend to clear the political air in South Carolina.

In short, Sen. Thurmond's decision is clearly in the public interest.

## Give Foreign Policy A New Flexibility

UNANIMOUS approval by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of President Eisenhower's nomination of Robert R. Bowie as assistant secretary of state is hopeful evidence of the China Lobby's dwindling fire power.

Mr. Bowie had been under attack because it was rumored that he favored U. S. recognition of Red China and the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Actually, he has advocated nothing of the kind. He has merely urged that the question not be subjected to blind, unreasoning resolution and that our Far Eastern policy be flexible enough to serve the best interests of the United States at any particular time.

As chief of the State Department's policy planning staff, he has not always been in total agreement with Secretary of State Dulles. But he has demonstrated the kind of probing mind, clear-eyed judgment and hard common sense that our government needs. What China Lobby supporters of Chiang Kai-shek obviously feared was that if Mr. Bowie truly thought that America's enlightened self interest would be served by recognition of Red China at some future time then he would say so in no uncertain terms. Indeed, we believe that he would. Furthermore, if he thought so he should.

But it was announced this week that Mr. Bowie had testified before the committee that he was opposed to recognition "under all the existing conditions." Asked whether Mr. Bowie had not thus in fact refused to commit himself against recognition in any foreseeable future circumstances, Sen. George, committee chairman, replied:

"I understood him to be dealing with the question simply as it existed today."

Sen. Knowland, who has taken a decidedly dim view of Mr. Bowie, now has bowed before growing pressure for realism in our Far Eastern relations. He promises not to fight the nomination. Other opposition is likewise collapsing.

These telling indications of a return to sanity are gratifying. The full Senate should not only confirm Mr. Bowie's appointment without further ado but should lend an attentive ear to his ideas on a dynamic U. S. foreign policy as well. The need is for flexibility and reason—not blind stubbornness when stubbornness is not supported by common sense and changing world conditions. Cussedness has its value but also its limits.

## No Spikes

CONNIE MACK didn't seem old enough to die.

True, he was 93. But until subtraction showed us the first of those 93 years was 1862 it was hard to think of him, even after his death Wednesday, as an old man. His life was totally enmeshed with baseball, and baseball smacks of sunshine, vigor and youth.

We had come to think of him as indestructible. He had some of that quality. It's a pity he hadn't enough remaining to carry him into another season when the teams were playing.

It wasn't fitting for Connie Mack to go in winter, without his spikes on.

From The Richmond News Leader

## THE MAN BEHIND WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

HAMLET: *Whose grave's this sir?*

FIRST CLOWN: *Mine, sir . . .*

HAMLET: *I think it be thine, indeed; for thou liest in't.*

FOR the past hundred years and more, scholars have speculated whether William Shakespeare really wrote the plays and poems ascribed to him. It has been a favorite indoor sport to try to prove that Shakespeare not only did not write and could not have written his works, but that this or that historical figure wrote them instead.

Most often the authorship has been ascribed to Francis Bacon, author of the NOVUM ORGANUM and other prose works. Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, and the playwright and poet Christopher Marlowe have also been proposed.

All of these theories arise out of the negative proposition that the historical William Shakespeare could not have written the plays and poems ascribed to him because he did not possess the requisite education and classical learning. Because he came from a yeoman rather than a courtly family, because he did not attend Cambridge, because no manuscripts indisputably written in his handwriting exist, it follows that someone else *must* have written the plays and poems for him. Or so the logic runs.

Thus the news from England that permission has been granted to open a centuries-old tomb in a County Kent church to see whether Christopher Marlowe wrote the Shakespeare plays comes as no surprise. Marlowe's patron and friend, the fourth Walsingham, is interred there along with three other gentlemen of the same name.

The idea is that when Marlowe fell under suspicion of treason, midway in the sixteenth century, the fourth Walsingham arranged that a man who had been killed in a London tavern fight would be buried as Marlowe, leaving Marlowe himself free to retire to a secluded spot and there write all the plays and poems. Naturally an author would have to be named, so the country bumpkin called Shakespeare, an actor, was selected.

Scholars who support the Marlowe theory declare that when the fourth Walsingham died, he carried to his grave evidence of the deception. By opening the tomb and examining the bodies, they hope, sure proof of the proposition can be found.

They will of course find nothing. For in all of the published plays and poems of Christopher Marlowe, there is no evidence that they were written by the same hand that wrote the Shakespeare plays, and there is ample evidence to the contrary. Marlowe was a fine, at times even a great dramatist. But he was no Shakespeare.

The various theories about Shakespearean authorship stem from the same motives as those which must make Andrew Jackson the illegitimate father of Abraham Lincoln, or the like. It is the notion that genius must be inherited, that it is impossible for humble origins to produce greatness. Shakespeare was of unlettered ancestry; therefore he *could* not have been Shakespeare.

When the tomb is opened and no secret documents are found (as if such a coup could ever have been kept secret!), perhaps a few of the theorizers will give up the quest. Most of them, however, will simply shrug their shoulders and look for something else. For fanciful theories like this one, facts are unimportant.

One thing is certain: If spirits walk the earth, the ghost of William Shakespeare will surely be on hand at old St. Nicholas Church at Chiselhurst, County Kent, to watch the goings-on when the graves are opened. No one would have enjoyed the ghost-writer school of Shakespearean scholarship more than the author of THE TEMPEST.

People's Platform

## The Skeleton In 'Dixie's' Closet Is A Yankee

Lancaster, S. C.

Editors, The News:

AS A transplanted Yankee who keeps hoping he'll learn to understand the South, I was badly discouraged in this endeavor by Mr. J. Earl's letter in your issue of Feb. 7. Mr. Earl, a fellow Lancastrian, exhorts southerners (including naturalized ones like me, I hope) to show profound respect for "Dixie," the Confederate National Anthem.

Mr. Editor, I would like very much to do as Mr. Earl exhorts; and before I was transplanted, I could easily have done so. Back in those benighted Yankee days, "Dixie" was to me a rousing American song that recalled all the fire and gallantry of the Old South. I showed for the song more than respect, I showed wild enthusiasm, particularly when it was played or sung in far-off places like Budapest or Bratislava.

But, Mr. Editor, since I moved down here, it has been suggested to me, by those professing an interest in my education, that "Dixie" was written by a Yankee and first sung in 1859 in New York City. I have even heard it intimated that the term "Dixie" originally had reference to the southern end of Manhattan Island. Now I ask you, how can a southerner, even a naturalized southerner, get profoundly respectful about a thing like that?

FIRST OFFICIAL CONFEDERATE FLAG
But 'Bonnie Blue Flag' Was The Anthem

There's something else, too. I've been reading some books, and the books seem to say that the Confederate National Anthem was not "Dixie" but the "Bonnie Blue Flag," first sung at New Orleans in 1861 honoring a blue flag with a single white star—a flag which was never officially adopted by the Confederacy.

Mr. Editor, I'm in a quandary. What should a good Southerner do with his profound respect?

—A. Z. F. WOOD

## Taney & Wilberforce: The Voice Of History

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

I WOULD LIKE to reply to the letter in Wednesday's Peoples Platform from Dr. K. A. Price of Hickory. Certain arguments he presents with respect to the slavery question and Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's decision in the Dred Scott case must be challenged lest some of your readers accept as fact a conclusion which appears to be based entirely on Dr. Price's own imagination and personal interpretation.

Dr. Price's main argument is that since the Negro was not mentioned in the constitution the founding fathers nursed the idea that he would be "sent back" to Africa at some more convenient time. Dr. Price quotes Patrick Henry's great speech, ". . . Give me liberty or give me death," and says: "Why should such an honest man as Patrick Henry want to make such a positive declaration unless he was sure the Negroes in America would be sent home?" It is hard to follow this. What did one thing—Negro slavery—to do with another, a speech against the oppression of George III's Furthermore, there does not exist such a concept of "being sent back" under our constitutional law and even before the constitution — in Locke's "Constitutions for the Carolinas," for instance. Even in Patrick Henry's day over one-half of the Negro slaves were already native-born.

**'BEING SENT BACK'**

Dr. Price confuses the whole idea of "being sent back" with his history of the abolition movement in England. This was initiated by the early Methodists of England and fought through with a tenacity of purpose which still has no parallel in religious or social action. They were led by Mr. Wilberforce and Mr. Clarkson and their imagination and inspiration would do justice to the most forceful religious revival or campaign of modern times, including all our tremendously improved means of communication. They made it fashionable for instance for upper - middle - class ladies to sign all their letters: "Abolish The Human Slave Traffic."

Eventually, these few men carried the day, probably the most notable victory in the entire history of human relations. British gunboats now patrolled the African coast and took the slave ships as prizes. Perhaps here is where Dr. Price gets his "being sent back" idea from — because the British gunboat captain had been given tremendous powers to cope with the slave traffic. He sentenced the master and crew of the slave ships, took the ship as a forfeit, and returned the Negroes to Sierra Leone on the African coast where they set up local councils of government, each according to his prior clan identification, but they all came to recognize England as the "mother country" and celebrated all of England's national holidays.

**IN TOUCH**

Dr. Price says that Mr. Wilberforce may have been in touch with Jefferson, Madison and the other framers of our constitution. Indeed he was in touch with them. He was "in touch" with political leaders wherever slavery existed as an institution, but two tremendous events in history were obstacles in his path. The French had tentatively agreed to join the British in abolishing slavery, but during the negotiations the Bastille fell and France had a bigger problem to face at the moment.

Dr. Price's statement that our founding fathers were not concerned with the Negro, is completely erroneous. The Negro was constantly on the minds of the founding fathers, to this extent: They faced a momentous decision whether it was more important to establish the United States of America, or to deal with the problem and risk the probability that the plantation colonies would not join the Union.

**GREAT PRICE**

I am certain that today every patriotic Negro in America will probably agree that, faced with this clear - cut alterative, the founding fathers acted wisely. The situation specifically recognized slavery. The northern delegates agreed with this proviso—that the words, "slave" or "slavery" should not appear in the text. Many of the delegates knew that they had paid a great price for union, but they felt it was worth it and left the problem to a future generation.

To uphold his point against citizenship status for the Negro, Dr. Price tolls the opinion of Chief Justice Taney. Indeed Justice Taney was a great man and it would have been well if Dr. Price had quoted at least a portion of the Dred Scott Decision, which by the way does not give the slightest hint of this concept of "being sent back."

**"It is difficult at this day (1856) to realize the state of public opinion in relation to that unfortunate race, which prevailed in the civilized and enlightened portions of the world at the time of the Declaration of Independence and when the constitution of the United States was framed and adopted."**

Thus Justice Taney began his famous opinion with the stated fact that "public opinion" in 1776 and in 1789 had not permitted of a solution, and there does not exist a scrap of paper to indicate that Jefferson, or Madison, Virginians all, had ever considered the idea of the Negroes "being sent back." Their reluctance to deal with the problem was based solely on the desire to get the constitution adopted and the nation established.

—HARRY L. GOLDEN

## Racial Row Produces 'Sense Of Revulsion'

Pittsboro

Editor, The News:

REAMS of paper and millions of words will be used in decrying the Alabama University racial upheaval, and none or very few at least will reflect the truth of the matter. Some will see only a part and imagine the rest, while others will magnify what they saw and fill the vacancies with prejudiced reports. In short, it's an ugly situation at best and will be made worse by deliberation.

The older I grow the more keenly aware I become of the perplexity of the antinomies and enigmas of life. I just can't understand the confused and contradictory thinking and conduct of supposedly intelligent people. We have here the culmination of racial animosity that has existed, more or less intensely, for thousands of years here and there throughout the earth, with no area or clime without it. However, the urge for correction of an age-old affliction just wells up in those who generally know nothing about the disease or in response to an impulse of generalcussedness break out of their own skein and attempt to solve the other fellows' problems. Not within 15 years have we had such a sorry spectacle in the South as that exhibited at the University of Alabama this week. Many such have occurred in the North and the West, but the South had been able to avoid such unsightedness from the outside attempted to take over our social and civil activities.

**SENSE OF DISGUST**

Maybe I should not express it, but there is a sense of disgust and revulsion in me, re: this occurrence, that will not down. We have in the background of this a court composed of men from various sections of the country, three of whom from the South, one from the Deep South, and I recall that he rose to political eminence via the KKK organization, who, by main strength and awkwardness, overturned the ruling of every court, including its own for five times, that had spoken on the subject and held that segregation violated the 14th Amendment to the U. S. Constitution. Acting de hors its function and authority, it precipitated a political and social revolution, the end of which is not in sight nor can the cost in blood and treasury be forecast.

And don't throw the term "anarchy" at me for so saying. The North paid absolutely no attention to the Dred Scott decision of the U. S. Supreme Court or the acts of Congress respecting slavery before the Civil War. But we are reminded that the national conscience revolted against the practice of slavery, and it did after it had its pockets filled with the planters' cash for the slaves that were not then conditioned for service in the mines and factories of the North.

**RACIAL IDENTITY**

And don't accuse me of being a Negro baiter. I have never had an altercation with a Negro in my life, though I worked in the fields with them until manhood, nor have I ever made an indecent overture to a Negro. I have financed some through college and have defended them, without pay or hope of pay, for even capital offenses, and but for health limitations I would do so now. I love the Negro, but I refuse to have him forced upon me socially or to lose voluntarily my racial identity with his, the court, church or press to the countrary notwithstanding. If outsiders would but recognize this basic principle of freedom, we could get along in peace with the Negro from now on out.

— JOHN W. HESTER

"They must have been crowded in your day, too . . .!"

Mob Violence In Alabama

## Moderation Must Be The Rule

By WALTER LIPPMANN

NEW YORK

AS OF NOW at the University of Alabama the situation appears to be this: Because the state government of Alabama has failed to maintain law and order on the campus of the state university, the authorities of the university have felt compelled to yield to the violence of a mob. This has raised an issue within the state of Alabama as to whether a great question of public policy is to be decided because a governor, instead of coming to the support of the local police, has stood aside and let a mob have its way.

Dr. Carmichael, the president of the university was in the act of complying faithfully with the order of the court that Miss Lucy be allowed to attend classes. There is no evidence that the university authorities and the faculty were not prepared to comply with the law. There is no evidence that the students who attended the same classes with her were aroused to rebellion. The mob, consisting of some students and it appears a hard core of outsiders, defied the local peace officers, left unaided by the governor, and succeeded in terrorizing the university authorities into denying Miss Lucy her undoubted constitutional rights.

**DIFFERENCE**

What is at stake in this surrender to a mob is whether Alabama is in fact, not merely in name, a sovereign state. For what has happened in Tuscaloosa is a quite different kind of thing from what has happened in any of the other southern states which are opposing integration in the schools. Nowhere else has resistance to the decision of the Supreme Court been left to a mob. Nowhere else has the state government connived at mob rule, which is what Gov. Folsom did. Whatever one may think of the legal reasoning in Virginia, for example, there and elsewhere the resistance is being carried out under the forms of law.

That makes a difference as between night and day. For it keeps the issue on a level where, though it cannot be settled quickly, it can be treated by the civilized process of accommodation and persuasion. This will not be possible where state governments abandon their authority to mobs, and the question is raised of how far the authority and dignity of the United States are to be flouted.

On Tuesday in Los Angeles at a meeting of Negro voters Gov. Stevenson was asked whether as President he would, if necessary, use the Army to enforce integration in the schools. His answer was the only conceivable answer that any responsible public man could make. He would not use the Army. It is ominous, however, that the question should have been put to him at all, that such a question should be asked of a man who may well be the President of the United States. It shows how very dangerous, how near to violence, is the situation. For we cannot afford to doubt that what Gov. Folsom has just let happen in Alabama — a surrender to lawless force — is precisely the kind of thing which will incite and provoke a mounting demand for the use of lawful force.

A number of politicians have been amusing themselves lately with deriding the notion that moderation could be, especially among Democrats, the sound and true approach to serious conflicts. Well, here in the wake of the Supreme Court decision, they can see in the concrete how there is no decent prospect unless we can preserve the spirit of moderation. They have here what is almost certainly the hardest and most dangerous internal American issue. They can see here how there is no way of dealing with it unless moderate men backed by the great moderate majority of our people are able to take the lead.

For the decision of the Supreme Court must be carried out. But it can be carried out only by winning the consent of the people who must live with it. The essential principle of the court's order is that a way must be found between that mob in Alabama, which insists on absolute segregation, and those northern politicians who ask for federal coercion to bring about the immediate ending of all segregation.

**COMPLEX PROCESS**

In the moderate course, which is the one that the court calls for, desegregation is not one action, to be taken simultaneously everywhere. It is a complex process which must vary with the conditions in the differing localities. The same kind and the same rate of integration cannot be applied everywhere at once, in the Deep South and in the border states.

Broadly speaking, it can be said, I suppose, that at the higher levels of education, the professional and graduate schools, integration is most easily put into effect. Integration is most difficult, on the other hand, in the schools for teenagers, among high school students and underclassmen, in co-educational institutions for adolescents. There may well be parts of the South where integration at the teenage level cannot wisely be put into effect for a long time to come. The country will understand the difficulty, and it will be disposed, I believe, to feel that the southern states are within the spirit of the constitution if, as many of them are already doing, they try to make integration work at the higher educational levels.

That is another reason why the case of Miss Lucy, who wants to go to college to become a librarian, is such a setback to law and to good sense.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

## Oil-Gas Lobby Has A Golden Touch

WASHINGTON

THE more you study the campaign contributions that finance the Republican and Democratic parties, the more you have to admire the courage of Francis Case, senator from South Dakota and son of a Methodist minister, for speaking out against the gas-oil lobby.

### Blatant Power

The more also you realize the importance of expanding the probe of gas-oil contributions as proposed by Sen. Tom Hennings (D-Mo), plus the importance of Washington Post Publisher Philip Graham's proposal to take political money out of the hands of the lobbies and raise it in small amounts from the public.

However, to get the real picture of the oil-gas lobby, you have to remember that it's been active for a long time and this was one way the 27 1-2 per cent oil depletion tax exemption was passed and has been kept on the books.

### Tax Break

This tax, in turn, is one reason why the gas-oil lobby has so much money to spend on influencing Congress. It gets a better tax break than any other industry.

In general, gas-oil political money can be divided into two parts, as follows:

1—Donations from old-established companies which go chiefly to Republicans.

2—Donations from wildcatters, which used to go to the Democrats, but now cross the political street and back up a lot of Republicans.

The big established oil-gas companies, however, always put their money on the Republicans. With a few minor exceptions such as Phillips Petroleum, which has a silent partnership with Democratic Sen. Bob Kerr of Oklahoma, they never bet on the Democrats.

And these big companies—the Rockefellers of Standard Oil, the Pews of Sun Oil, and the Mellons of Gulf Oil—are among some of the heaviest contributors to the GOP.

Here is how their donations operate: Take the most famous and established oil family in the world—the Rockefellers. During the 1952 campaign, they put up a total of $85,000 for Eisenhower, distributed among different political committees.

### Rockefeller Donations

Here are the total contributions of each member of the Rockefeller family: David Rockefeller, $10,000; Mrs. David Rockefeller, $1,000; John D. Jr., $6,000; Mrs. John D. Jr., $7,000; John D. III, $11,000; Laurence Rockefeller, $11,500; Mrs. Laurence Rockefeller, $1,000; Nelson Rockefeller, $9,000; Winthrop Rockefeller, $9,000; Martha Rockefeller, $1,500.