



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON.....Publisher
J. E. DOWD.....General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH.....Executive Editor
C. A. MCKNIGHT (On Leave).....Editor

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1955

New Hope For An Old Chestnut?

WHEN Gov. Luther Hodges delivered his State of the State message to North Carolina's General Assembly on Jan. 6, there was not a word about a legal floor for Tar Heel wages. But the following day he marched briskly into a capitol press conference and announced that he would support a minimum wage bill "something along the line" of the ill-fated 55-cent proposal offered in 1953.

This statement and a subsequent remark by Mr. Hodges on the importance of fair wages to the worker, hardly produced cartwheels of joy among Tar Heel statemen. State minimum wage bills are old legislative chestnuts—often proposed, always shouted down.

It took two months for the matter even to be brought up this year. Reps. Cloyd Philpott of Davidson and Thomas Turner of Guilford finally tossed a minimum wage bill in the House hopper March 3. It is resting comfortably today in the now-familiar surroundings of the Manufacturers and Labor Committee.

Essentially, it is the same old proposal. Gov. Umstead backed unsuccessfully in 1953—a 55-cent floor except for workers in agriculture, dairying, domestic service in private homes, outside salesmen on commission, those whose pay is usually composed of tips in addition to wages, and some others.

The bill is not unreasonable. If anything, a 55-cent floor is too low. It is, however, a start, a forward step—however mincing. No state with a high factor of economic well-being can be built upon shaky foundations of poverty and low wages.

Surely, there must be enough level-headed, thinking lawmakers in the 1955 legislature to pry the bill out of committee and get it enacted. As we have said before, North Carolina owes its people a minimum, not of subsistence, but of decency. The Philpott-Turner bill will help the state provide just that for Tar Heel citizens.

City School Needs Are Great But . . .

HAVE Charlotte's educational leaders put the fiscal cart before the horse? The question is worth considering. Legislation raising the local school tax limit to 60 cents per \$100 valuation has been introduced to meet the demand of increased enrollment.

But with the ceiling presently anchored at 50 cents, the current school tax levy is only 45 cents.

That leaves a five-cent cushion—for use when needed.

No one can deny that educational needs are increasing. Charlotte schools

need more money. What they get is not enough. But it seems reasonable to suggest that educators make use of fiscal channels already open to them before asking that new ones be provided.

It is possible that the city can meet its educational obligations by raising the levy slightly without raising the limit.

Suppose, however, that it hits the 50-cent limit and still cannot make ends meet. Then is the time to propose a ceiling adjustment—even if it necessitates a short wait until the next legislative year.

Russia Sided With The Yankees

IT MUST have made many an unrecruited Reddy wince when Secretary of State John Foster Dulles referred to "our historic friendship" with the Russians.

Heaven to Betsy! Russia never has been a pal of Dixie—not even in the days when the Reds were whooping it up behind the Kremlin walls.

Those scalawags across the Volga were strongly sympathetic to the Union cause during The Late Unpleasantness.

They were, in fact, instrumental in restraining Britain and France from recognizing the Confederacy.

The whole sordid story is outlined in *Road To Tambov* by Foster Rhea Dulles, the cousin, no less, of the State Department's Mr. D.

Russia's motives in snooting the Confederacy were pretty obvious. She had only recently been fighting in the Crimea and still regarded Britain as the principal barrier to her ambitions. Russia simply looked upon Washington as an ally against Britain.

A number of Russian officers even served in the Union Army during the Civil War.

And the Car freed his slaves one year before President Lincoln set U. S. slaves free.

Mr. Dulles (Foster Rhea) also reminds

us that in 1863, when British recognition of the Confederacy was still a possibility and the cause of grave anxiety in Washington, Russian naval squadrons visited New York and San Francisco—to the enormous relief and delight of the Unionists.

It has always been suspected though that the real reason for the visits was that the fleet had been ordered to seek shelter in friendly neutral ports to escape the possibility of being bottled up in Russian harbors by the stronger British fleet.

And the fact that they made John Paul Jones (North Carolina's friend during an earlier Unpleasantness) an admiral in the Russian Navy doesn't change things one whit. Those Yankeeophile Russians are no comrades of ours.

Footnote

THE Confederacy decided to pull out again it's dollars to bagels that Russia would be kicking Dixie's boots this time. Wasn't it Rhett Butler who said the Confederacy was the only nation in history to start a war when it didn't own a cannon factory?

We fixed that. Those are not exactly mint juleps they are manufacturing at the Aiken plant.

From The Lexington Dispatch

NO BALM IN GILEAD

NOW who would think the day would come so soon when the famous old railroad town of Spencer wouldn't even locate any sort of a steam locomotive anywhere in the railroad system that built the town and has been its main support over the years?

That very thing has come to pass. Some patriotic Spencerians recently decided it would be the expense of moving one across the highway and mounting it on proper supports in the park, which is owned by the railroad company. The hitch to this is that the office of the Southern Railway president reports the company has no more steam locomotives available. An advocate of the Spencer plan has found that the Chesapeake & Ohio gave one to a Virginia town and it has been rededicated with much fanfare. So it is now suggested that the C. & O. (that's Young's railroad) might send a locomotive to Spencer, which stands at the heart of the Southern system. Of course, Southern officials would have to approve such an "indignity."

Leastwise, the word is that the Spencer folks, most of whose first conscious awakening was in response to the shrill

whistles from the great railroad yards, are not giving up in their search for a locomotive. The town has been redeemed from the pall of coal smoke that so long made plain freshness a hopeless task. From sheer patriotism though, the folks want to preserve a token of their past.

Evidently railroad folks have a much more effective method of disposing of cars, discards than those who rather than worn-out or smashed up automobiles. There must be millions of these laying around along the roadways of the nation to mar the beauty nature has to offer.

Wife (looking up from her newspaper) I say, Jim, what is the Order of the Rite? Hubby (embracing the opportunity)—Well, as I've experienced it, it's too cold; then you're short a towel, then you step on the soap, and finally, the telephone bell rings!—GREENEVILLE (TENN.) SUN.

Scientists announce that artificial diamonds can be made that are exactly like the natural ones and that will cost twice as much as the real ones. It's going to be interesting to see if people rare when they learn that the stones in a diamond brooch are artificial or turn up their noses upon learning that the diamonds are only real.—LEXINGTON HERALD.

An antique collector, passing through a small village, stopped to watch an old man chopping wood with an ancient axe. There, "reminded the collector. "Yes," said the villager, "it once belonged to George Washington. "Not really!" gasped the collector. "It's certainly stood up well." "Of course," admitted the old man. "It had three new handles and two new heads."—STANLEY NEWS AND PRESS.



IT'S A TRADITION: U. S. Presidents Must Model Headress Of Every Size, Shape. Above: Ike's Contributions.

Homage To Hats: Some Highs & Lows In Headgear

By ROBERT PAYNE

(Editors' Note: This global survey of the hat situation was condensed from The New York Times Magazine.)

FROM ANKARA the Turkish Minister of the Interior announces a new war against the fez, the red felt cone that is worn all over the Middle East. The fez, banned by Kemal Ataturk in 1928 when he was pushing through a rapid modernization of Turkey, has recently resurfaced in country districts. Villagers are warned that they must wear hats with brims, or suffer the penalties. In the days of Kemal Ataturk the penalties were grim; a man could be sent to prison for ten years at hard labor for wearing a fez.

FRIGHTENING There is nothing new in sending people to prison for wearing the wrong headgear. In 1787 John Heberington, a Strand haberdasher, was arrested for wearing a tall hat "having a lustre calculated to frighten timid people." Napoleon issued a decree forbidding the wearing of the Bonnet rouge worn by the French revolutionaries. After the revolution of 1811 the Chinese banned Manchu headgear. For a brief while the British banned the white cotton cap worn by members of the Indian Congress party. Hats are history. When they are banned, or when new hats emerge, we can be pretty certain that something of unusual importance is happening to the ethos of a nation.

In his campaign against the fez, Kemal Ataturk hammered home the theme that a modern people "will wear brims to the coverings on our heads." Oddly enough, the hat with a brim was an invention of the Greeks, a people for whom Kemal Ataturk had little regard. The first brimmed hat was the petasos, made of felt or straw with a strap at the back, which prevented it from being whirled away by the wind. It was a sensible hat, and it survives to this day among the peasants of Greece. The petasos traveled over Europe, and drawings of English peasants made in the thirteenth century show them wearing the same kind of headgear which must have been worn by Socrates.

arise naturally out of age-old tradition. Western headgear has a history of deliberate invention. The brimmed fur hat was invented by a Swiss who showed it first in Paris in the year 1404. We know the dates when the heaver, the derby, the panama and the homburg were invented. The tall hat invented by the unfortunate Hetherington can be dated to the exact month. We have had topers ever since. They swept over the whole world, and today the Emperor of Japan wears one when he opens the Diet and they can still be seen in New York on St. Patrick's Day. But the top hat is too universal to tell us much about the people who wear them except that they are affluent, or else they are cabbies.

The most respectable hats have odd histories. You would never think that the felt worn by business men on Fifth Avenue has a revolutionary past. Originally it was worn by cowboys on the Hungarian plain. When Louis Kossuth escaped to England and America after the failure of the 1848 revolution, he wore a black, wide-brimmed felt. Enormously popular, hailed as the apostle of freedom, he was imitated everywhere. Oriental headgear seems to

Soon the felt was replacing the topless.

ENDLESS ADAPTATION

The Russians have a passion for the sensible antraskan fur hat, but have been influenced by Lenin to wear caps as well. After his visit to London, Lenin took to wearing the English workman's cap. It fits close to the head, and the visor is stuffed with cardboard. The point of the visor was not so much to shade the eyes as to provide a lever which helped the workman to doff the hat in the presence of his superiors. A useful, comfortable hat, it is sometimes provided with flaps which can be let down to cover the ears on cold days. For the Englishman's cap, like the Irishman's, it is capable of endless adaptation.

Yet it lacks some of the advantages of the French beret. You cannot easily remove a beret. It hugs the head. You can sweep it off, but it is troublesome to replace. The ideal hat for those who do not wish to remove their hats. The beret, which derives from the honest rags of the French revolutionaries and, further back, from the priest's biretta, can be stuffed easily in

the pocket, can be replaced cheaply and can be worn at a rakish angle. The beret is a symbol of all the French virtues: their independence, their frugality, their gaiety.

PORTABLE BAR

In America the hat reaches its apotheosis in the ten-gallon hat of the cowboys, modeled on the broad-brimmed sombrero of the Mexicans, but extended to a point where the sombrero would hardly recognize its descendant. The sombrero was made of straw, the ten-gallon hat of blocked felt. The sombrero had a definite brim, but the ten-gallon hat can be punched into any shape you please. It is roof, umbrella, sunshade, water-carrier. It has the pride of a galleon, and you can keep letters in it, as Abraham Lincoln kept letters in a fair share of a pinch even a bottle of whiskey.

It is, indeed, the granddaddy and mountain of hats, the finest flower of the long movement which started with the petasos. If the Turks are looking for something to replace the fez, they must as well look to the ten-gallon hat, which in this utilitarian age serves so many purposes.

American Heritage Is Liberty, Not 'Economic Security'

By SEN. SAM J. ERVIN JR.

(Editors' Note: This discussion of U. S. heritage was excerpted from an address by Sen. Ervin delivered Friday in Richmond, Va.)

WE received our heritage in trust for ourselves and our children and our children's children from all those men and women, both great and small, whose blood and sweat, tears, and prayers made the America we know and love a living reality.

Our heritage is liberty. While liberty has blossomed in our land, love of liberty did not have its origin here

childhood, the graves of their loved dead, the comparative security of the then civilized world, and journeyed in tiny barks across a hostless ocean to establish homes for themselves and their children and their children's children in what was then a perilous wilderness in a new and strange land.

BREAD OF BONDADE Why did they do this? Why did they exchange the comparative security of the Old World for the terrifying insecurity of the New? The answer is simply this: Nothing more. They believed that only the slave, who depends upon a master for the bread of bondage, is really secure; and they knew that only the self-reliant soul, who spurs security for opportunity, is truly free. For this reason, they chose liberty rather than security.

The valiant folk who made

America great had the hardihood to accept the economic truths so plainly visible to all persons who possess the capacity and willings to meet reality face to face.

ADAM'S CURSE

They knew that earth yields nothing to man except the products of his own labor. They knew that Adam's curse is an unchangeable law of life.

In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread, till thou returnest to the ground. They knew that man has but one choice in respect to this immutable economic fact, and that, such choice is simply

ly this: Whether the bread which he must eat in the sweat of his face shall be the bread of freedom or the bread of bondage. They knew this unalterable decree of the creator of the universe. Free men cannot be induced to produce things of value unless they are permitted to retain a fair share of the fruits of their labor for themselves and their families.

Moreover, that man can be free only if he is willing to accept the responsibility for his own life which is inseparable from liberty.

People's Platform

Congressional Pay

Raise Questioned

Charlotte

Editors, The News: ARE the senators trying to help reduce our taxes? No, even trying to keep them in the present level according to their action in voting their pay hike.

Now, these seven men when they were asking you and me for that job what we were paying, so if they knew they could not live on \$10,000 a year they did they ask for the job?

It certainly would be nice if we could all get a job and then tell our employer that we were going to take more than 50 per cent more than we had first agreed on wouldn't it?

My dear senators, I dare say that a big majority of the taxpayers make far less money per year than the increase you boys have voted yourselves, and I am one of them. I'm fat, my wife and I live in a nice home, we have decent living, and still make much less than \$7,500, and believe me we don't get ruction exception.

So, my good politicians, I would like to know why you think we should allow you a \$10,000 exemption. You do make your money in these good old United States and I think you should pay the same rate of taxes as everyone else. Yes, I even think you should have to pay your own money for whisky used at your parties.

Now, here is one and only one advantage in raising this pay from \$10,000 to \$23,750 and that is the fact that we may interest more better and better equipped men in running for these offices come next election, who are more interested in the affairs of state than in their own personal gain.

Oh yes, I am hoping that you have voted yourselves out of the job, and I hereby promise to do everything in my power to help in this endeavor.

—RAYMOND PRESSON

Whisky Is Sold On

Almost Any Street

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

[HAVE tried to decide who to blame for so many broken homes and so many alcoholics. On almost any street in Charlotte you can walk in and buy a gallon of whisky. Bootleggers can have a gallon and deliver it, and so get another gallon. When a someone gets so drunk they don't know what they are doing, they put them in jail. And yet they allow the stuff to be sold.

What kind of law and world is it that children going hungry, homes broken up, men lying around drinking, what does anyone do to help? And churches all over town, people's lost, going to hell, every day because of liquor. And yet the stuff is sold on almost all streets.

Who is to blame? The dealers I think.

—MRS. MAYME BARGER

Quote, Unquote

The man who never makes a mistake lacks something—especially the spirit of adventure. He never tries anything new; he is the slave of the wheel of progress. —Audubon County (Iowa) Hawkeye Gazette.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON

SECRETARY of State Dulles, meeting with U. S. Ambassadors to 15 Asian countries last week, told them there would be no more retreats in Asia. This will be welcome news to a lot of people.

However, standing firm in Asia without war is a tough proposition, and in all humility I would like to suggest a strategy which we might use against the Chinese Reds in the Far East.

The strategy is quite simple. I would adopt exactly the same tactics as the Chinese, Indians, and other orientals use against us when they find themselves in a tight spot. I would use the boycott.

There are other names for this strategy. The Indians call it passive resistance. Westerners sometimes call it a blockade. But it all amounts to the same thing—refusing to have any dealings, business, economic, political, or otherwise with a high-handed or aggressive nation.

Chiang Once A Red Leader

The Chinese communists have also employed this strategy with great success. In 1925 I was in Canton when that city was controlled by the first wave of communists to agitate China. Their leader was Chen Chang, a man of the name of the rather uncertain red whom we lean today. At that time Chiang was in command of the Whampoa cadets south of Canton on the Pearl River, and commander Mikhail Markovich Borodin was sent direct from Moscow to train these cadets.

But though Chiang sent threats to American shipping not to come up the Pearl River past his fort, those threats were as empty as the threats he makes

against the Reds today.

What was effective, however, and deadly effective, was the boycott which the communists in Canton enforced against the American-British international community of Shanghai, an island adjacent to Canton.

No Chinese goods, no food, no water was permitted on the island. Business came to an absolute stop. Grass grew in the streets. It had to be cut with a lawnmower. The American consul swooped on his own office. I used to see the Italian consul, majestically bawling gories from the Italian consulate, a commissary on a child's expiring waga.

Naval Blockade

This type of boycott, I repeat, is old hat in the Orient. It's an oriental weapon which the orientals understand, and it's been foolish on our part not to have applied it long ago—in the form of a naval blockade.

Naturally there has been talk of blockade in the past, but there have been two main reasons why it hasn't been adopted:

1. The proposals have come from military men, notably Admiral Arthur Radford, which has scared the wits out of our friends and allies. A boycott or blockade is more a political than a military operation, and military men should put putting their feet in their mouths.

2. British businessmen and the British government have put trade ahead of peace. They have insisted on peeling trade holes in the bamboo curtain. Other European businessmen, especially the Greeks, have been the victims of progress, but the British have been the worst offenders.

However, the fact remains that Red China is fairly easy to boycott. For China is by no means self-sustaining and could not possibly subsist during a long period with outside goods shut off.