

Thomas L. 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 Stinson Circulation Manager

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1957

Replace The Chalk Line With Science

The first "drunk test" was a fairly simple contrivance. The arresting officer merely drew a line on the sidewalk and challenged the suspect to walk it.

The chalk line went out with Grandpe's on-horse job but methods of determining the degree of drunkenness are still distressingly primitive in North Carolina. It is high time that something be done about it.

Science has provided the means. It is a simple test based upon the generally accepted principle that there is a direct correlation between the amount of alcohol in the blood and the effect of that alcohol upon the individual. Nothing is left to guesswork.

Unless the General Assembly makes the results of scientific tests for intoxication admissible as evidence in North Carolina, however, guesswork will continue to be the most familiar yardstick in many a Tar Heel court.

The need for this legislation is clear-cut. Section 20-138 of the General Statutes makes it unlawful for any person who is under the influence of intoxicating liquor to drive any vehicle upon any highway within the state.

At the same time, impairment resembling intoxication can arise from conditions which have nothing to do with the consumption of alcohol—diabetic shock, for instance, or a heart ailment.

Scientific tests would tend to protect the innocent as well as help convict the guilty. They would aid immeasurably the judge and jury to reach more accurate and just decisions.

Opposition to the tests is stubborn, however. It is charged that they are unconstitutional, so is fingerprinting.

There are other complaints as well. One has to do with the necessary time lapse between the arrest and the testing. It is possible that the alcohol would not be sufficiently absorbed by the system to impair a person's faculties at the time of the arrest, while absorption would be complete at the time of the test.

It is, of course, well known that some people have a greater "tolerance" to alcohol than others and are therefore less affected by a given quantity of alcohol. But medical authorities have established certain standards for interpreting results of the tests which would be fair to all individuals.

Any report of blood alcohol concentration would have prima facie status only. It would not preclude a contrary finding.

Testimony on the alcohol content of body fluids is admissible in North Carolina courts—but it is necessary to have an expert present to explain the effect which a given amount of alcohol would have upon a person's mental or physical faculties.

A scale of evidentiary values would simply be adopted for the interpretation of the tests. But no one would be required to take the test.

By Joseph Alsop. To the much simpler and more obvious explanation. In the second place, everyone here all too clearly remembers the extraordinary visit of British Gen. Sir Gerald Templer, who was sent to Amman to command Jordan to join the Baghdad Pact.

The State Department's threat takes the amiable form of ex-Congressman James P. Richards. There is nothing outwardly menacing, of course, about the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, whom Secretary of State Dulles named as a roving ambassador to the Middle East to appease angry senators and representatives.

The Local Drought Is Drowning In Rainwater

Charlotte The past three months? If the wet ground, damp basements, flooded yards, leaking roofs, overflowing storm drains, halted construction work, fouled-up airplane transportation, and many other things do not add up to her to be a wet season, she need only to take a trip to Calawba River (Lake, if you please) to see that more water has run off into the river in the past three months than in any like period in quite some time.

Phoenix I would be very glad for her to thank me for my honey and attempt with me, to plant a few flowers and shrubs. I would recommend, however, that she bring her own shovel and above-ground rubber gloves.

—MACK R. WILKINSON
Diplomat Norman Had Communist Ties

YOUR editorial of April 18 asking for a Senate probe into the E. Herbert Norman case, the Canadian diplomat at who joined the Communist Party, placed the Charlotte News as usual on the same side of the fence with the rest of the "liberal" press.

This "liberal" press has reached another high watermark of misrepresentation and omission in the case of Norman, exceeded only a few times in the past when other Communist fronters were caught up with.

The current target, other than Sen. Eastland, seems to be the Internal Security Subcommittee, Counsel Robert Morris, whose questioning of U. S. Foreign Officer John K. Emmerson focused public attention on Norman's activities of past Communist relationships.

When Norman fell to his death April 14, the "liberal" press sent out a high speed campaign of vilification. In their uproar of accusations against the committee, however, the "liberal" press conveniently expressed Norman's Communist background, and the significance of the case, in terms of the United States. Here are some of the facts — which did not appear in your editorial and which probably never will.

Norman was cheek and jowl with a number of important American Communists and pro-Communist frontiers. He was executive secretary of the Canadian affiliate of the Communist front "American Friends of the Chinese People."

He was a functionary of the Communist-dominated Institute of Pacific Relations, and a frequent contributor to JPB pro-Communist publications. Dr. Carl Wittmer, himself a former Communist, testified that he knew Norman as a member of a Communist front group, and said that it was "obvious" that Norman was a Communist.

The inquiries of the Canadian Royal Commission in 1946 showed that Canada was a staging post for the infiltration and subversion of the United States. Prime Minister Mackenzie King stated in the House of Commons: "These documents disclose among other things that Canada was being made the base for securing information matters of grave concern to the United States and Great Britain."

In the line of these findings by Canadian sources, it is now deemed imperative that the United States be on guard against communism in the border—especially if they have interlocking relationships with American subversives.

Editors Note: Precisely. And for that reason, the FBI and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police maintain an exchange of security information, an exchange which Canada threatens withdrawal as a result of the subcommittee's investigation.

As for Canada's so-called "clearance" of Norman, it is recalled that Klaus Fuchs, who came to America to work on our atomic energy project, had also received "clearance" from British authorities.

Not one word in your editorial about the Communist activities being bad, only seemed to be bringing it out in the open was the only bad thing. It would be my guess that Norman was pushed by his fellow travelers because they were through with him or that he jumped because his conscience was hurting him. —A. T. SWISHER

No Apologies Due From Senate Group
Editors Note: How much longer will liberal hearts bleed over the suicide of E. H. Norman, Canadian ambassador to Egypt? I'm referring to your second editorial on this affair captioned, "Senate should Probe Norman Case."

Because you have miserably failed in presenting this subject in proper perspective and haven't revealed all the facts to your readers, do you mind if I try to do a better job?
Mr. Norman's hands reeked with the filth of Communist fratricide. Dr. Karl Wittfogel of Columbia University, a former Communist, testified that he knew Norman as a member of a Communist study group at Columbia years ago. Norman was executive secretary of the Canadian affiliate of the Communist front, "American Friends of the Chinese People."

It should be vividly remembered that Klaus Fuchs, the British traitor who gave "clearance" by British authorities to come to America and work in our atomic energy project, "clearance" was also given the American traitor, Harry Dexter Gandy, who served as assistant secretary of state under American Communists and pro-Communist frontiers. Truman's administration. Therefore, "clearance" of an individual is fine and dandy and perhaps not a proper subject for the Communist-dominated institute of Pacific Relations, and a frequent contributor to JPB pro-Communist publications.

Your suggestion that the Senate "apologize" for its subcommittee's revelations is ridiculous. Apologize for what? The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was created by law and duly constituted body of the U. S. Senate and the American people. It is not to be seen to it that the executive department makes use of proper and effective standards of internal security.

Now, let's dispose of one final and palpably stupid point which you have made. You have pointedly made or inferred about Norman's suicide. Namely, that the gentleman hopped to his death as the result of the revelations about him by our Senate committee. Even the Canadian government has not maintained that to my knowledge. The fact is, the Canadian government has several times reaffirmed its confidence in Mr. Norman since 1951 when charges were first publicly aired. —J. R. CHERRY JR.

Editors Note: Does reader Cherry really believe a U.S. Senate subcommittee can, or should attempt to, dictate to the Canadian government the selection of its ambassador to Egypt? We do not.



The Unwanted Salesman Is Mr. Richards A Menace?

By Joseph Alsop

AMMAN, Jordan To the much simpler and more obvious explanation. In the second place, everyone here all too clearly remembers the extraordinary visit of British Gen. Sir Gerald Templer, who was sent to Amman to command Jordan to join the Baghdad Pact.

The State Department's threat takes the amiable form of ex-Congressman James P. Richards. There is nothing outwardly menacing, of course, about the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, whom Secretary of State Dulles named as a roving ambassador to the Middle East to appease angry senators and representatives.

There are several reasons for this. In the first place, a great many people in Jordan, and throughout the Middle East, are these circumstances, a Richards visit, if it materializes, will offer the large local over-supply of Egyptian and Communist agents, and nationalistic left-wing demagogues their ideal chance for a comeback.

As Congressman Richards' hosts, King Hussein and his new government will have before them only two possible alternatives: Either they must accept the risk of very serious disorders, which may well get together out of hand, or they must take military and police precautions of the most extreme nature. That would certainly be embarrassing to the government, which ought to be embarrassing to the State Department and Congressman Richards.

Perhaps this answer will have been changed before these words can be printed. But the story of the Richards menace and the State Department's handling of the Richards menace still contains two vital morals for the American Middle East policymakers.

The first is the simple fact that in this insanely complicated area, it is not possible to make national policy successfully with one eye on the ball and the other on the press. Both eyes on the ball are essential.

As for the second moral, it is not very difficult either. All we want in Jordan is for that country to remain independent, to avoid becoming either an outright Egyptian satellite or a pro-Soviet Egypt, and to refrain from the popular Middle Eastern sport of kicking the West in the butt.

To get this, it is not necessary to ask Jordan to adhere to doctrines, declarations, preambles or pledges. Both sides keeping their mouths shut is the wiser course.

SECOND MORAL. As for the second moral, it is not very difficult either. All we want in Jordan is for that country to remain independent, to avoid becoming either an outright Egyptian satellite or a pro-Soviet Egypt, and to refrain from the popular Middle Eastern sport of kicking the West in the butt.

To get this, it is not necessary to ask Jordan to adhere to doctrines, declarations, preambles or pledges. Both sides keeping their mouths shut is the wiser course.

Either they must accept the risk of very serious disorders, which may well get together out of hand, or they must take military and police precautions of the most extreme nature. That would certainly be embarrassing to the government, which ought to be embarrassing to the State Department and Congressman Richards.

up a airline transportation, and many other things do not add up to her to be a wet season, she need only to take a trip to Calawba River (Lake, if you please) to see that more water has run off into the river in the past three months than in any like period in quite some time.

Phoenix I would be very glad for her to thank me for my honey and attempt with me, to plant a few flowers and shrubs. I would recommend, however, that she bring her own shovel and above-ground rubber gloves.

—MACK R. WILKINSON
Diplomat Norman Had Communist Ties

YOUR editorial of April 18 asking for a Senate probe into the E. Herbert Norman case, the Canadian diplomat at who joined the Communist Party, placed the Charlotte News as usual on the same side of the fence with the rest of the "liberal" press.

This "liberal" press has reached another high watermark of misrepresentation and omission in the case of Norman, exceeded only a few times in the past when other Communist fronters were caught up with.

The current target, other than Sen. Eastland, seems to be the Internal Security Subcommittee, Counsel Robert Morris, whose questioning of U. S. Foreign Officer John K. Emmerson focused public attention on Norman's activities of past Communist relationships.

When Norman fell to his death April 14, the "liberal" press sent out a high speed campaign of vilification. In their uproar of accusations against the committee, however, the "liberal" press conveniently expressed Norman's Communist background, and the significance of the case, in terms of the United States. Here are some of the facts — which did not appear in your editorial and which probably never will.

Norman was cheek and jowl with a number of important American Communists and pro-Communist frontiers. He was executive secretary of the Canadian affiliate of the Communist front "American Friends of the Chinese People."

He was a functionary of the Communist-dominated Institute of Pacific Relations, and a frequent contributor to JPB pro-Communist publications. Dr. Carl Wittmer, himself a former Communist, testified that he knew Norman as a member of a Communist front group, and said that it was "obvious" that Norman was a Communist.

The inquiries of the Canadian Royal Commission in 1946 showed that Canada was a staging post for the infiltration and subversion of the United States. Prime Minister Mackenzie King stated in the House of Commons: "These documents disclose among other things that Canada was being made the base for securing information matters of grave concern to the United States and Great Britain."

In the line of these findings by Canadian sources, it is now deemed imperative that the United States be on guard against communism in the border—especially if they have interlocking relationships with American subversives.

Editors Note: Precisely. And for that reason, the FBI and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police maintain an exchange of security information, an exchange which Canada threatens withdrawal as a result of the subcommittee's investigation.

As for Canada's so-called "clearance" of Norman, it is recalled that Klaus Fuchs, who came to America to work on our atomic energy project, had also received "clearance" from British authorities.

Not one word in your editorial about the Communist activities being bad, only seemed to be bringing it out in the open was the only bad thing. It would be my guess that Norman was pushed by his fellow travelers because they were through with him or that he jumped because his conscience was hurting him. —A. T. SWISHER

No Apologies Due From Senate Group
Editors Note: How much longer will liberal hearts bleed over the suicide of E. H. Norman, Canadian ambassador to Egypt? I'm referring to your second editorial on this affair captioned, "Senate should Probe Norman Case."

Because you have miserably failed in presenting this subject in proper perspective and haven't revealed all the facts to your readers, do you mind if I try to do a better job?
Mr. Norman's hands reeked with the filth of Communist fratricide. Dr. Karl Wittfogel of Columbia University, a former Communist, testified that he knew Norman as a member of a Communist study group at Columbia years ago. Norman was executive secretary of the Canadian affiliate of the Communist front, "American Friends of the Chinese People."

It should be vividly remembered that Klaus Fuchs, the British traitor who gave "clearance" by British authorities to come to America and work in our atomic energy project, "clearance" was also given the American traitor, Harry Dexter Gandy, who served as assistant secretary of state under American Communists and pro-Communist frontiers. Truman's administration. Therefore, "clearance" of an individual is fine and dandy and perhaps not a proper subject for the Communist-dominated institute of Pacific Relations, and a frequent contributor to JPB pro-Communist publications.

Your suggestion that the Senate "apologize" for its subcommittee's revelations is ridiculous. Apologize for what? The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was created by law and duly constituted body of the U. S. Senate and the American people. It is not to be seen to it that the executive department makes use of proper and effective standards of internal security.

The Talent North Carolina Wastes

A LITTLE progress goes a long way in North Carolina's Department of Public Instruction.

When a follow-up study of high school graduates revealed that more Tar Heels entered college in 1956 than in 1955 a sound of soft applause was heard in Raleigh.

Any loud hurrahs would be definitely ill-advised, however. The indicated improvement is fractional and does not necessarily reflect a trend. As the department wisely warned, the number of studies made to date are actually too few to be conclusive.

The percentage of high school graduates entering junior and senior colleges only rose from 31.2 per cent in 1955 to 32.1 per cent in 1956.

Comparing city and county school systems, there is a wide variation in the percentage of 1956 high school graduates going to college. The percentage of white graduates entering college from county schools is 26.9; from city schools, 48.9.

It is particularly discouraging that only 73.9 per cent of graduates ranking first scholastically in their classes went to college. Only 68.2 of the second-ranking graduates entered college.

The Southern Regional Education Board estimates that the average college graduate earns \$100,000 more during his lifetime than the average person who does not have a college degree. If the 78,000 college-age persons in the South who are capable of graduating from college during the past year had done so, they would have increased the taxable income of the southern states by nearly \$8 billion during the rest of their lifetimes.

This represents social and economic erosion Dixie cannot afford. The waste of human resources is particularly evident in North Carolina. According to North Carolina Education Association, 5 per cent of Tar Heel adults have had a college education, putting North Carolina 12th from the bottom of the list in the national averages.

The challenge to the state's pride and ingenuity is a tough one. The simplest solution lies in the maintenance of strong, low-tuition community colleges in major metropolitan centers, to which students would commute daily. Until the state bolsters this concept with money and enlightened leadership, there is little hope for any significant improvement in North Carolina's college attendance record. Progress that is only fractional is hardly worthy of the name.

There are several reasons for this. In the first place, a great many people in Jordan, and throughout the Middle East, are these circumstances, a Richards visit, if it materializes, will offer the large local over-supply of Egyptian and Communist agents, and nationalistic left-wing demagogues their ideal chance for a comeback.

The Unwanted Salesman Is Mr. Richards A Menace?

By Joseph Alsop

AMMAN, Jordan To the much simpler and more obvious explanation. In the second place, everyone here all too clearly remembers the extraordinary visit of British Gen. Sir Gerald Templer, who was sent to Amman to command Jordan to join the Baghdad Pact.

The State Department's threat takes the amiable form of ex-Congressman James P. Richards. There is nothing outwardly menacing, of course, about the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, whom Secretary of State Dulles named as a roving ambassador to the Middle East to appease angry senators and representatives.

There are several reasons for this. In the first place, a great many people in Jordan, and throughout the Middle East, are these circumstances, a Richards visit, if it materializes, will offer the large local over-supply of Egyptian and Communist agents, and nationalistic left-wing demagogues their ideal chance for a comeback.

As Congressman Richards' hosts, King Hussein and his new government will have before them only two possible alternatives: Either they must accept the risk of very serious disorders, which may well get together out of hand, or they must take military and police precautions of the most extreme nature. That would certainly be embarrassing to the government, which ought to be embarrassing to the State Department and Congressman Richards.

Perhaps this answer will have been changed before these words can be printed. But the story of the Richards menace and the State Department's handling of the Richards menace still contains two vital morals for the American Middle East policymakers.

The first is the simple fact that in this insanely complicated area, it is not possible to make national policy successfully with one eye on the ball and the other on the press. Both eyes on the ball are essential.

As for the second moral, it is not very difficult either. All we want in Jordan is for that country to remain independent, to avoid becoming either an outright Egyptian satellite or a pro-Soviet Egypt, and to refrain from the popular Middle Eastern sport of kicking the West in the butt.

To get this, it is not necessary to ask Jordan to adhere to doctrines, declarations, preambles or pledges. Both sides keeping their mouths shut is the wiser course.

SECOND MORAL. As for the second moral, it is not very difficult either. All we want in Jordan is for that country to remain independent, to avoid becoming either an outright Egyptian satellite or a pro-Soviet Egypt, and to refrain from the popular Middle Eastern sport of kicking the West in the butt.

To get this, it is not necessary to ask Jordan to adhere to doctrines, declarations, preambles or pledges. Both sides keeping their mouths shut is the wiser course.

Either they must accept the risk of very serious disorders, which may well get together out of hand, or they must take military and police precautions of the most extreme nature. That would certainly be embarrassing to the government, which ought to be embarrassing to the State Department and Congressman Richards.

up a airline transportation, and many other things do not add up to her to be a wet season, she need only to take a trip to Calawba River (Lake, if you please) to see that more water has run off into the river in the past three months than in any like period in quite some time.

Phoenix I would be very glad for her to thank me for my honey and attempt with me, to plant a few flowers and shrubs. I would recommend, however, that she bring her own shovel and above-ground rubber gloves.

—MACK R. WILKINSON
Diplomat Norman Had Communist Ties

YOUR editorial of April 18 asking for a Senate probe into the E. Herbert Norman case, the Canadian diplomat at who joined the Communist Party, placed the Charlotte News as usual on the same side of the fence with the rest of the "liberal" press.

This "liberal" press has reached another high watermark of misrepresentation and omission in the case of Norman, exceeded only a few times in the past when other Communist fronters were caught up with.

The current target, other than Sen. Eastland, seems to be the Internal Security Subcommittee, Counsel Robert Morris, whose questioning of U. S. Foreign Officer John K. Emmerson focused public attention on Norman's activities of past Communist relationships.

When Norman fell to his death April 14, the "liberal" press sent out a high speed campaign of vilification. In their uproar of accusations against the committee, however, the "liberal" press conveniently expressed Norman's Communist background, and the significance of the case, in terms of the United States. Here are some of the facts — which did not appear in your editorial and which probably never will.

Norman was cheek and jowl with a number of important American Communists and pro-Communist frontiers. He was executive secretary of the Canadian affiliate of the Communist front "American Friends of the Chinese People."

He was a functionary of the Communist-dominated Institute of Pacific Relations, and a frequent contributor to JPB pro-Communist publications. Dr. Carl Wittmer, himself a former Communist, testified that he knew Norman as a member of a Communist front group, and said that it was "obvious" that Norman was a Communist.

The inquiries of the Canadian Royal Commission in 1946 showed that Canada was a staging post for the infiltration and subversion of the United States. Prime Minister Mackenzie King stated in the House of Commons: "These documents disclose among other things that Canada was being made the base for securing information matters of grave concern to the United States and Great Britain."

In the line of these findings by Canadian sources, it is now deemed imperative that the United States be on guard against communism in the border—especially if they have interlocking relationships with American subversives.

Editors Note: Precisely. And for that reason, the FBI and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police maintain an exchange of security information, an exchange which Canada threatens withdrawal as a result of the subcommittee's investigation.

As for Canada's so-called "clearance" of Norman, it is recalled that Klaus Fuchs, who came to America to work on our atomic energy project, had also received "clearance" from British authorities.

Not one word in your editorial about the Communist activities being bad, only seemed to be bringing it out in the open was the only bad thing. It would be my guess that Norman was pushed by his fellow travelers because they were through with him or that he jumped because his conscience was hurting him. —A. T. SWISHER

No Apologies Due From Senate Group
Editors Note: How much longer will liberal hearts bleed over the suicide of E. H. Norman, Canadian ambassador to Egypt? I'm referring to your second editorial on this affair captioned, "Senate should Probe Norman Case."

Because you have miserably failed in presenting this subject in proper perspective and haven't revealed all the facts to your readers, do you mind if I try to do a better job?
Mr. Norman's hands reeked with the filth of Communist fratricide. Dr. Karl Wittfogel of Columbia University, a former Communist, testified that he knew Norman as a member of a Communist study group at Columbia years ago. Norman was executive secretary of the Canadian affiliate of the Communist front, "American Friends of the Chinese People."

It should be vividly remembered that Klaus Fuchs, the British traitor who gave "clearance" by British authorities to come to America and work in our atomic energy project, "clearance" was also given the American traitor, Harry Dexter Gandy, who served as assistant secretary of state under American Communists and pro-Communist frontiers. Truman's administration. Therefore, "clearance" of an individual is fine and dandy and perhaps not a proper subject for the Communist-dominated institute of Pacific Relations, and a frequent contributor to JPB pro-Communist publications.

Your suggestion that the Senate "apologize" for its subcommittee's revelations is ridiculous. Apologize for what? The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was created by law and duly constituted body of the U. S. Senate and the American people. It is not to be seen to it that the executive department makes use of proper and effective standards of internal security.

Deliver Us From Dullness, Please

AN ERA of stultifying decorum in the literary set has apparently come to a sudden and satisfying end.

Critic John Ciardi has taken a meat cleaver in public to the poetry of Anne Morrow Lindbergh. William Faulkner has unreluctantly acknowledged that he is America's greatest living writer. And now along comes James Jones, author of FROM HERE TO ETERNITY, to describe his latest opus, a 900-pager called SOME CAME RUNNING.

"It's not only longer than WAR AND PEACE, but it has more narrative pull. It's a great novel! I know I don't look it, but damn it, it IS! It's the greatest novel we had in America."

Thus, for the first time in years, the literary scene is marked by some vitality. We were beginning to fear that the brand of anemic propriety ushered in by party-walkers of the New Criticism had taken root.

Cheek may have nothing in common with craftsmanship but it at least awakens the snoring Philistines and may even coax the rest away from the giant cyclops of the livingroom and into the pages of a decent book.

Bernard Shaw envied the good part of a cent with his well-expressed eye. Oscar Wilde was no slouch at the same chore. Mencken was a master. It was the only thing that made Alexander Woolcott all that bearable. The same can be said of Dorothy Parker.

The Unwanted Salesman Is Mr. Richards A Menace?

By Joseph Alsop

AMMAN, Jordan To the much simpler and more obvious explanation. In the second place, everyone here all too clearly remembers the extraordinary visit of British Gen. Sir Gerald Templer, who was sent to Amman to command Jordan to join the Baghdad Pact.

The State Department's threat takes the amiable form of ex-Congressman James P. Richards. There is nothing outwardly menacing, of course, about the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, whom Secretary of State Dulles named as a roving ambassador to the Middle East to appease angry senators and representatives.

There are several reasons for this. In the first place, a great many people in Jordan, and throughout the Middle East, are these circumstances, a Richards visit, if it materializes, will offer the large local over-supply of Egyptian and Communist agents, and nationalistic left-wing demagogues their ideal chance for a comeback.

As Congressman Richards' hosts, King Hussein and his new government will have before them only two possible alternatives: Either they must accept the risk of very serious disorders, which may well get together out of hand, or they must take military and police precautions of the most extreme nature. That would certainly be embarrassing to the government, which ought to be embarrassing to the State Department and Congressman Richards.

Perhaps this answer will have been changed before these words can be printed. But the story of the Richards menace and the State Department's handling of the Richards menace still contains two vital morals for the American Middle East policymakers.

The first is the simple fact that in this insanely complicated area, it is not possible to make national policy successfully with one eye on the ball and the other on the press. Both eyes on the ball are essential.

As for the second moral, it is not very difficult either. All we want in Jordan is for that country to remain independent, to avoid becoming either an outright Egyptian satellite or a pro-Soviet Egypt, and to refrain from the popular Middle Eastern sport of kicking the West in the butt.

To get this, it is not necessary to ask Jordan to adhere to doctrines, declarations, preambles or pledges. Both sides keeping their mouths shut is the wiser course.

SECOND MORAL. As for the second moral, it is not very difficult either. All we want in Jordan is for that country to remain independent, to avoid becoming either an outright Egyptian satellite or a pro-Soviet Egypt, and to refrain from the popular Middle Eastern sport of kicking the West in the butt.

To get this, it is not necessary to ask Jordan to adhere to doctrines, declarations, preambles or pledges. Both sides keeping their mouths shut is the wiser course.

Either they must accept the risk of very serious disorders, which may well get together out of hand, or they must take military and police precautions of the most extreme nature. That would certainly be embarrassing to the government, which ought to be embarrassing to the State Department and Congressman Richards.

up a airline transportation, and many other things do not add up to her to be a wet season, she need only to take a trip to Calawba River (Lake, if you please) to see that more water has run off into the river in the past three months than in any like period in quite some time.

Phoenix I would be very glad for her to thank me for my honey and attempt with me, to plant a few flowers and shrubs. I would recommend, however, that she bring her own shovel and above-ground rubber gloves.

—MACK R. WILKINSON
Diplomat Norman Had Communist Ties

YOUR editorial of April 18 asking for a Senate probe into the E. Herbert Norman case, the Canadian diplomat at who joined the Communist Party, placed the Charlotte News as usual on the same side of the fence with the rest of the "liberal" press.

This "liberal" press has reached another high watermark of misrepresentation and omission in the case of Norman, exceeded only a few times in the past when other Communist fronters were caught up with.

The current target, other than Sen. Eastland, seems to be the Internal Security Subcommittee, Counsel Robert Morris, whose questioning of U. S. Foreign Officer John K. Emmerson focused public attention on Norman's activities of past Communist relationships.

When Norman fell to his death April 14, the "liberal" press sent out a high speed campaign of vilification. In their uproar of accusations against the committee, however, the "liberal" press conveniently expressed Norman's Communist background, and the significance of the case, in terms of the United States. Here are some of the facts — which did not appear in your editorial and which probably never will.

Norman was cheek and jowl with a number of important American Communists and pro-Communist frontiers. He was executive secretary of the Canadian affiliate of the Communist front "American Friends of the Chinese People."

He was a functionary of the Communist-dominated Institute of Pacific Relations, and a frequent contributor to JPB pro-Communist publications. Dr. Carl Wittmer, himself a former Communist, testified that he knew Norman as a member of a Communist front group, and said that it was "obvious" that Norman was a Communist.

The inquiries of the Canadian Royal Commission in 1946 showed that Canada was a staging post for the infiltration and subversion of the United States. Prime Minister Mackenzie King stated in the House of Commons: "These documents disclose among other things that Canada was being made the base for securing information matters of grave concern to the United States and Great Britain."

In the line of these findings by Canadian sources, it is now deemed imperative that the United States be on guard against communism in the border—especially if they have interlocking relationships with American subversives.

Editors Note: Precisely. And for that reason, the FBI and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police maintain an exchange of security information, an exchange which Canada threatens withdrawal as a result of the subcommittee's investigation.