

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1956

Parking, Politics & Providence Road: A Way Out Of The Traffic Squeeze

THE ascending curve that marks the development of Charlotte as an ordered, integrated metropolis is broken by recurring downward movements. One of these twitches in the line of civic progress came yesterday when the City Council took up the controversy over a parking ban on Providence Road.

Measured against other community issues, the problem had some remarkably lightweight characteristics. But as a symptom of a kind of political dyspepsia that occasionally affects City Hall it was indeed significant.

First of all, the city had made a rather feeble temporary effort to solve a big problem with little tools. To unblock traffic on a segment of Providence Road, parking was forbidden along the particular stretch. Traffic Engineer Hoose insisted that only about 10 spaces were taken but the outcry from affected business and professional people in the zone was immediate and loud.

Yesterday afternoon, the Council heard the protesting parties and Mr. Hoose state their cases and promptly and unanimously undid Mr. Hoose's handwork.

So, that is apparently that. The complaints of the affected businesses, two pleasant but concerned ladies, and a dentist were perfectly legitimate. They each had disturbing stories about how the parking ban would affect their livelihood. They deserved to be heard for government must never become so big that it crushes everything heartlessly in its path, studiously ignoring the rights of individuals.

THE six protesting parties were understandably happy about their victory. But nobody really won yesterday. Certainly not the 10,000 or so people who use that strip of Providence Road during a 12-hour period every day, cursing the congestion and the delay. Certainly not the people of Charlotte who want to see the city grow sensibly and painlessly, without the strangling traffic confusion that drives business away.

But this strip of Providence Road is only one thoroughfare that is clogged beyond its capacity to move traffic efficiently. It is only a part of the growing challenge facing Charlotte today. It represents in its own small but insistent way the challenge that Charlotte is not meeting effectively.

Charlotte's traffic muddles are expensive inconveniences—a fact that is often obscured by the knowledge that it is costly to do something about them. It is expensive to allocate improved urban land to off-street parking, or to the build-

ing of freeways to route traffic out of midtown swiftly. However, the facts show that the cost of not providing these facilities are even greater and has more far-reaching effect on the life of the community.

With a few notable exceptions Charlotte's tools have been too small. Even the palliatives—like Mr. Hoose's parking ban—must suffer the slings and arrows of outraged constituents, and be abandoned.

Wide streets of improved design, costly as they may be, are still the best answer. Low cost, temporary measures merely lure one into thinking the problem has been solved. And this mistaken belief only delays the proper solution of the problem.

THE traffic congestion problem is big, and has to be solved with big tools. These tools are the design and construction of modern, adequate traffic carriers.

Here is what needs to be done: 1—Assign clearly the responsibility of this urban congestion problem to Mr. Hoose and his experts—with as little political meddling as possible.

2—Let them study fully the problem of traffic congestion which may be relieved by properly designed thoroughfares.

3—Produce a sound program of street construction with priority which will solve today's problems as well as prepare for the future.

4—Armed with this sound approach to the traffic problem, acquaint the public with the nature of the problem and its solution.

These are not particularly new ideas. Other cities have tried them. They work. Charlotte desperately needs such a master plan. Without one, the Queen City of the South will forever be like a big troubled giant, stumbling over its own feet.

Footnote

UNHAPPYEST aspect of yesterday's City Council session dealing with the Providence Road issue was the mercenary treatment City Traffic Engineer Herman Hoose received at the hands of Councilman Steve Dellinger.

Mr. Hoose plainly did not deserve the needling he took with such admirable grace. He is, after all, an honorable employee of the city and a conscientious, if somewhat controversial, public servant. Respect—not public embarrassment—is his due.

Sterilization Is A Wrong Answer

JUDGE WILSON WARLICK'S espousal of sterilization to reduce births of illegitimate children lends that proposal a dignity it doesn't deserve. The tax problem posed by an increasing number of these children, of course, is real. The aim of supporters of sterilization—to reduce the births and thereby the amount of tax money required to support them—is valid. But however much of a quick-sure-cure aspect may surround the sterilization idea, we believe it arises more out of frustration than of any solid reasoning, surrounding the problem.

In the first place, would sterilization do the job? Judge Warlick proposes that a woman seeking aid for an unborn illegitimate child be granted aid only if she agrees to submit to sterilization. This suggests, of course, that aid to dependent children is a stimulus to more illegitimacy. But a North Carolina House Welfare subcommittee reported this year "there is no relationship between the number of illegitimate children and aid to dependent children program. In other words, the group said, "few children are born out of wedlock after a mother once begins to receive aid to dependent children." In Mecklenburg County roughly 95 percent of the illegitimate children being aided by tax money were born before the mother applied for aid. Advocates of sterilization have yet to show how it would lock the door before the horse escapes.

But practically it is not the only test of sterilization. There are moral considerations to be faced by legislators who would write the laws, and by doctors who would perform the operations. Judge Warlick's proposal seemingly suggests a fair choice. A woman could choose between aid for her child, or the cold certainty that she never could have another, regardless of hopes for redemption. This

choice might meet the test of law, but never, we submit, that of conscience. It is no trifling thing to tamper with a human being's creative process, nor to penalize an innocent child for the mistakes of its parents. Further as to the fairness of the proposal, assuming it ever were enacted, should not the father be sterilized, too, as well as the mother?

Judge Warlick's concern with a thorny, perplexing social problem is commendable. His additional proposal that fathers be forced to support their illegitimate children is just, and may be workable. Certainly all reasonable efforts should be made to discourage illegitimacy and to waste-proof public assistance programs. But it is not a new problem—although more illegitimate children are being born now there is no evidence that the percentage has increased—and it is not at root a legal problem. It is a moral problem and any semblance of a competent answer to it must come from the sources of community morality—the home, church, school and other organizations concerned with the moral training of citizens.

What is new about the problem and what, we suspect, provokes such drastic proposals as sterilization, is public concern with it. Until recent years the illegitimate child lived as best it could in a limbo of shame. Now that citizens have assumed a responsibility to see that children are fed and housed, any suggestion that tax money is being wasted unduly on illegitimate children demands for quick, drastic cures.

But there is a chance of waste in all charity—in the giving of a nickel to a bum on a street, as well as in providing minimum support for illegitimate children. That chance cannot be eliminated by sterilization. It is drastic, but it is no cure, either in a practical or a moral sense.

From The Chapel Hill News Leader

THOUGHTS OF SPRING

AS SOON as January 15 is over, a man begins to think about spring. Even though the bleakest weather is yet to come, he notes that the days are longer and the afternoon light is no longer so leaden. The green chickweed is spreading under the old weeds of the garden and in warm corners the green spikes of jonquils are already breaking the ground. Spells of snow and ice may intervene, but the fact remains that in another month, plus a couple of weeks, the winter jessa-

mine, lonicera, and spirea will be in flower and the first daffodils will be nodding in the breeze. The frogs in the marshes will be piping down at sundown and the college boys will be out for baseball practice.

Recalling these things, a man wonders that so many people don't abandon life north of the Potomac River.

I do not make speeches. When I stand up in Congressman Scott's office, he (COBRA HARRIS IN COCHRAN) JOURNAL.



IN THE SPOTLIGHT of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee during Sen. Eastland's probe of Communist activities at the New York Times were these present and former Timesmen. Left to

right: Clayton Knowles, reporter; Samuel Weissman, member of the editorial staff; Jerry Seymour, former Times editor; Seymour Peck, deskman for the Sunday Times Magazine; and Jack Shuman, former copywriter. (AP Wirephoto)

Probe Of N. Y. Times Raises A Constitutional Issue

By WALTER LIPPMAN
NEW YORK
or another employed a very small number of Communists, and that these Communists not infiltrated, have not in any visible way subverted, what the paper has thought fit to print.

THE Eastland subcommittee announced last week that "this phase of our hearing is closed for the present." This phase has had to do with Communist infiltration of the newspaper press, and the specific target has been the New York Times.

OBJECTIVE TEST
The objective test of whether there has in fact been infiltration is whether or not the pages of the New York Times show any evidence of the suppression or distortion of news by the members of the staff. If the paper had indeed been subverted, any competent investigator would have been able to point to the evidence that the Communist infiltrators had served their cause in the pages of the New York Times.



JULIAN G. SOURWINE
Subcommittee Counsel

THE crucial question posed by the Eastland Committee is whether Congress has the power to censor the individual employees of a newspaper. If a congressional committee has that power in case of employees who are, have been, or are charged with being Communists, what is to stop future congressional committees from censoring newspaper employment on other grounds? Let the political climate change, let it become again like that of the '30s, and what legal ground is Congress to be challenged if it chooses to investigate the influence on the press of corporate interests, if, for example, it demands a public accounting of the financial connec-

tions and interests of publishers, editors, and reporters?

Once it is accepted principle that Congress has power to set up standards of newspaper employment, the later spirit and the practical meaning of the First Amendment will be deeply impaired. Congress, has, of course, no power to pass laws dealing with the standards of newspaper employment. Has it the right to do the same thing by the power to investigate? As exercised by latter day congressional committees, the power to investigate is a tremendous instrument, commanding the power to make laws, to enforce those laws, to judge and to punish men under those laws. This tremendous instrument can be, and is, used to harass, to intimidate, to punish, and to destroy. Were it to become the accepted practice that Congress may investigate the press, machinery would exist to nullify the First Amendment.

GRAVE INVASION
The question therefore is whether the newspaper profession shall assent to or shall oppose the claim that Congress has the power to investigate the editorial management of newspapers. The hiring or firing of employees is an essential and central part of the editing of a newspaper. My own view is that no part of the editorial management should, that no part can under the First Amendment, be ceded legitimately to Congress. If we who are connected with newspapers acquiesce in the right to Congress to censor on any grounds whatsoever newspaper employment, we shall have opened the way to a grave invasion of the freedom of the press.

People's Platform Opinions Should Stand The Test Of Dissent

Editors: The News: Charlotte
I CONCUR heartily in your recent reaffirmation of the people's platform open for continual dissent. I support you in your plea for tolerance, for moderate and reasonable language. Certainly you should edit out some of the more inflammatory expressions from

some letters, along with libelous and obscene statements from all letters; and you must, sometimes, reject some letters altogether—those which reflect, for example, views obviously psychotic or of the most base and sordid nature. You have a duty to the public; and you would be derelict in that duty should you allow the Platform to become too selective or utterly non-selective.

It seems to me that the Platform is functioning well, that strong convictions from each side of current issues are being presented and that the Platform is truly the place of free expression that it purports to be. I hope that its purpose shall remain always a true "soap box." There is a crying need for such, particularly in these times.

I do see no harm, however, in contributors to the Platform criticizing the views of other letter-writers. In fact, there would be a dearth of vigorous expression, I believe, if you printed no letters that attack or take issue with the sentiments of other contributors. If you printed no letters of opinion—mine, in this case. But opinions must be attacked and defended if they are at all worthy. If they are to attract the attention and gain the significance due worthy opinions.

—J. J. JUSTINE

News Letter Policy Endorsed By Reader

Editors: The News: Charlotte
YOUR editorial of January 9, headed, "The Right To Speak Your Mind," is a very progressive step forward.

It is wise, timely, and I am certain the majority of your readers will subscribe to every point mentioned that would cover your Platform letters.

—AL SMITH

Back Proposed Social Security Amendment

Editors: The News: Charlotte
THEIR is now bill pending before the Senate Finance Committee in Washington (HR 7223) to amend the Social Security laws that persons 62 years of age and handicapped persons over 50 years of age may draw benefits. However, unless public opinion is cleaned up, giving the Department might be tabled in the rush of business in the present session of Congress.

Therefore, you who will be eligible may, with a few moments of your time, a page of note paper and a three-cent stamp, exercise your right as a citizen by writing your congressman and senators urging them to pass this law now.

I have been employed by the Salvation Army here in Charlotte

Smokestacks Made Queen City Bustle

Editors: The News: Charlotte
DON'T be so personally for God has done just that thing. He directed the people that made Charlotte that to erect smokestacks to attract people from all over the world. That's the reason our 150,000 people built a busy, bustling town.

I have been around here over 25 years, born May 11, 1879. I know just what this town on the map.

No, the city's engineers cannot construct the 50,000 cars, trucks and automobiles with smoke pouring out their exhaust pipes on foggy days. Not smog. Just plain fog.

—Wm. C. McINTIRE

Drew Pearson's Biracial Bloc Plans Civil Rights Battle

WASHINGTON
THE first backstage meeting on the most dynamic-led question before this Congress was held in the office of Congressman Hugh Scott of Philadelphia last week to discuss the protection of Negroes in the Deep South and civil rights generally.

Strategy Mapped
At the meeting, where Congressman Jimmy Roosevelt of Los Angeles, Dick Bolling of Kansas City, Adam Clayton Powell of Harlem, N. Y., and Charles Diggs of Detroit, the latter two are among the three Negroes in Congress, all Democrats. Though the meeting was held in Congressman Scott's office, he was the only Republican present. Another meeting which two other Republicans want to attend, Wolverton of Cam-

den, N. J., and Hesselton of western Massachusetts, was scheduled for today. Chief strategy decided on was to abandon any attempt to pass an FEPC—Fair Employment Practices Act—but concentrate everything on an omnibus bill guaranteeing the Negroes' right to vote and his physical protection. This bill would be in two parts: 1—Protection of voting rights by abolishing the poll tax, preventing terrorism at the polls, giving the Justice Department broad powers to probe any attempt to deprive Negroes of voting rights in either federal or local elections. 2—A general anti-lynching bill which would also apply to drowning, or any other type of violence based on race, creed, or color, regardless of state lines. The meeting in Congressman Scott's office took place immediately after a

group of Georgia congressmen, including Lanham, Davis and Forester, had spent an hour on the House floor exhorting "Niggers." The Congressional Record was cleaned up afterward and some of their most vitriolic language censored. But at the meeting of the two Negro and three white congressmen which followed minutes later in Scott's office, Jimmy Roosevelt expressed concern that these speeches would make headlines the next day, thereby hurting a bipartisan approach to civil rights.

Unseating Proposal
Congressman Diggs, first Negro elected from Detroit, brought with him an 18-page legal memorandum proposing that the congressmen from Mississippi—scene of the Till murder—be unseated on the ground that they were not elected by all

the voters of Mississippi. The memo was prepared by Frank Polhaus, whom Truman had appointed head of the Justice Department Civil Rights Division, and turned out to be an exhaustive document going back to Thaddeus Stevens in Civil War days and showing that a move to unseat a congressman does not have to be made at the opening of Congress. At a previous meeting, Diggs had been vigorous in wanting to try to unseat the Mississippi congressmen. Diggs and Bolling have urged against this. "It would only arouse passion and get our southern friends sore," cautioned Roosevelt. Diggs agreed and for the time being will not introduce his anti-Mississippi resolution.