

Thomas L. Robinson... President and Publisher
Brodie S. Griffith... General Manager
Eckl Prince... Associate Editor
R. L. Young Jr... Managing Editor
W. W. Sirmon... Circulation Manager

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956

'Capitalism Will Die'

Shepilov Swings A Big Ax

By STEWART ALSP

NOW THAT WASHINGTON head has been offered to Marshal Tito on a platter, the name of Dmitri Shepilov, Molotov's successor as Soviet foreign minister, is certain to become widely familiar to newspaper readers. It may be worth recalling an interview this reporter had with Shepilov in Moscow last summer.

The interview took place in a big room in the plant of Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper, of which Shepilov was editor until last week. This reporter and William Worley of the Baltimore Afro-American were ushered into a long, brownish, dark room, festively dreary in the indescribable Soviet manner, decorated with the inevitable huge, heroic picture of Lenin and Stalin (one wonders if Stalin's picture is still on the wall).

At one end of a long table sat Shepilov. He is a very big man—about six foot three—with a tanned, handsome, strong face, twisted greying hair, and huge, hamlike hands. He was flanked by two younger men, one of them an English-speaking Pravda reporter. They laughed when he laughed, a little louder, and when a tactlessly incontinent question was asked, the English-speaking re-

porter would interpret it to Shepilov with a deprecating, half-embarassed grimace, as though to remind the boss that the question was none of his making. That was the first impression of Shepilov—that he is a born boss, a hard-driving, ruthless, fiercely ambitious, highly intelligent, immensely able man. The interview started with the obvious question, Was it true that Shepilov was slated to replace Molotov as foreign minister?

'NO SENSE' The question was interpreted with a special, striking obsequiousness, and it obviously angered Shepilov—such delicate matters are not publicly discussed in the Soviet Union. The talk about his becoming foreign minister was "the usual irresponsible speculation in the foreign press."

On this frosty note the interview began. It lasted for two hours, perhaps three. It quickly became apparent that no real news would result—Shepilov brushed off all questions about the forthcoming Geneva conference and other matters of current interest. So this reporter tried instead, to sense the answer to a single question. Did this coming man, representing the new, upsurging generation which had never known anything but Soviet life, really believe the rigid doctrines of the regime he served?

The long interview was a curious baffling experience. Sometimes in the Soviet Union, in a chance encounter at a restaurant or while travelling, it is possible to make contact with a human being, and to sense, even across the language barrier, a personal and individual response. But aside from that just brief flash of anger, talking to Shepilov was to any high Soviet official, as a wholly automatic experience.

You ask your question and back comes the answer, as predictable and impersonal as though you had dialed for the time or the weather on the telephone. AUTOMATIC ANSWERS Did Mr. Shepilov agree with Lenin that a "series of fearful clashes" must occur between the capitalist and Communist worlds? "It is inevitable as night follows day that the capitalist system will be replaced by the Socialist system."

Did Mr. Shepilov agree with Mr. Malenkov that nuclear war might destroy civilization? "Civilization will not die. Instead, the more bases the Americans establish, the more quickly will capitalism die, because the people will rise against American imperialism."

DEEP BELIEF And so on. In one way, the interview was a futile experience, since it would have been simpler

SHEPILOV (right) & ITALIAN AMBASSADOR Behind the Grid: Raw Determination

to get the current party line from the pages of Pravda. But it was useful in another way. For, as the automatic, predigested responses followed each other, over vodka and wine and delicious leader-bait, it became more and more certain that Shepilov really and deeply believed what he was saying.

He really and deeply believes that the Soviet system and the American system are inherently and totally hostile, and that the only possible outcome must be the utter destruction of the American system. He will take this conviction, which he shares with all the Soviet leaders, into his new role as foreign minister, and it will be the base line from which he operates. In this era of the Soviet smile, when hopeful voices are being raised that a true peace settlement may be reached with the new Soviet regime, it is worth while occasionally reminding oneself of that fact.

State Should Support Driver Training

LIKE many a Tar Heel, we are weary of the years of butyrugging and unashed mumble-grumble about highway accidents in North Carolina.

But ideas must be sold—even the life-saving variety. We wish, however, that all of the ideas were as worthy as the one that Robert T. Ellett Jr. is merchandising throughout 47 Tar Heel counties. The purpose of all this state-stumping: Explanation of the advantages of driver training in public high schools.

There are, unfortunately, 25 counties in North Carolina with no driver education program at all. Another 22 have the program in only one school or one administrative unit.

Mr. Ellett is a Carolina Motor Club safety expert on loan to R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., a Tar Heel firm which has been busily promoting driver education. It must be admitted, in all frankness, that the problem is too big for Mr. Ellett and/or R. J. Reynolds—alone.

However much they may desire to establish driver training programs, many Tar Heel counties simply cannot do so. First of all there is a shortage of trained teachers. In addition, there is a lack of local funds.

The only completely satisfactory solution for the state to establish and support driver education in all high schools of all counties.

Only when this is accomplished can the full effect of driver training be felt on the Tar Heel traffic safety picture.

According to the Association of Casualty Companies, only 13 per cent of all accidents come from mechanical or roadway defects. The remaining 85 per cent come from one source only: The man behind the wheel. Human frailties—including lack of knowledge, lack of skill and, in particular, improper mental attitudes—lie at the root of most accidents.

Yet thousands of Tar Heel youngsters never have a chance to correct these human frailties before they climb behind the steering wheel and take to the road.

What if they did get the instruction they need? The American Automobile Association reported last year that a nationwide survey indicated driver education courses reduce traffic accidents at least one-half and, in many cases, more.

The cost is about \$30 a student on the average, says AAA.

If lives and limbs can be saved and so much stark tragedy prevented, it is worth every penny.

A commendable interest among local parents has produced a limited driver training program in Charlotte. It should be extended and expanded. But the statewide problem of accident prevention will never be met honestly and effectively until a uniform driver training program is launched in every community. Without doubt, this should be one of the major goals of the North Carolina General Assembly when it meets in regular session next January.

The Leviathan's Pulse Is Weakening

THE health of U. S. foreign policy is bad. But determining how bad is like standing in shallow water and trying to feel a whale's pulse.

Many suggestions are being made with a view to slimming down the leviathan and adapting it to the tides of the times.

Unfortunately, Washington is treating the advice as if it all came from quacks, bunion choppers and herb cooks.

Such is not the case. Serious students of foreign affairs are represented among the administration's critics. They deserve at least a hearing.

But little can be accomplished until the administration itself is willing to admit that changes are urgently needed. Steadfastness is perhaps a virtue. Stubbornness is not. In policy planning, Uncle Sam is exhibiting more stubbornness than steadfastness.

The public is told that U. S. policy will not change because U. S. S. R. policy has not really changed.

It is probably true that Soviet imperialism is not on the decline—despite new faces and the practiced smiles that create those new faces. But Soviet imperialism is most certainly shifting its ground.

The evidence is clearly visible. The repudiation of Stalin is Exhibit A. The monolithic structure of the Soviet system is cracking.

Then there is the firing of Vyacheslav Molotov as foreign minister. His adopted name means "hammer," and that accurately describes his style of diplomacy. He was "a man of... cold-blooded ruthlessness... an incalculable machine," said Churchill. He pounded away at his adversaries until they were simply worn down.

Dmitri Shepilov, more affable, pleasant and imaginative, is better suited for the Russia of Khrushchev and Bulganin. He played an important part in the Egyptian arm deal, and as editor of Pravda, has done a skillful job of interpreting Soviet communism's new line.

Furthermore, the Russians have shifted the emphasis in the cold war from military to economic competition. America's aid program is keyed to conditions that

existed two years ago—when arms were still important.

Finally, as we have stood by silently, the Soviets have gone all-out to win the confidence of uncommitted Asians, Africans and South Americans. We have failed to give these peoples a persuasive vision as they strive for freedom from the last vestiges of colonialism.

What is needed now is not simply a reappraisal of the manner of military aid programs and systems of military alliances, but what Chester Bowles calls a reappraisal of our relations with our fellow men, our proper role in world affairs, our national purposes and aspirations.

We seem to lack what we were once known for—the world over—for—ideas that stir men's minds and create faith in the principles of a liberal democracy.

The goal of our foreign policy should therefore be a balance between ideas and defense. Mr. Bowles has expressed it well.

On the one hand, the bringing together of the banner of militant new freedom of those people of the earth—and today they are by far the majority—who seek the goals that we seek: self-determination, human dignity and expanding opportunities; and on the other hand, the power of a massive, competent assembly when it screens behind which those goals can be vigorously pursued.

Our opponent has shifted his ground. We must shift with him—not only to our skins but to rediscover our ideals as well.

Get Well Card

SEN. F. J. BLYTHE, stricken for a second time this spring with a heart attack, has the best wishes of the entire community for a speedy recovery.

Equipped as he is with such notable tenacity of spirit, he feels sure that he will be back in the political and civic arena within a very short time.

Both Mecklenburg and North Carolina have benefited from his leadership in the past. We are sure that he will render additional service in the future.

Historians, of course, can carry this series of incidents all the way back to the Madison Square Garden basketball gambling scandals—and further. And they can show that it all went on to the accompaniment of confessions by ex-athletes, protest and apologies by athletic departments and university presidents, and the most horrible sins against legals by sports announcers. We leave the definitive words to Warren Giese, football coach at South Carolina, bringing in six high school stars from New York, he said: "Our proselyting program is now in high gear."

"Diogenes, here is your man!" The preacher at the wedding ceremony was an ardent fisherman. He asked the groom: "Do you promise to love, honor and cherish this woman?" "I do," said the groom, meekly. "O. K.," said the preacher, turning to the bride. "Get him in!"—FORT MYERS (FLA.) NEWS PRESS.

Keeping up with the Joneses isn't half as dangerous as trying to pass 'em on a hill.—TALLAHASSEE DEMOCRAT.

Don't argue with a fool. He might win.—CRAWFORDVILLE (GA.) ADVOCATE.

'Let's Be Alert To The Big Things, Men'



People's Platform

It was interesting to note then the News' June 1 editorial stating belief "strongly in the separation of church and state, not only in the letter of the law" but also in the spirit of the law.

Please be kind enough to state just where the letter or the spirit of the law makes any mention of "separation of church and state."

I am aware of the Supreme Court's decision in the McCollum case as well as the court's decision in the recent state sedition law matter. In both instances the court disregarded facts and rendered its decisions on the basis of the personal opinions and philosophies of its members.

In declaring the state sedition laws invalid, for example, the court claimed that Congress, by passing the Smith Act and other legislation, intended to keep the

matter of sedition to itself exclusively. The author of the Smith Act, however, as well as other members of Congress, state emphatically that Congress had no such intention.

The increasing disregard for facts and law by the Supreme Court is a direct result of the "liberals" capture of the Supreme Court after the successful attack on the "nine old men" lack in the thirties. It presents a situation that must be changed if our nation is to survive.

Again I ask The News to document its statement that there is a law that mentions either directly or in spirit a "separation of church and state." In so asking I am aware of the "liberals" passionate aversion to the direct answer.

— PETER J. KING Editor's Note: First Amendment.

ALONG THE STRAIGHT AND NARROW

AS AMATEUR sports are such great character-builders—as any college coach will freely admit—it is natural that they should be circumscribed by about as many safeguards as are thrown around an Atomic Energy Commission job.

These include a rule against accidental association with transgressors as was shown when the whole William & Mary track team was suspended by the Amateur Athletic Union because in a dual meet against the Quantico Marines its milers ran against the Marines' Wes Santee who is under a deep A. A. U. brown because of a matter of expense money. But this will not affect the W. & M. season.

A day or two earlier Ohio State was put on probation by the Big Ten because of unexplained cash payments to players by Coach Woodrow Hayes. Penalty: Ohio State may not play in the Rose Bowl game next year for which it may not be eligible anyway.

The University of Washington may be in deeper trouble for a similar reason, but the penalty imposed by the Pacific Coast conference adds up to the same thing: No post-season games. Since well-managed sports operation can do all right with the regular schedule.

Separation of Church and State Challenged

THE U. S. government directly supports, by use of tax money, the Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religions. It provides chapels for the exercise of these faiths, pays the salaries of the clergymen, supplies assistants to them and provides transportation for them. These facts can be verified by a visit to any Army base.

Nowhere in either the letter or the spirit of the Constitution can one find any support for the theory of separation of church and state.

The three who have turned down the chance to confer with Ike are the presidents of Bolivia, Colombia and Peru.

Extrem Caution The true who have adopted a favorable though waisite policy are the presidents of some of the most powerful nations in the Western Hemisphere—Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela and Cuba. They have politely indicated their desire to come, but they seem a little leery of what they may be asked to sign at Panama.

Also, they don't like the way in which the invitation was thrown at them

Three Presidents Nix Ike's Invitation

so suddenly without any advance notice. So, incidentally, were invited two days after the others. Finally, some figure that this is a Madison Avenue stunt aimed at impressing the American public politically during the campaign season.

Latin American skepticism was expressed by astute Bolivian Ambassador Victor Andrade at a meeting of the General Commission of the American States.

"We learned one day after our resolution to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the American Revolution would be another meeting in Panama," said Andrade, referring to the way in which the U. S. and Panama had agreed to meet privately and suddenly sprung the idea of having Ike latched on to the previously arranged meeting of ambassadors in Panama. "Naturally this created a little confusion.

"The presidents of the republics will meet informally," the Bolivian Ambas-

sador continued. "This meeting will be closed to the public. The presidents may talk about how they reduced their budgets, or they may talk about their golf scores. But the public will never believe that they didn't talk about something very important. And in the future a president may be charged with selling out to the U. S. at this closed Panam meeting. Why risk that?"

"Another thing," Ambassador Andrade continued. "The presidents will have to sit and listen to us while we, the ambassadors, make the public speeches commemorating the 150th anniversary. Yet we are the servants of the presidents.

Principles Of Presidents "The third problem," summarized the Bolivian envoy, "is this Declaration of Principles to be adopted in Panama. To draft language acceptable to 21 countries and yet say anything important would take every minute if we

New Russian Look Leaves America Lost In The Stars

By MARQUIS CHILDS

OVERSHADOWING the controversy over foreign aid is an unanswered question: How can the United States exercise world leadership in a time when the emphasis is rapidly shifting from military to economic competition?

So long as there is no satisfactory answer to that question the issue of foreign aid will seem irrelevant and outdated.

The Senate may restore part of the billion dollars cut out by the House. But it will not seem to matter too much to anyone, certainly not to the administration, which has been going through the motions, but scarcely more than that.

HARD THINKING The answer can be found only through some hard thinking that takes into account that vast change in the world situation that has come about with the new Soviet look.

It is vital to move ahead into the new era. This can be done either in a giant stride calling for the utmost courage and candor. Or, if that is too much to ask, then it can be done by the piecemeal acceptance of new ideas and concepts.

The same policy of indecision applies to the North Atlantic Alliance, which today straddles the old world of military defense prepared against Soviet aggression and the new world of economic and ideological competition.

WORD INTO DEEDS The NATO council, meeting in Paris, responded by naming a committee of three foreign ministers, Lester Pearson of Canada, Gaetano Martino of Italy and Halvard Lange of Norway, to discover ways and means for political and perhaps economic cooperation to give the alliance new and broader meaning. They are to report their findings to the council in December.

POLICY CHOICE Soon, Lord Pearson will come to Washington to talk with Dulles. He already is discussing, according to reports from Canada, what it is going to be held to get agreement in the fields of politics, economics and propaganda—in which he is convinced NATO must expand if it is to survive.

He is a fortunate choice for this assignment, since he has again he has come up with ideas that look to a broad new concept of cooperation in the West.

He has served as a kind of broker between Western Europe and the United States, mitigating the impatience of the Europeans to move on to much wider cooperation and prodding Washington to move off of dead center.

In several recent speeches, Pearson has pointed the way to new channels of economic cooperation between the have and the have-not nations.

These plans and policies could be, in Pearson's words, "examined, made public and coordinated." Any suggestion that they were being used for political purposes could be challenged and exposed as true or false.

These are constructive ideas of which the West stands urgently in need if it are to do more than merely react to Communist activity. The same old record played over again on foreign aid and on NATO will not do.

Quote, Unquote Revision of the Communist manifesto for Stalms who must now accept the new party line: "Workers of the world unite; you have nothing to lose but your brains."—Memphis Press-Scimitar.

When a machine or gadget stops functioning, the average person's notion of how to set it going is to strike it sharply. And it's remarkable how often this works.—Jackson (Miss.) State Times.

Side Line Sitting Meanwhile the drafting of the Declaration of Principles for the Western Hemisphere is being carried out by the United States and Chile. This in itself is one reason why some of the major countries are sitting on the side lines—they are left out of the drafting they want to see what the final result is before they commit their presidents to go to Panama to sign it.

Latin Americans take their diplomacy seriously. And they don't want to attend an informal social gathering such as the Mexican-Canadian one staged at White Sulphur Springs unless they know something definite will be accomplished.