

# THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

Thomas M. Robinson ..... President and Publisher  
 Brodie S. Griffith ..... General Manager  
 Robert H. Lampe ..... Advertising Director  
 Cecil Prince ..... Editor  
 Perry Morgan ..... Associate Editor  
 R. L. Young Jr. ..... Managing Editor  
 Huey Sinsco ..... Circulation Manager

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1957

## State Must Stop Counting Bad Ballots

THERE is one compelling reason for repeal of the "get-Jonas bill." The reason is that it permits the use of improperly marked ballots.

For this reason, and quite apart from the partisan squabbles involved, the vote law should be replaced by a measure offered by Mecklenburg and other Tenth District Democrats. Under this measure, any ballot improperly marked both in a party circle and an individual box on the opposite side would be voided.

The proposal is fair and proper. The general Assembly's intent in passing the "get-Jonas" bill has been argued

long and loud—and to no proved conclusions. As far as we know, the evidence of anti-Jonas intent on the Assembly's part is purely circumstantial. It can be argued that in theory the bill is as fair to Republicans as to Democrats.

But the Assembly's intent is entirely beside the point. The law is unfair to the voter who improperly marks a ballot. It does not void the ballot, it arbitrarily assigns it to the party total, and subtracts it from the individual candidate's total.

Thus the law not only disregards the voter's apparent wishes, but also penalizes him for an improper marking.

## It's The Citizen Who Needs Protection

TO DO the right thing for the wrong reason is frowned upon by both the poet and the philosopher. But among politicians it has a certain giddy popularity.

As a matter of fact, this sort of reasoning—or nonreasoning—often produces some astonishing good social legislation. The phenomenon is strikingly apparent in the current debate over proposed changes in the state election laws. Bills introduced in both houses of the General Assembly would provide for appeals to the county board of elections and then to the courts by persons claiming they were arbitrarily denied registration. As it is now, the registrar has the final say.

But much of the support for these measures comes from legislators who seem to be less interested in protecting the constitutional rights of all citizens than in getting the registrar off the hook.

"A lot of criticism has been thrown on registrars—unjustly, we think," said Sen.

Perry Martin of Northampton, one of the signers of the bill. By providing an avenue of appeal the proposed statute would also provide a measure of relief for registrars, he said.

Under present law, a county board of elections may remove from office a registrar who is ruled to have rejected a ballot without proper cause. But the board has no authority to order the voter registered.

The prospective voter clearly deserves an appeal route when rejected by the registrar. It is unfair in the extreme for a single individual to be the final judge of whether or not the citizen is qualified to vote.

But the emphasis should be placed first on the protection of a citizen's right to exercise his franchise rather than a registrar's right to exercise discrimination. The new law should in no way lessen the penalty for rejecting a voter without just cause.

## Too Many Answers Spoil The Scheme

THE "I-dotters" and the "I-crossers" have very nearly knocked in the head a badly needed amendment to the U. S. Constitution.

The fitness of a Cabinet to determine the disability of a president is equalled only by the likelihood that a Cabinet will ever be given the chance to do so. It is a case of zero equalling zero. And why the administration involved the Cabinet in what otherwise was a sound, if limited, answer to a very serious constitutional question is quite beyond our understanding.

The question: What to do if a president is unable, as Garfield, Wilson and Eisenhower were for a time, to administer his office. As originally disclosed, the administration plan proposed to limit discretionary powers to the president himself. He would assign his powers to the vice president during a period of disability he determined. The vice president would exercise the powers, but not assume the office of the president.

By ignoring the lesser but far more complex question of what happens if a president is too ill to determine his

disability, the first proposal aroused strong hopes that a constitutional vacuum as old as the document itself might be partially filled. Congressional hoppers already are choked with bills setting up various commissions and councils to determine disability. All of them raise political considerations, and for that reason have made no progress. By bringing the Cabinet into the act, the administration has put its bill in the same category. Certainly the Cabinet would immediately be suspected of political motivation in any decision it might make on presidential disability.

The essential aim of any amendment ought to be provision of a mechanism that would inspire the trust and confidence of the people. It may be possible to devise a council or commission with this qualification, but an appointive Cabinet obviously doesn't qualify.

It is nice that the administration has a plan that answers all the questions involved in presidential disability. But it would be much nicer to have a plan that answers the big question and has a chance of passage.

## After Death, A Lesson In Immortality

THE trouble is that logically the not-very ought to be dead," wrote Alan Pryce-Jones recently. "It is, after all, nothing but a graft from the tree of poetry, a graft stuck into the unfruitful soil of popular taste some 400 years ago and allowed to pop up and suckers or hard up deadwood as it might be."

The novel is still very much alive. But the pens of two distinguished writers, who continuously gave this much-disparaged art form new splendor and significance, were suddenly stilled last week within a single 24-hour period. Christopher Morley died Thursday on Long Island. Joyce Cary died Friday in Oxford, England.

The loss to the world of letters was

tremendous. Each in his own way contributed handsomely to the treasury of contemporary literature — Morley with whimsical charm and lyrical tenderness, Cary with exuberant imagination and comic zest.

Both dabbled in many literary forms; both seemed more comfortable in the novel. Together they taught the critics a valuable and continuing lesson. It was that the novel will live so long as writers of imagination and talent are plagued by the elusive nature of truth and feel the need of a broad canvas to mirror their feelings.

Messrs. Morley and Cary showed how it was done.

## From The Columbia Missouri

### ARE JEFFERSON'S WORDS DANGEROUS NOW?

WOULD you sign the following statement?

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, in order to secure these ends."

At Thomas Jefferson would have signed it (and did) but 13 out of 20 University of Missouri students refused to sign their names to this document, which you may recognize as the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence.

A MISSOURIAN reporter, interested in seeing how many present-day students agreed with the principles of the founding fathers, asked 20 students, 10 men and 10 women picked at random on the University campus, to sign this declaration.

Author of the Declaration of Independence Jefferson, whose famous gravestone

in front of Jesse Hall is one of the campus landmarks, would have been disappointed the school's women students did not one by one believe in these principles. The male students were more enthusiastic—a majority of them, seven, signed the declaration.

Almost all the students asked the purpose of the petition. "To see if students on this campus believe in these principles," was the reporter's answer.

Why did students hesitate to sign? Various reasons were given.

One male student agreed to all but the last clause of the declaration, "... whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government." His objection to this final phrase was that such words might lead to the violent overthrow of the government—which is exactly what they did lead to in 1776.

A brunette co-ed told the reporter that she agreed with the declaration, she wouldn't sign because "I always hesitate to put my signature on anything."

## Who Gave Him The Do-It-Yourself Kit?



## Dulles Wanted Trouble

# Brinkmanship Scores Again

By STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

IT IS NOT the usual function of a political reporter to review books, but occasionally a book comes along which is also important news. Such a book is "John Foster Dulles: A Biography" by John Robinson Beal of Time magazine.

The book is news for two reasons. First, it contains a fascinating account of what had previously been only rumored or suspected—a calculated decision by Secretary Dulles to force a showdown in the Middle East. The account of this startling episode is unambiguously based on interviews with Dulles himself. Second, the book will no doubt have important international repercussions, since it not only opens all the old half-healed wounds caused by the Suez crisis, but also pours great dollops of salt in them.

The Beal book is thus likely to cause as much uproar as the account based on interviews with Dulles of the Dulles "brink of war" theory, by another Time man, James Shepley.

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

In his introduction Beal, while formally absolving Dulles of responsibility for the book states that "it benefits from personal interviews with him which provided insight into his official actions, for which I thank him."

Repeatedly Beal describes Dulles as a kind of nervous Dulles White Paper on his Middle East policies, unofficial but authentic. Beal confidently describes the manner of Dulles' withdrawal of the American offer of aid to Egypt in building the Aswan Dam as a calculated slip of the tongue. Egypt's President Nasser, consciously designed to bring on a showdown. The Beal account should be read in full, since it is an authoritative report of one of the most amazing exercises in diplomacy in recent history. But

the following excerpts give the gist. "For Dulles, a moment of cold-war climax had come. It was necessary to call Russia's hand in the game of economic competition. It was necessary to make the demonstration on a grand scale. Nasser combined the right timing, the right geography and the right order of magnitude for a truly major gambit in the cold war. Why did (Dulles) turn down Nasser so brutally, without a

decision to force a showdown parallels almost word for word the version of the decision previously offered by still another Time-Life man and Dulles admirer, former Presidential adviser C. D. Jackson. When the Jackson version of the Dulles decision was made public, it was widely assumed that it was in fact the Dulles version. Now there can be no reasonable doubt that it was an experienced reporter like Beal could not conceivably describe the secretary of state's reasoning and motivation in such authoritative detail so simply by guesswork.

AWARE OF DANGERS

Beal makes it clear, moreover, that Dulles was aware of the dangers involved in forcing a showdown. "As a calculated risk (the decision was) on a grand scale comparable in the sphere of diplomacy to the calculated risks of war taken in Korea and Formosa. But his experience at dealing in diplomatic waters convinced him that the breeze would be either if he took a new and independent tack."

The chapters which follow, while also clearly benefit from "insight into his official actions," are designed to prove that the Dulles decision to force a showdown was a brilliantly successful diplomatic coup. This proves a trifle difficult, even for so able an advocate as Beal, since it is uncomfortably obvious that the Middle Eastern "breeze" had not been better, but a great deal worse since Dulles forced his showdown.

The difficulty is overcome by the simple device of blaming everything that has gone wrong on our allies—while the Dulles policies are "moral," "consistent" and "purposeful." Our Allies' policies were both stupid and dishonest. This theory of the crisis, which deserves further examination, will be studied with pained attention abroad, in view of the authority with which the author clearly speaks.

Beal's version of the Dulles decision to force a showdown parallels almost word for word the version of the decision previously offered by still another Time-Life man and Dulles admirer, former Presidential adviser C. D. Jackson. When the Jackson version of the Dulles decision was made public, it was widely assumed that it was in fact the Dulles version. Now there can be no reasonable doubt that it was an experienced reporter like Beal could not conceivably describe the secretary of state's reasoning and motivation in such authoritative detail so simply by guesswork.

Beal's version of the Dulles decision to force a showdown parallels almost word for word the version of the decision previously offered by still another Time-Life man and Dulles admirer, former Presidential adviser C. D. Jackson. When the Jackson version of the Dulles decision was made public, it was widely assumed that it was in fact the Dulles version. Now there can be no reasonable doubt that it was an experienced reporter like Beal could not conceivably describe the secretary of state's reasoning and motivation in such authoritative detail so simply by guesswork.

## Mr. Nixon's Whirlwind Trip Ends With Unknowing Popoff

By ROBERT C. RUARK

PALAMOS, Spain  
 I NOTICE that Vice President Richard M. Nixon, back from his intensive three-week inspection of half the world, has returned to at least one American diploma in a major African city as a "corn ball," wondered aloud "how we ever got anything done with people like that," and expressed his disapproval of much of our consular and embassy forces abroad.

Apart from the wisdom of such a popoff to the press, I would like to challenge Nixon's right to know anything about anybody on a three-week junket made up almost entirely of banquets, receptions, air-travel, packing, unpacking, and possibly the constant companions of the junket—stomach trouble, lack of sleep, and nervous irritation.

A WAGER

I will bet my two-million-plus air miles against Nixon's hectic official junkets, scheduled to a split second, that nobody ever reads anything about anything on a junket except that his disposition was sunbaked, that he was bored, that all speeches are a bloody bore, that all official hospitality forced and strained, that whiskers grow faster and clothes smell more, that ankles swell and finger nails get chipped, that water won't get up when the alarm clock rings, and that after several thousand miles of changing climates and attitudes all aircraft are second-rate buses and smell like them.

In any case, the vice president of the United States, traveling as official emissary of the President, must see all the best of it in his brief hurried inspections. Dead bodies are hidden in closets; dirty linen is tossed in the basket; neckties and party manners are hauled out of the cupboard, and no honest, searching appraisal of man or his work is possible on sleeper jumps by air.

You get to the heart of any matter by spending unofficial time in a place and by asking questions of minor employees in such places as bars, enlisted men's clubs or junior officers' clubs or even the small-caliber people in a position to judge the big guns.

CORRECT CLUES

In more than 20 years in my pocket I never got a decent story out of a press conference, a reception, a banquet, a luncheon, or from any official of major rank. The hotel clerk is apt to know more about what is going on than the manager, and the burglar sergeant or file clerk is more apt to be correctly chicaned than the general or the ambassador.

Nixon must have endeared himself to all the top brass at every one of his whistle-stops by an "Amazing" Americanism which is not normal, friendly, and natural

## VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Judgments Come Easy

in foreign posts, and not go overboard for pomp and formality." This is a beautiful diplomatic dream, or a Dodge fan, perhaps, but is pretty useless in actual practice.

NATURAL COLORATION

The very first thing any good consular staff does in a strange country is find out what's peculiar to the country and speedily adapt himself to the protective coloration of those usages. In a striped pants-frock coat country it is exceedingly good business to wear striped pants and a frock coat instead of an alba shirt and yellow corduroy pants.

With the way Americans are generally disliked in many a foreign land today, the best service a foreign servant can perform in a country is to stop being as obtrusively American as possible and fit himself into things as they are broadly done.

SHOPPING IN SHORTS

It is possible to serve one's country without having Mama go shopping in shorts and a halter in a predominantly Muslim country, or by having Papa loudly display his American normalcy by decrying the acute shortage of bourbon in Mombasa.

It is a horrible sacrifice, but I assure you know some consular people who learned the local language and drank tea instead of coffee, when tea-drinking was indicated. Some even ape "foreign" customs to the extent of choking down sheep's eyes in the face of a politeness and good will for America.

But I stray for the point, which is that neither Nixon nor anybody else can make snap judgments on anything that is encountered in a political tour which piles visits to the top of a politeness in three weeks' elapsed time.

## People's Platform

A Real Puzzle In Louisiana  
 Auto Inspection Law Hypocritical

Charlotte

Editors: The News: I think any kind of automobile inspection law is hypocritical as long as the state sells liquor and beer to people to make them drunk, and cause accidents on our highways.

No matter how old an automobile is, it is as safe as long as sane, sober and safe drivers are behind the wheel of the car.

The intelligent thing to do is for our representatives who were elected and sent to Raleigh to represent us to give the citizens of our state the right to vote on the liquor question. There are millions of church members in North Carolina who want a chance to vote against the liquor stores. But they don't have anybody in Raleigh to represent them.

—ARTHUR A. CATHEY

—PARKS A. RANLIER

## Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON

LAST week, Washington watched a stampeding coalition of Republicans and Dixiecrats cut down appropriation after appropriation in the Eisenhower budget like a tractor-drawn mowing machine knocking down a field of hay.

In their headlong rush for economy, they lopped off such items as \$20,000 for research into radiation from atomic fallout. Apparently the congressmen did not know that we live in an atomic age, something both manageable and absolutely necessary in fixing wages.

They knocked off \$100,000 to revise the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

And they knocked off \$100,000 for the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment, an agency of great importance to veterans, especially since the GI bill of rights is no more.

## Jonas Fights Increase In Inspectors

WASHINGTON

THE budget of the Republican administration. Some of the Democrats stood up to defend the President, but not one Republican.

Pidding Savings

After three days of frantic amendments, Congressman John Fogarty, Rhode Island Democrat, reminded his colleagues that the money they had cut only \$1,345,000.

"At that rate," said Wayne Hays, Ohio Democrat, "in 30 days we could cut it \$10,000,000, and if we stayed here a year or 300 days we could cut it \$100,000,000."

Hysteria Charged

"I want to reiterate to you," reminded Democrat Fogarty, chief champion of the Eisenhower budget, "that you pass laws and then you fail to carry out your responsibility of seeing that necessary appropriations are made to administer them."

"The amendments offered during the last three days have been without constructive evaluation of what damage they will do. In your hysteria you do not stop here."

Anemic Support

"My friends on the other (Republican) side of the aisle have been notably conspicuous by the anemic support they have given me. The President, the President of the United States.

"The press has been carrying stories of tens of millions of dollars of savings. Now, let us set the record straight. Let

us not fool the public and let us not fool ourselves. The greatest part of the so-called savings will not save the U.S. Treasury one cent."

Commitments

He went on to point out that commitments had been made by the U.S. government, in many cases to the individual states, and that if the money was not appropriated now, Congress would simply have to come back and appropriate it later.

Kept Cutting

Republicans, however, paid little attention to the Democratic champion of the Eisenhower budget. They kept on cutting. They cut \$1,000,000 for new inspectors for the Food and Drug Administration, chief watchdog of American housewives.

At present, Food and Drug has enough inspectors to inspect chicken-processing plants only once every 12 years. It can inspect many drug companies only once every eight or nine years.

Poison Sprays

It has been trying to curb the use of poisons on fruits and vegetables. It found oyster dealers watering their cans so the public was buying more water than oysters. It had difficulty checking back vaccines because of its shortage of inspectors.

However, Congressman Charles Jonas, the only Republican from North Carolina, moved to strike all money for ad-

ditional inspectors. He won by a margin of one vote—though a roll-call vote will come up again today, at which time the House could reverse him.

Rivers At Bat

Jonas did not win, however, until after another Carolinian, Mendel Rivers, this one a Democrat and from South Carolina, went to bat for the Republican cause and urged for more protection for housewives.

"During the month of February," Rivers said, "1,000 pounds of contaminated food products were taken off the market. Another 239,000 pounds were destroyed by the owners under the supervision of inspectors. Six drug products were seized because they were improperly labeled. A bakery was seized because the pies and cakes were contaminated with insect and rodent filth."

Small Staff

The Food and Drug Administration is small," continued the South Carolinian. "Meanwhile, the volume of all these foods, drugs, and cosmetics has been growing in proportion to the needs of our expanding population. The 300 FDA inspectors are responsible for the checking of over \$60 billion of products."

Congressman Rivers made an eloquent appeal for funds to help inspect the food and drugs of the nation. But when the vote was taken, more of the Republicans joined with enough Democrats to vote down the new inspectors — unless the House crosses itself on the roll-call today.