THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

1888—Sixty-Fifth Anniversary Year—1953

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

SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1953

AUDITORIUM - COLISEUM FUNDS NEEDED

AS FAR as the wording on the ballot is concerned, next Saturday's election will be on the question of issuing another million dollars in bonds to complete the auditorium and coliseum as originally planned.

Actually, Charlotteans will be voting on more than that. They will be voting either to build an auditorium and a coliseum, or not to build them.

If the vote is favorable, enough money will be available ($4,000,000) for an auditorium seating 2,500 persons and a coliseum with 10,000 permanent seats.

If the vote is unfavorable, the whole project will probably be lost. The only alternative would be to draw new plans for smaller structures that could be built with the $3,000,000 originally made available. And there is no disposition to do that. In the first place, it would be both costly and time-consuming to revise the plans. In the second place, smaller structures would be a poor investment indeed for a city that is growing so rapidly as Charlotte.

After studying all the factors involved, including the heavy obligations already assumed by the people in past bond issues, The News believes strongly that the additional million dollars in bonds should be authorized.

The lack of adequate facilities for community cultural and recreational activities is one of Charlotte's greatest handicaps. The city needs both an auditorium and a coliseum, and it needs them badly.

The building committee spent many months studying similar structures in other cities before recommending a design and specifications. Much money has already been spent on the site and on the design. The plans are good, the seating capacity adequate, the site excellent.

We urge the residents of Charlotte to vote "for" next Saturday when the question is presented to them.

A BETTER FARM BALANCE IS NEEDED

YEAR after year, the statistics from the U. S. Department of Agriculture tell the same story about North Carolina agriculture.

Our agriculture is not balanced.

Farm prosperity is too dependent on cash crops.

Livestock production is too low.

Cash income per farm is inadequate.

The dismal statistics have been put together again by S. H. Hobbs Jr. for the University of North Carolina *News Letter*. They show:

1. North Carolina ranks 42nd among the states in cash income per farm.

2. North Carolina ranks 46th in cash income from livestock.

3. North Carolina ranks 47th, and just a fraction of a point out of 48th, in percentage of farm income derived from livestock.

In the current *News Letter*, Dr. Hobbs puts the facts bluntly:

"If the percent of farm income derived from the sale of livestock and livestock products is a measure of a balanced agricultural state, then North Carolina cannot be considered as a balanced agricultural state. . .

"Too little of our land is in production and too much of our unsurpassed agricultural labor supply is seasonally underemployed. Underemployment is due to the highly seasonal nature of our leading crops which leaves producers of these crops with little or nothing to do after the crops have been sold. . .

"The one-crop regions are the ones shortest on nonagricultural employment. These regions are also shortest on livestock and probably have the largest amounts of idle or semi-idle land that can readily be put into production."

The State Department of Agriculture, county agents, farmer organizations, Federal agencies have all championed crop diversification and livestock production in North Carolina for many years. But the Tar Heel farmer has not yet heeded them. He is still too much the prisoner of the vicious one-crop system, and both he and the state suffer therefrom.

REP. JONAS ON THE SPOILS SYSTEM

AN EXCHANGE of correespondence between a Charlotte businessman and Rep. Charles Raper Jonas came to our attention the other day. Because it presents the Congressman's views on the spoils system in an interesting light, we asked, and received, permission to quote from both, without using names.

The businessman was concerned over the fate of a Federal official with whom he had had dealings over a period of years. He had heard that the man would be fired because of the change of administrations, and wrote Mr. Jonas this:

"I'm told that the job of ——— may be in jeopardy because of the change in administrations. While devoutly grateful for the aforesaid change, and having no wish to meddle in business that isn't mine, and without the knowledge or request of the individual concerned, I would like to say that ——— has done a good job.

". . . I have found him reliable and earnest and effective. He's made a career of ———, and I dislike to see a good man lose out, as I'm sure you do."

This was the Congressman's reply, in part:

"I am in receipt of your letter of May 12 in which you intimate that the job of ——— may be in jeopardy because of the change of administrations. Your letter is the first intimation I have had to this effect, and I will look into the rumor right away.

"Your favorable reaction to ———'s work is of interest, and I am glad to know that you think he has done a good job. I have not heard any criticism of his work myself and, as above stated, did not even know there was any question about his job.

"As you perhaps may know, or should at least suspect from the public statements I have made on the subject, I am not a spoilsman and have no interest whatever in patronage other than a desire to see that good men are appointed to represent the Federal Government in all positions.

"Wherever we have a good man on the job who knows his work and is doing it in a satisfactory manner, I am not interested in trying to have him displaced simply because there has been a change of administration. Of course, this would not apply in the case of a man who holds a strictly political job and who will use his position to further the interests of his own party against the present administration."

That strikes us as a highly sensible attitude toward patronage. Despite the great hullabaloo about a few government employees who may have been indolent or indiscreet or plain dishonest, there are many public servants on the Federal payroll who work at their jobs with devotion and fidelity, and who are competent at them.

To make of the whole Federal structure one vast spoils system, to be overturned with each change of administration, would scare off qualified applicants who may want to make careers of public service, leaving only the hacks and misfits who can't make a decent living in private employment.

Mr. Jonas' position is right on this question, as it is on so many others.

AS MAINE GOES, ETC.

THE STATE OF MAINE, having been a political bellwether for many years, now promises to lead the flock in another direction.

The Maine Legislature has told Congress to ignore its earlier resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to limit income taxes to 25 per cent.

That should do it. Maine is among the most conservative of states. If its legislature opposes the limitation, it is inconceivable that three-fourth of the states would favor it.

Nor should they. The scheme was cooked up by a small group of strategists and slipped through many state legislatures with little or no publicity. Others besides Maine have repealed their resolutions once they found out that a rigid constitutional limit on such a major source of income would either (1) seriously handicap the Federal Government in times of crisis, or (2) dump a bigger share of the tax load on the little man.

From The Smithfield Herald

MUST WE FEAR THE 'CONTROVERSIAL'?

AMERICAN books used on foreign information programs are hereafter not to be written by "Communists, fellow travelers, or persons who might be considered controversial."

This strange decree comes from the State Department at Washington which is asking book publishers who submit books for these purposes to certify that they are clean of such influences.

Thus is one more nail being driven into the coffin of freedom.

If this official trend is maintained we can look forward to the time when an American citizen will be a kind of neuter, blank in the head and carrying a vacuum where knowledge and judgment are ordinarily expected.

The United States was born amid controversy, rebellion, and defiance of constituted authority. The government of George III was objectionable to the founding fathers, and their spokesman questioned it and denounced it without stint although thousands of people on both sides of the Atlantic revered it as good and sound if not sacred.

The republic set up by feeble colonies in the latter part of the 18th century has passed through many storms and stresses, and has weathered a thousand controversies and a million differences of opinion, without being overthrown. Are we now so afraid of Communist opinion and doctrine that we must take fright at controversy lest it lead into Communism?

The State Department used to be regarded as one of the solidest government institutions. But here lately it seems to be suffering from nerves as indicated by a tendency toward nightmares and a temptation to see hobgoblins on dark nights? What has become of the Uncle Sam who used to be pictured as a fearless figure with a square jaw?

Won't it be wonderful when income taxes get back down where we can afford to make a living?—*Asheville (N. C.) Citizen.*

'We Might Clear Him For Foreign Travel If He Doesn't Take Any Books Along'

Marquis Childs

Humphrey On Hot Spot

WASHINGTON

WITH the disarming frankness that is one of his attractive qualities, Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey had some things to say to the President the other day about the job at the Treasury. He wanted the President to know that he was expendable. If what he was doing was wrong, then he wanted his boss to say so and he would be happy to step out.

Since Humphrey is generally rated as the ablest member of the Cabinet, this came as a surprise to Mr. Eisenhower. One of the President's qualities is loyalty and the team spirit. He protested warmly that he was 100 per cent back of the effort to keep taxes at their present levels until with greater economies the budget to go into effect a year from now can be brought into balance.

How critical this test is for the Administration Humphrey is fully aware. So many pieces of the Administration program are in process of being shelved for this session of Congress. If tax requests, repeatedly emphasized, are now refused, the effect will be serious indeed in terms of prestige and influence at home and abroad.

FRIENDS AND FOES

Humphrey is on the friendliest possible terms with Chairman Daniel Reed of the House Ways and Means Committee. They talk about the tax problem together. They go a long way and then Reed just says "No!" He has what he calls his "Little Bill" to cut personal income taxes and allow the Excess Profits Tax to die.

To Humphrey the common sense of the Administration course seems so clear. He simply refuses to believe that the Congress, that is 6 *say* most of the Republicans and most of the Democrats, will not go along with the plan to keep the present tax rates through 1953. Then in the first Eisenhower budget — as contrasted with the revised Truman budget—economies of $12 billions can be realized over the present spending level of $74 billions a year.

Talking about those vast sums, Humphrey expresses what is in almost everyone's mind — they are so big, so overwhelming that they escape the grasp of even the most capable and efficient men. There is the haunting sense that waste is inevitable, efficiency all but impossible. In a reduced framework of $62 billions — with $12 billions cut away — the Secretary believes that these sums will become manageable. And he is convinced, too, that somehow national security can also be found within this framework.

GEORGE M. HUMPHREY

Missionary work is going forward with the all-important Ways & Means Committee. Yet Humphrey would be the first to admit his ignorance of politics and how to get things done politically. That is just where the big question mark comes in as to how the Committee and then the House, if the renewal of the tax is presented to the House for action, will act.

President Eisenhower made a nationwide radio address telling the people that he wanted to keep present taxes in order to reduce the deficit bound to result from the Truman budget as revised by the Eisenhower team. Mail to Congressmen from the grass roots in response to that speech could be influential.

A check by this reporter with available Republican members of the Ways & Means Committee shows that the mail response has been negligible or negative. There was no appreciable increase of mail following the address according to the offices of Representatives Mason of Illinois, Jenkins of Ohio, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Knox of Michigan, Curtis of Nebraska and Holmes of Washington.

The following reported an appreciable stepup in the flow of mail: Representatives Kean of New Jersey, Goodwin of Massachusetts, Sadlek of Connecticut, Baker of Tennessee, Curtis of Missouri and Utt of California. But with the exception of Kean, all reported that the balance was against the President's position. Sadlek said that his mail has run seven to three against keeping the Excess Profits Tax. Goodwin's office likewise reported the ratio heavily against the President.

BUSINESS REACTION

These letters come largely from heads of small businesses on whom the Excess Profits Tax works in many instances a great injustice. Seventy-five to 90 per cent of the tax is paid by a few of the country's largest corporations. They have an advantage over small business because they have a long established base of profits on which the Excess Profits Tax is computed.

As for the Democrats on the committee, most of them report that their mail has reflected little change since the President's talk. They are beginning to feel restive and even resentful as the pressure builds up with the almost daily injunction put on them that it is their solemn duty to save the Administration from the Republican holdouts in this situation. On the one hand they heard Treasury spokesmen refuse until recently to take any stand on the Excess Profits Tax; they kept calling it a vicious tax. On the other end they hear Committee Republicans grumble at the responsibility which the Chief Executive is trying to put on them.

They have not actually accepted that responsibility yet. It is a remarkable fact that with only one month to go before the tax expires, no Republican member of the Committee has introduced an Administration bill. The Committee will hold hearings on what the Treasury has asked. But that is a grudging concession.

Action On Kelly Air Report To Test Defense Leadership

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

THE REAL question about the Administration's controversial defense program is not whether earlier defense planning was practical or impractical, wasteful or economical. The real question is whether Secretary of Defense Wilson is going on the rule that adequate and reasonable American defenses have first priority.

There is a lot of evidence, by now, that first priority may have been given to other aims, such as balancing the budget, reducing taxes, and bringing the wild chaos of the Pentagon under effective managerial control. But the evidence is not as yet final and decisive, because Secretary Wilson might well have done everything that he has done in order to clear the decks for a more efficient effort.

The test of whether Secretary Wilson is primarily concerned with his primary job, which is defending this country, is occurring at this moment. The so-called Kelly report, recommending an American air defense program, is now in the hands of Secretary Wilson and Under Secretary Roger Kyes.

A DECISIVE TEST

One of the Kelly report's major recommendations is that the people of this country be acquainted with the hard facts of their situation. A draft summary of the air defense problem, suitable for publication, has been given to Wilson and Kyes. Will they publish, or will they suppress this document? Will they act on the Kelly report, or will they shove this whole painful problem back under the rug? There would be no more final and decisive trial of the purposes and character of the new defense leadership.

This is true for three reasons. First of all, there is the nature of the problem itself. As has been emphasized before in this space, the growth of Soviet air-atomic power will expose this country to actual destruction, at the will of the Kremlin, within the short space of two to four years. Our existing air defenses are worthless. And the future danger, surely, is one that cannot be ignored by reasoning men.

Second, there is the character of the Kelly report. The warning signal concerning the air defense problem was originally raised by Project Lincoln, a massive research task force of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The Lincoln warnings have been fully confirmed, but the Lincoln program for warding off the future danger had been much criticized as over-ambitious, excessively theoretical and over-experimental.

The men who prepared the Kelly report were chosen by former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett for the precise purpose of a hard-headed, practical assessment of the problem, instead of a purely scientific and theoretical assessment.

Their leader was the most eminent scientist-industrialist in this country, Dr. Marvin J. Kelly of the Bell Laboratories. Robert Wilson of Standard of Indiana, President Frederick L. Hovde of Purdue, and Prof. Charles C. Lauritsen were other members. These men, so conspicuously hard-headed as well as so expertly qualified to judge, have spent five months weighing every relevant fact. Even if the Lincoln program is condemned, the recommendations of this Kelly committee cannot be brushed aside as "impractical."

Third and finally, the compromise program put forward by the Kelly committee is known to be moderate and careful. It does not urge the immediate expenditure of huge sums on equipment that has not been adequately proven. But it does urge making a start now, to build an effective air defense system around the equipment that has been fully proven.

A great deal of equipment has in fact successfully passed through the final stage of research and development. Early warning nets can now be built. Warning on the sea flanks can now be organized. A proper air defense communications system, that will not break down under saturating attacks, can now be put together. Good all-weather fighters can now be produced. These are the essential components of an improved American air defense system, that will eventually guard us against the appalling danger that is known to lie ahead.

Finally, a much greater effort is also needed to build up the force of fighter - interceptors, without which the best warning system is useless. Here again, large appropriations, over and above those in the budget, will have to be requested.

Most Englishmen Feel They Have A Part In Coronation

By HAL BOYLE

LONDON

MANY Americans have the idea next week's coronation may be the last in British Empire history, and some English hold this view, too.

"The queen is young and will have a long reign, but will the throne survive after her?" one said. "After all times are changing, and we are changing with them."

This has been a century of war, privation and suffering for Britain's common people. And the contrast between their own pinched way of life and the pomp and pageantry of the royal family stirs some to grumble and question:

"Is it worth the cost?"

Emrys Hughes, a Laborite Welshman, startled the House of Commons last summer by proposing that the monarchy be ditched and Buckingham Palace turned into an apartment house. But the shocked conservatives went right ahead and voted the usual annual royal budget of $1,336,000. They also refused a Laborite demand that the yearly allowance of the Duke of Edinburgh be chopped from $112,000 down to $28,000.

Hughes was so annoyed at the coronation festival he refused even to stay in town this week and look at the decorations. He stormed off to Scotland, saying he wouldn't return "until this jamboree is over." However, if he left an empty seat behind, no one has found it.

London is so crowded that they even have arranged for a floating hotel to care for visitors who can't find a bed ashore. It is the 10,123-ton Spanish liner, Monte Ulia, the largest vessel ever to enter London port.

But while many here may grumble at the high cost of maintaining the monarchy, there is little real evidence that Queen Elizabeth's son, fair-haired Prince Charlie, will grow up unemployed.

The crown is firm in the hearts of most British. You have only to walk around the bleak streets of London to see the signs. The great thoroughfares, of course, are formally decorated with flaring banners.

But in the back streets the working people have caught the coronation fever too. Thousands of small homes have a portrait of the Queen in the window and the legend "Long May She Reign."

In one block 40 families have put out 750 flags. They chipped in to raise about $325 for the decorations. The average rent in these homes is about $2.80 a week, the average wage earner in this area gets less than $25 a week.

"We're proud of our show," one said.

That spirit is typical. The coronation is unlike any American celebration. Each Englishman feels he has a part in it, whether his station in life is high or low. And most take a personal pride in the Queen.

"Get rid of the royal family?" one pub owner said. "What would we have to take their place?

"You Americans could use a royal family. It knits a people, doesn't it? And with all the money you Yanks have, you wouldn't have to stop at one. You could easily afford two royal families, couldn't you?"

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Divided Democrats Desert Senator Morse

WASHINGTON

DEMOCRATIC Senators have shown remarkable teamwork since January, but they split wide open this week over a Republican—Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon. Tempers flared backstage as Democrats debated whether they should vote to restore previous committee seats to the man who had done his best to help them out in the last election and who, as a result, is now being punished by the Republicans.

The issue has been seething among the Democrats for some time. It began several weeks ago when a majority of Senate Democrats met privately in the office of Sen. Clinton Anderson of New Mexico and decided to make a fight to restore the committee appointments which the Republicans had taken from Morse. To this end Sen. Lister Hill of Alabama was delegated to discuss the matter with Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson.

Johnson, however, was in Texas and Hill didn't see him. So the matter finally came up in the Democratic Steering Committee Monday, at which time Sens. Herbert H. Lehman of New York, Paul H. Douglas of Illinois, Henry M. Jackson of Washington, and Anderson appeared before the committee and urged that Morse be given back his old seats on the Armed Services and Labor Committees.

"There is no reason," pleaded Anderson, "that Democrats should help the Republicans discipline Morse."

"Morse will be chief speaker at the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner for the Democratic Party in Oregon," urged Douglas. "The Democrats should be the last people to turn against him."

"Munroe Sweetland, Democratic national committeeman from Oregon, is here in town right now urging that he get Democratic support," argued Jackson of Washington.

Neely's Eloquence

MOST eloquent plea was made by elder statesman Matt Neely, who has been in Congress or governor of West Virginia for about 40 years.

"Back in the 64th or 65th Congress," Neely reminded his Democratic colleagues, "it came to the election of a Speaker, and blind Senator Schall, then a Republican Congressman from Minnesota, deserted Speaker Joe Cannon, walked down the center of the aisle and made a speech for Champ Clark. His vote let the Democrats organize the House of Representatives for Woodrow Wilson.

"I would like to remind you," continued Neely, "that the next Senate could easily result in a tie vote in which the Senator from Oregon might determine who organizes the Senate.

"Today the Republicans are determined to punish this man despite our Constitution which guarantees the right to vote our convictions without punishment. It's just plain common sense that the Democrats support Wayne Morse."

But after these closed-door arguments, Senator "Lying-Down" Johnson made an appeal to the Steering Committee to stand back of him. He explained that he had made a deal with Senator Taft on committee assignments and he demanded Democratic support for that deal.

Democratic Split

SEN. A. Willis Robertson of Virginia supported Johnson—though for purely personal reasons. He was afraid he would lose his seat on the Appropriations Committee if Morse was given back his committee assignments. Sen. Albert Gore of Tennessee also said that if Morse got his committee back, he, Gore, would insist on going on the Appropriations Committee.

In the end, Democrats voted 16 to 23 against the independent Senator from Oregon. Among his supporters were such friends as Sens. Stuart Symington of Missouri, John O. Pastore of Rhode Island, John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Mike Mansfield of Montana. Symington called Morse to tell him what a fine job he had done on the Armed Services Committee.

"But," he added, "Lyndon has made this a matter of party loyalty."

"Thus," ironically concluded Anderson of New Mexico, "we Democrats help the Republicans to discipline one of their party who befriended us while the Democrats who deserted our party take the lead in helping the Republicans."

Note—Johnson, who led the move against Morse, took only a tepid part in the Stevenson campaign in Texas last year, while Sen. Richard B. Russell of Georgia, who also helped the fight against Morse, went to Venezuela last Fall, refused to make a speech for Stevenson.

World Friendship

WHILE Senator McCarthy and the isolationists are blasting our old allies in Europe, a large segment of the American people are working harder than ever at people-to-people friendship. Here are some of them. The Cleveland Heights, Ohio, public school choir will embark on a European tour with broadcasts from various European capitals over the Voice of America . . . Today the "Tour of Somerville" bicycle race starts in New Jersey featuring bicycle teams from Japan, Mexico and other countries as one way to cement closer relations . . . Kiwanis International brings senior high school students from various European countries and gives them one year of study in the U.S.A. Kiwanis clubs all over the country have joined in this; treat the youngsters as if they were their own. In Gainesville, Ga., Kiwanians gave their youngster a new evening gown and expenses for a week-end date at Annapolis.