

# THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1956

## Estes, Adlai And The Crying Towel

IF THOSE two "moufers," Adlai and Estes, were running for the Democratic nomination in North Carolina today there would be nothing to do but vote for confident and capable Jim Tatum.

And if Adlai and Estes continue their game of "get under the underdog" Sunny Jim might go on to sweep the convention, and wind up holding skull practice in the Indian Treaty Room.

What brought us to Tatum's entourage was that total confidence in public has a right to expect from candidates for immortality, either political or athletic.

Consider the views of Adlai. Estes and Jim on future prospects. Over at Aberdeen Adlai was asked about the Florida primary. Sen. Kefauver, I understand, has indicated he thinks he is ahead. I'm going to do my level best to overtake him.

What about California? "I confront serious difficulties and large obstacles" quoth the candidate in classic if elaborate locker room style.

Meantime, Estes was in Miami, laid out in a crying towel, reciting his own last rites. "Adlai's way out front, everybody's against me," especially those old political bosses.

Our hero, however, laid it on the line to a football smoker at the Charlotte Country Club. The future, he said, is full of glory and victory for Tatum, team and titillated audience.

It's glad his schedule is tough—the bigger they come the harder they fall. For all the world, Jim Tatum sounded

like "Ole Gene" Talmadge telling a Georgia campaign crowd that "I'm gonna sweep this state from Rabun Gap to Tybee Light."

To the cynics who say Tatum can't come through on his promises, we ask: "Has he balanced the budget?"

We are weary of this primary struggle between Adlai and Estes. They sound almost as much like football coaches as Jim Tatum does a politician.

We're particularly tired of Estes going around axing those dead dragons—the political bosses, and we're going to say to him if he ever sticks out his hand to us, "Name one."

Kefauver knows very well there hasn't been a political boss in America worth his salt since he put on the conskin and beat Boss Crump in Memphis. Carmine De Sapia, the current Tammany Hall tiger, is such a kity he can't even deliver his district to Averell Harriman at the convention.

This isn't to say some voters weren't sorry to see the bosses go. There was the Texan who, when asked by political pollster Sam Lubell who he voted for in 1952, replied, "I haven't voted since they shot Huey Long. He was my man."

We suspect, however, that Estes himself is as much disappointed at the demise of the bosses as anyone.

Estes' political district, Justice Frankfurter holds it a boss and make him holier. Estes might be as confident as Jim Tatum.

Until the candidates and the coaches get back into character, we're sticking with Sunny Jim.

# The Age Of Anxiety? Robert Frost Bets On The World

Editors' Note: On the "Meet The Press" television program recently Robert Frost, most famous of living American poets, talked poetry, politics and philosophy. Following are excerpts from his interview with Lawrence Spivak, A. T. Baker of Time magazine, Inez Robb, Scripps-Howard writer, Norman Cousins of the Saturday Review and Ned Brooks, program moderator.

**SPIVAK:** You once wrote that a poem should begin in delight and end in wisdom.

**Frost:** Yes.

**SPIVAK:** Do you think many of our poets write that way?

**Frost:** Many of our love affairs are just the same, you know.

**Robb:** Frost, one of the most famous "lines" of modern poetry was written by an expatriate American, T. S. Eliot, who said, "This is the way the world ends not with a bang but a whimper." Would you tell us if you agree with him or if you disagree?

**Frost:** We're not a nation anxious to be good and to be decent. That's what marks us, I think, found when I was in South America last year. I found they looked on us as an over-anxious nation, and that's a nice way to look at it. We'd like to be decent. It gets us into a lot of trouble but we get out of it. **WONDERFUL LAND**

**Robb:** Mr. Frost, aren't we Americans still in the process of belonging to this wonderful land?

**Frost:** Yes, and everything is in process all the time, isn't it? Some people are worried. They can't rest in the process. That's what's the matter with a lot of people; you ought to be able to curl up and go to sleep in a process when you have to.

**Brooks:** Mr. Frost, I'm sure you must have a lot of young and ambitious poets come to you for advice, perhaps some of them with talents. What do you tell them about their chances to succeed or how to succeed?

**Frost:** Well, I'm always rather cranky. I tell them nothing we want like artists here. I want them the same as everybody wants them, but you got to have a smidgen of punishment.

**Brooks:** More than anything else probably.

**TRY THE ARTS**

**Frost:** Yes. They put it into my head; newspaper questions are often put in my head by reporters, what do you say to young people, young artists? I say if you're looking around for something to be brave about short of being shot, you know, or blown through the air at 400 miles an hour, why not try one of the arts.

**Cousins:** Mr. Frost, coming back to an earlier question, I seem to recall somewhere that the late Charles A. Beard, the distinguished historian, once said when ever a man reaches the age of 75 he has the obligation to sum up what he has learned out of life in about four short sentences, no more. Have you ever felt that this was a privilege?



"The way of understanding is partly mirth."

**PARTLY MIRTH**

**Frost:** This occasion is one of those privileges, isn't it? I ought to be able to sum life up. But I think it will have to be in poetry. The way one line of my poetry says, "The way of understanding is partly mirth."

**Spivak:** You once wrote or at least this was attributed to you: "I never dared be radical when young for fear it would make me conservative when old." When did you write that?

**Frost:** I was in California when a lady asked me about it. She said you've said all sorts of things this evening, Mr. Frost. Which are you, a conservative or a radical? This was in Pasadena, and I said, I looked her right in the eye and I delivered that line. I never dared be radical when young for fear it would make me conservative when old. I let her laugh up on that.

**HAVE I HAVE NOTS**

**Spivak:** You can't let us be hung up on. Which are you, the conservative or a radical?

**Frost:** I stayed pretty even about it from the days when I first heard of the have and the have nots in capital letters.

**Spivak:** A conservative liberal?

**Frost:** I suppose, if you want to call me names.

**Brooks:** Middle of the road?

**Frost:** If you want to call me names.

**Cousins:** Or maybe just Robert Frost?

**Frost:** I guess just me. I tell you I'm very radical about education, for instance. You find a radical in politics and conservative in verse, I could name an extreme case of that. Let's leave names out.

**Baker:** There has been a lot of talk about escape from the

bad times in Charlemagne's reign, and I don't know, I'm not smart enough to know.

**Spivak:** You think one time is pretty much the same as another and neither worse nor better?

**Frost:** BETTER OR WORSE.

**Frost:** Always a predicament.

**Baker:** Wasn't your point, sir, the world will always remain in a difficult place in which to save your soul?

**Frost:** Yes, sir, that's what I am fond of having said. That was a pretty clever one for me.

## Individual Liberty: The Quiet Revolution

THE highly sensitive field of individual rights and national security, a quiet revolution is underway.

The initiative is no longer in the hands of fanatics who make an organized business of intellectual vigilantism.

The congressional witch hunts are history.

Only a few backstage cheeps have been heard from the celebrated Commission on Government Security which received so many headlines when it was created in 1955.

But in their thorough and unspectacular fashion, the federal courts have made constitutional history in a series of recent decisions.

With the cooling of emotions, the Supreme Court and its circuit courts have simply been reinforcing the individual liberties of Americans and emphasizing that the Bill of Rights means what it says.

Recent information on the Peters case and arbitrary denial of passports have all been exposed to judicial scrutiny. More recently, the Supreme Court has ruled on the constitutionality of the Immunity Act of 1954, legislation which provides that in matters involving national security a witness may in effect be compelled to give testimony in exchange for a grant of immunity from criminal prosecution. The law was upheld in a 7-2 decision.

This latter development is important for several reasons. First, it settles in a calm, cool atmosphere a matter which created a great deal of unnecessary political heat lightning when "Fifth Amendment Communists" were fished into

a burning issue by the McCarthys. Second, it reiterates the significance of the Fifth Amendment. Third, it makes the abuse of constitutional privilege—the unrestricted invocation of the Fifth Amendment—which would hamper rather than further the cause of justice—more difficult in certain important areas of government.

But let there be no misunderstanding about the intent of the court. It did not mean to amend the Constitution, one whit. It simply found that the Immunity Act falls within the constitutional purview, for by its very terms it forestalls the self-incrimination that the amendment was designed to prevent. In the majority opinion Justice Frankfurter took special pains to point out:

"Too many, even those who should be better advised, view the privilege as a shelter for wrongdoers. They too readily assume that those who invoke it are guilty of a crime or committed a crime. It is not so. The privilege is a shield, not a sword. It does not belong to the patriots who sponsored the Bill of Rights as a condition to acceptance of the Constitution.

"Those gentlemen Justice Frankfurter refers to include the early patriots of North Carolina who at Hillsboro in 1788 flatly refused to have anything to do with a federal constitution which contained no bill of rights—a stubbornness of which Tar Heels can be justly proud."

After the shouting has ended and the raucous emotionalism has died down, the voices of wisdom can again be heard. Given a temperate climate, they always triumph. That is one of the beauties of a democracy such as ours.



## People's Platform Amoeba's Progress

Editors: The News

**IRE SAYS** he will take it, now the opportunity is of fewer American citizens to relax interest and concern relative to national affairs. However, we may with advantage direct attention to the world situation which affects opinion and conditions in the United States. Continuing consideration to the question of peace or war is relevant to inquire as to what is the determinant action by a nation.

Common race, customs and language in one sense constitute a nation but, in the meaning here used, the body of people organized under one government and the function of government, aside from preserving order within its borders, without which it could not exist, is defense, and the following of that policy which tends to the advantage of the nation. Therefore self-interest is the determinant for action for all national governments and, as there are many governments, or nations, it is self-evident that there will be many and constant conflicting interests.

Conflicts of interest bring conflicts of force, thus war.

Therefore logically the term peace and the term national are paradoxical.

What is involved in the law of self interest? Invasion, exploitation, conquest, defense implying war. All history shows this in the ears of the people of the 20th century. Yet certain chronic optimists blind to history and irresponsible in its meaning, advocate what they are pleased to call world federation. Federations are temporary arrangements, or agreements, formed in the interests of certain nations and exist commensurate with the interests of the nations forming them for defense or aggression.

The United Nations is formed for the purpose of adjudicating the interests of nations on arrangements less than war and in that it may succeed, but the first minister of state of a great nation, a member of the United Nations, is reported to have said that his country has within recent days been on the brink of war. With whom? Was that known to the United Nations, and was that dangerous war condition known to the people of his own country, or was it information to them?

Was such expression calculated to add to the dignity, prestige and purpose of the United Nations, or was it an individual officer of a member nation? The United

Nations is in Europe today seeking peace. We have passed slavery, colonialism is on the way out, exploitation of nations by nations proceeds. Hunger for material things is dominant among the races and has been since the law of Eden. Man faces in the sweat of other men's faces and a nation follows the characteristic of the individuals of which it is composed. We have come from the amoeba and we aspire to the ideal.

It is plain that there must be some sort of world organization to preserve peace but can we consistently worship at the shrine of world peace until we give up some of our own desire for dominion? Nations should strive first to establish good faith and eliminate war.

In such an atmosphere agreements could be made.

—HOYT LEAVES

## Swing: The Man Who Hired A Hall

ON PAGE SIX OF DOWNBEAT magazine last week, down in a corner, was a little story. It told of the death at 55 of Frank Dailey, billed as the entrepreneur of the Meadowbrook. It kindled memories for those who haven't brushed or rocked 'n' rolled.

Frank Dailey's Meadowbrook at Cedar Grove, N. J., was, perhaps, America's No. 1 house of swing in the late 1930s and the early 1940s.

The Artie Shaw and the Dorsey and the Gene Krupa and the Claude Thornhill and the Glenn Millers all performed their musical rites there and millions of swingera jittersbugs listened and learned. Those who couldn't jam the dance floor heard the word on their radios. The

broadcasts were fine—and frequent.

Frank Dailey—just a name to millions—struggled to keep the Meadowbrook open when the name band business slumped after World War II. Soon the hands played there only on weekends and western music and banquets filled the hall on other nights.

Then Frank Dailey died.

He died still personally unknown to millions but his name was justly proud. He had a whole nation tapping its feet to the beat—before swing gave way to bop and bop gave away to an odd kind of whoop-and-holler called rock 'n' roll.

It made Page Six of a music magazine and hardly a line elsewhere.

## Russia Can Put Out The Fire

BY WALTER LIPPMANN

NEW YORK

MESSRS. Khrushchev and Bulganin were due to arrive in London today.

There has been a considerable change since the Soviet Union will agree to maintain it. War is probable if the Soviet Union comes out at war by refusing to prevent war.

Nobody knew last July that this would be the main business to be discussed when Bulganin and Khrushchev came to London. It now overshadows every other subject.

Because the situation in the Middle East is so critical, and the responsibility of the Soviet Union is so unmistakably clear, the coming talks in London may well be momentous. They will be in the nature of a show-down on what are Moscow's intentions, on whether Moscow wants the future of the Middle East to be determined by peaceful negotiations or by war.

The great undecided question of policy is whether on the basis of the prevention of an Arab-Israeli war, there are to be broader negotiations about the Middle East. The alternative is for London, Paris and Washington to take their own measures, despite the fact-Moscow says, to maintain the status quo. This is a disagreeable and dangerous alternative.

It was such expressions calculated to add to the dignity, prestige and purpose of the United Nations, or was it an individual officer of a member nation? The United

States is in Europe today seeking peace. We have passed slavery, colonialism is on the way out, exploitation of nations by nations proceeds. Hunger for material things is dominant among the races and has been since the law of Eden. Man faces in the sweat of other men's faces and a nation follows the characteristic of the individuals of which it is composed. We have come from the amoeba and we aspire to the ideal.

It is plain that there must be some sort of world organization to preserve peace but can we consistently worship at the shrine of world peace until we give up some of our own desire for dominion? Nations should strive first to establish good faith and eliminate war.

In such an atmosphere agreements could be made.

—HOYT LEAVES

## BABEL ON THE POTOMAC

EVERY four years around this time, we consider our humble duty to serve as medium between the political tongue and the voters' inner ear—to translate what the candidates call "plain speaking" into the plainer truth. We offer this service free of charge.

For example, when a candidate says "I am glad you asked that question," what he means is "Give me a moment to think."

When one of his supporters says "My candidate is a man of the people," he means that his candidate was also born in a hospital.

The phrase "I am not a candidate for vice president" means "I got a better presidential bandwagon rolling until after the first ballot."

"I'm in this fight to the finish" means "The law sets the election day and I can't do a thing about it."

When he says "We must return to the principles of our forefathers," he means "Things must have been sim-

ple in those days."

When he says "I intend to hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may," he really means that he intends to put his bet on the wheel and let his voice be heard.

When he says "I can't tell you what a pleasure it is to get back home with you folks and away from that Tower of Babel on the Potomac, he is really saying "If I get stuck in a candidate open a law office in Washington."

And of course when a candidate tells you "A vote for me is a vote for the American way of life," what he means is "I ain't running in Southern Rhodesia."

We trust this brief glossary will serve as a handy guide to help you get through the season; we might even expand it from time to time if things get more confusing than they are at present, a contingency that scarcely bears contemplation.

## Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round Marshal Zhukov May Visit President

WASHINGTON

IT ISN'T supposed to be announced, but plans are under discussion to have Marshal Zhukov, Eisenhower's wartime co-commander in Germany, visit the United States in September or October.

**Political Implications**

For some time the Kremlin's two rover boys, Khrushchev and Bulganin, have been discreetly hinting that they might like to visit the U.S.A. This has been met with State Department rebuffs, or to welcome the two Soviet high-seas in an elective year, some proposed political strategy plus a real security problem. The job of protecting Khrushchev and Bulganin from the many refugees and White Russians in this country makes secret service men shudder.

However, when Marshal Zhukov hinted,

during a diplomatic reception in Moscow, that he might like to come to the U.S.A., there was a more favorable response.

In the first place, Zhukov is considered the rising strong man of Russia. Second, the visit of an army man who has not an active Communist would sit better with the American public. Third, such a visit would further the idea that President Eisenhower, through his wartime associations, might lead the choice between the two U.S.A. toward a Russian-American peace.

The plan is still in the discussion stage, but the chances are strong that Marshal Zhukov will come to Washington and make a call on the president during the height of the election campaign.

## Restoring Sight To The Blind

Editors: The News

HERE are quotations from a recent newspaper clipping:

"Sight of Boy Restored by Eyes of Dead Priest."

"Milan, Italy—Can you see my hand?" Yes, answered a child's voice.

"Then the prompter, trembling a little, held up three fingers and directed: 'Try and count my fingers.' Three, there are three."

In this way a 12-year-old Italian boy saw for the first time in five years through the eyes of a dead priest.

Angelo Colagrande, blinded by a spray of quick lime, received a new pair of eyes from the eyes of the dead Don Carlo Grocchi, an Italian priest who had asked that his eyes be used in an effort to restore sight to blind children.

You and you and I, too, can give sight to the blind after we are dead, because the question of age has no bearing on donating one's eyes, if the tissues in the eyes are healthy.

Do not make the gift of your eyes part of your will, since eyes may be used before wills can be proved.

Through the corneal graft operation there are thousands of blind Americans who could probably see again. Write to the Eye Bank for Restoring Sight, The Doctors Exchange, Winston-Salem, N. C.

—MRS. P. P. SUTLEYMIRE

**Dems Dishonor Wilson**

Worst egg the Democratic National Committee has laid in a long time is looming Saturday night when the biggest Democratic dinner of the year is expected to be held in a half-empty armory.

Instead of making money for the already in debt Democrats, it will put them in the light of failing to honor a great Democratic hero, Woodrow Wilson, and the man who saved the country from Lenin Hall's triumph when he collected \$3 million at Madison Square Garden Jan. 30 for Ike.

Reason for the fiasco is that the dinner is slated for April 21, when it faces the following competing attractions:

**Attraction No. 1—Margaret Truman** is getting married. So top Democrats will be in Independence, Mo., not Washington.

**Attraction No. 2—Minnesota Democrats** are holding a national dinner on the same night.

**Attraction No. 3—Sen. Kefauver** is speaking with Sen. Wayne Morse in Oregon to launch the beginning of his own and Morse's campaign.

**Attraction No. 4—Eisenhower** is speaking before the American Society of Newspaper Editors at their big wind-up dinner in Washington.

As of this writing, 800 tickets are sold for the armory which seats 3,000 people. Probability is that Democratic speakers will be extolling Woodrow Wilson to 2,000 empty chairs.