

Thomas L. Robinson... President and Publisher
Robert 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, AUGUST 19, 1957

Anybody In Charlotte For Politics?

I AM NOT a politician," said Artemus Ward, "and my other habits are good."
Yet here we have City Councilman Herbert H. Baxter labeling politics as man's noblest calling.

The biggest frozen asset in American life today," he told Charlotte Civilians, "is the men and women who are capable and honest... but who do not offer for public office."

Unfortunately, Charlotteans seem to put more stock in Ward's cynicism than Baxter's do-goodism.

Upper crust leaders are more than willing to perform non-political civic chores. But few representatives from any walk of life are eager for the blood, sweat and tears of practical, rough-and-tumble politics.

As a result, too many elective political posts are left to the haphazard outcome of listless campaigns. The principal jobs go to a few old pols, the political hobbyists and only a handful of earnest publicists who can brave the prejudices and stomach the hardships.

And when somebody at City Hall, or in Raleigh or in Washington does something particularly admirable, somebody in Charlotte is sure to exclaim: "Why my old Aunt Clarissa could do a better job than that." But when filing time comes around neither Our Hero or Aunt Clarissa offers for office.

The sociologists call it "a flight from responsibility, accompanied by a fatigue of the individual will and a blunting of the individual intelligence." They say it is a malady of the times.

It is all that and it is more. It is a lack of appreciation of the true and proper role of the politician. He has fallen from grace as a respectable figure in American life because of the transgressions of a few rascals. The rascals have garnered the headlines while the honest and conscientious politicians have toiled in relative obscurity. Thus, the general belief that politicians are incompetent and probably not incorruptible.

Furthermore few honest citizens like the climate of abuse that may be with politics. As a general rule, only dead

politicians may be canonized and admitted to the ranks of saints. An editorial writer in 1793 believed that Washington should "retire immediately; let no flatterer persuade you to rest one hour longer at the ship of state. You are utterly incapable to steer the political life today," he told Charlotte Civilians, "is the men and women who are capable and honest... but who do not offer for public office."

Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln endured the criticism and rose above it. So must the minor office-seeker.

Those who shun politics because they "don't want to get mixed up with that sort of thing" actually undermining the prestige of public service and weaken the leadership of the community. Meanwhile, the wholesale condemnation of politics is shallow and menacing. It is actually the politician who makes democracy work as no one else can. In order to widen the field of selection of the public servant there must be many, many more recruits from the grass roots.

You may win very little appreciation and you are sure to win almost no gratitude," wrote Frederick M. Davenport of the politician, "but there is nothing comparable with it as a friend of potent endeavor for one's country and mankind."

Or, as poet Ogden Nash put it: Whenever decent intelligent people get together They talk about politicians as about bad weather.

But they are always too decent to go into politics themselves and too intelligent even to go to the polls.

So I hope the kind of politicians that get away have no mercy on their pocketbooks or souls.

After The Putt-Putts, Wooden Wagons?

BY POLICE edict the sound of the putt-putt and sidewalk. The gendarmerie is quite correct. A vehicle powered by a lawnmower motor, braked by feet, and held together by whatever's handy is not in the same league with Detroit's 300-horsepower chariots, and shouldn't travel the same thoroughfares.

The police would seem inviting grief and gore by continuing to put up with the putt-putts, and they are not to blame for the cauterizing that has arisen from some grounded youngsters. We say "grounded" because one of the putt-putters pulled over to the curb explained that "you feel like you're really flyin'."

All the same, a boy finds magic in motion and in building things and it seems a shame for the area of his inventiveness to be narrowed. There are substitutes for putt-putts, of course. A rummaging around in our own memory suggests these do-it-yourself projects, the first of which is also recommended to reporters: Digging in China.

Making wave wheels. Building rabbit boxes. Building wooden-wheeled wagons. Making wooden whistles. Building stone ovens. These of these projects are hopelessly old-fashioned, of course, but they are comfortably safe and productive of huge appetites.

American Movies: Art Vs. Artifice

THE severest critics of American movies still say they are devoid of ideas and serve primarily to give us an escape into a dream world where the hero is always brave, the heroine always beautiful and ending always both happy and expected. They definitely do not make you think.

But Gilbert Seldes, who showed in two books, The Seven Arts and The Public Arts, that he is a hopeful as well as a severe critic of the movies, comes up with the most optimistic prediction yet.

"Television," says Mr. Seldes, "is now drawing off the movie audience that resists any intellectual content. People used to say 'Come over to our house and we'll go to a movie'—and they meant just any movie. Now they say 'Come over and let's watch television.'"

"The average audience up to now for an 'A' movie was 15 million. Now it is only five million. The other ten is home watching television. The movie makers have to do to reduce their costs and make movies of genuine intellectual content for the five million people who will still watch them."

From The Louisville-Courier Journal

TWO VOLUMES

IF YOU had to choose two books that best tell "the American story" to people in other countries, what would you select? That is the question asked of a group of publishers by George P. Brett Jr., of the Macmillan Company. His one warning is that no propaganda items are wanted.

Our nominations would be Carl Sandburg's towering biography of Abraham Lincoln, and Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn.

Neither of these works presents a Pollyanna picture of America. Lincoln was man martyred not only by an assassin's bullet but by the yet deeper sounds of a war that tore apart the country he

loved. Twain's classic contains such dark elements as a fatal family feud, the flight of a Negro from slavery, and the petty meanness and ignorance of small-town life on the fringes of the frontier.

We think these are assets, rather than liabilities, in presenting a believable picture of America to foreign readers. Both books in their widely varying ways, breathe their health, keen air of a democracy. Their healthy sweep and vitality are the very spirit of American life. The Twain classic shows what made America different from every other country. The Sandburg book shows what made America great.

Enraged Democrats Ready To Rough Up 'His Majesty'

By STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON (AP)—An old prophecy by President Eisenhower is belatedly coming true. In 1944, the President warned that the election of a Democratic Congress would result in "uncertainty, confusion, and divided responsibility."

In fact, until rather recently, the President has lived rather more happily with the Democratic 84th and 85th Congresses than he did with the Republican 83rd Congress. But that is no longer so. As the President's desperate threat to call a special session to save his foreign aid program suggests, the present relationship between Congress and the White House is indeed one of uncertainty, confusion, and divided responsibility.

There are a lot of reasons for this. But the most important reason is the present mood of the Democrats in Congress. By and large, they are disgruntled, fed up, frustrated, and enraged. Three examples will serve to suggest why this is so.

SPECIAL MAGIC

Take, as example number one, the case of Democratic Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson. Last year, Johnson almost single-handedly saved the President's foreign aid program. His own vote on the Appropriations Committee pro-

vided a majority of one for the President's program, and thereafter Johnson worked his special magic to swing nine votes the President's way.

Johnson is exceedingly unlikely to do the same thing again. He is acutely convinced that the civil rights bill, passed by the friends put it. "Why in the devil should Lyndon attack his neck out for Ike?"



DWIGHT EISENHOWER The Rug Is Pulled

Senate largely as a result of his own heroic efforts, is a good and fair bill. He is equally convinced that the administration has adopted the strategy of prolonging the civil rights battle in order to make political hay out of the issue in 1958. In the circumstances, as one of Johnson's

enraged Democrats are ready to rough up 'His Majesty'.

Neuberger has sent an anguished protest to Republican National Chairman Meade ALCORN, but the protest seems unlikely to do him much good. At any rate, Neuberger's sad story is by no means unusual, and the moral is not lost on the Democrats. Support the President on issues like

HIGH RECORD

According to the Congressional Quarterly, Neuberger has supported the President on 13 out of 17 key issues on which the President has taken a stand. This is one of the highest records of Presidential support in the Senate. And what is Neuberger's reward? Using the Congressional Quarterly's statistics, Oregon's Republican State Chairman, James Short, attacks Neuberger for his "appalling" record of "disregard for the demands of the people for economy."

Neuberger has sent an anguished protest to Republican National Chairman Meade ALCORN, but the protest seems unlikely to do him much good. At any rate, Neuberger's sad story is by no means unusual, and the moral is not lost on the Democrats. Support the President on issues like

foreign aid, and get your teeth bled by the Republicans back home.

Or take, as example number three, the case of Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri. When the House heavily cut the President's defense budget, the President went on the air to say that to fail



LYNDON JOHNSON The Neck Retracts

to restore a substantial part of the cut would mean taking a "fearful gamble" with the national security. Symington led the fight in the Senate, on the Democratic side, to get the President what he wanted, and largely succeeded. Then, when the Senate House

conference on the defense budget met, Secretary of Defense Wilson and Budget Chief Brundage blandly informed the conference that the amount Symington had fought to restore was not really necessary after all. Symington, who has been much criticized back home as a heavy spender, thus had the rug neatly pulled out from under him. As a result, he is now considering voting against the foreign military aid, for the first time in his Senate career.

SPECIAL DELIGHT

These three examples — and more could be cited—should be enough to suggest why the Democratic majorities in Congress now take a special delight in defying the President on such issues as foreign aid. The President's threat to call a special session has further disgruntled the Democrats. "If His Majesty wants to play rough," one Democrat grimly remarked, "He'll find that His Majesty's loyal opposition can play pretty rough too."

Another, an ugly situation is developing. When the White House and the Congress are controlled by different parties, there is always the danger of something worse than "uncertainty and confusion"—a kind of angry paralysis of the processes of government. That danger is now real, and it is to be hoped that they recognize it, and it is prepared to deal with it.

"All Ready, Men—Just Sing 'Auld Acquaintance' And Walk Right Through"



What Matters The Statesmen

By WALTER LIPPMANN

NEW YORK (AP)—THE issue on the Senate civil rights bill is now very narrow, except for the southern politicians who do not want any bill and for the northern politicians who will play politics with the bill. Speaker Rayburn, who will be followed by the Democrats in the House, is offering an amendment to cure what such a champion of civil rights as Sen. J. William Fulbright of Arkansas argues that it would be better to let the bill die than to pass an amended version of the Senate bill.

For it would be better to let the bill die than to pass an amended version of the Senate bill. For it would be better to let the bill die than to pass an amended version of the Senate bill. For it would be better to let the bill die than to pass an amended version of the Senate bill.

BIG MEASURE

As a matter of fact, the Senate bill even with the provision for jury trials in criminal contempt cases, is a very big measure. It inaugurates a new national policy, that the federal government has the duty to take the initiative in securing and protecting the constitutional rights of Negroes to vote. It vests in the executive legal powers to intervene in southern elections, to go into the federal courts for civil injunctions which, without jury trial, mean that imprisonment or fines can be imposed on those who violate the injunction. Why this would be called a weak bill is more than a bit understandable. For the procedure under civil contempt, which does not require a jury trial, is a very great power.

IMPOSSIBLE TASK

Would it be a "stronger" bill if it promised more, if in addition to a promise to protect and secure the vote, the bill proposed to integrate the public schools? Supporters of that kind of bill in the House, could be passed, it would be almost impossible to enforce.

Two-and-one-half years have now passed. The Justice Department has not yet had the courtesy to reply.

On March 22, 1955, Sen. Hennings also wrote the Justice Department asking its opinion on his bill to "amend and supplement existing civil rights statutes."

On March 22, 1955, Sen. Hennings also asked the Justice Department for its view on Senate Bill 90, an omnibus bill in which was combined many provisions of the present civil rights bill protecting the vote in the Republican Party's high command are taking justice for Negroes?" he continued.

Probably he didn't expect an answer. But Congressman Dick Simpson of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Republican committee for re-electing congressmen, gave it in a private remark to other Republicans.

"If we pass a civil rights bill," he confided, "we can pick up almost every

SAM RAYBURN Unusual Alliance

Yet the crux of the matter is the possibility of a bill that is enacted, and the difference between a politician and a statesman is that the politician is interested in the promises and the statesman is interested in enforcement. Does not the history of the problem of civil inequality in this country prove conclusively that declarations of rights can be nothing but empty sounds if the rest of the country is strong enough? That is why the Senate bill is so extraordinary. It is the first bill for civil rights which contains strong powers of enforcement and is not being resisted inconceivably by the political leaders of the South.

Quote, Unquote

Heap Big Chief says trouble today is that nations are always smoking peace pipe but nobody is inhaling. —Lexington Leader.

It's a great feeling, owning one's own house — until the time comes to fix the roof and apply a couple gallons of paint. —Laurel (Miss.) Leader-Call.

Church Rolls Aren't Tickets To Heaven

Editors, The News: A CHRISTIAN is one who follows Christ and His teachings fully and completely. It takes more than pouring water and baptism or a name on a church roll to be a Christian.

People's Platform

A Christian proves his or her belief not by words alone, but mainly by deeds. Christianity means vital action, not mere lip service. As Christians, we must live for every individual in the world. Not only people we love, but those around us.

We have no fear if we are Christians for Christ knows us. And the only hope of the world

today is Christ, and until Christians assume the responsibilities of Christianity are falling short of a Christian duty.

Don't tell the world you are a Christian if you are not living it for the world to see. You can't fool God. For he has plans for a Christian and if we fail we pay someday when we meet him at the Judgment.

—MRS. MAYME BARGER

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON (AP)—It should be noted that one group working ardently to delay the civil rights bill until next year in order to pass a tougher bill, is the Justice Department.

To keep the record straight, here is the Justice Department's pusillifooted regarding civil rights in the past: On July 27, 1955, exactly two years ago, Sen. Tom Hennings, Missouri Democrat, chairman of the Constitutional Rights Committee and a member of the Judiciary Committee, wrote the Justice Department requesting its views on Senate Bill 903 to protect the right of every citizen in political participation.

Long Delay

The Justice Department delayed more than two months trying to make up its mind. Then on September 8, 1955, it refused to make up its mind. Whether this particular measure should be enacted, it wrote, "constitutes a question of policy concerning which the Department of Justice prefers to make no recommendation."

In other words, the civil rights bill which the Justice Department now wants strengthened and held over until next year was something upon which it refused to take a stand two years ago.

Reply Repeated

On March 22, 1955, more than two years ago, Sen. Hennings wrote the

Justice Dept. Digs For Political Gold

Justice Department asking for its opinion on Senate Bill 906 to establish a commission on civil rights. This is the same commission on civil rights now in the civil rights bill.

Five months passed, during which the Justice Department struggled to make up its mind. Then it decided it couldn't make up its mind. On September 8, 1955, it replied: "Whether or not this measure should be enacted constitutes a question of policy concerning which the Department of Justice prefers to make no commitments."

Yet the Justice Department now wants a tougher civil rights bill passed.

New Question

On February 8, 1955, Sen. Hennings wrote the Justice Department requesting its views on Senate Bill 904 to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude.

This seemed rather non-controversial. Few Americans were to continue slavery in this modern day and age. Nevertheless, the Justice Department waited three months, then timidly informed Sen. Hennings April 19, 1955, that it "would have no objection to the enactment of this legislation." The Justice Department did not come out explicitly for it. It did not say that strengthening the laws against peonage, slavery and involuntary servitude was a wholesome thing. It merely had "no objection."

Political Gold

"Just who in this administration finally decided," asked Sen. Hennings the other day, "that it was a matter of good and sound public policy to do something or other to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens?"

"Just what do you really suppose is now the reason for this sudden and unexpected interest which Mr. Brownell and other gentlemen in the Republican Party's high command are taking justice for Negroes?" he continued.

Probably he didn't expect an answer. But Congressman Dick Simpson of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Republican committee for re-electing congressmen, gave it in a private remark to other Republicans.

"If we pass a civil rights bill," he confided, "we can pick up almost every

Justice Dept. Digs For Political Gold

On March 22, 1955, Sen. Hennings also wrote the Justice Department asking its opinion on his bill to "amend and supplement existing civil rights statutes."

On March 22, 1955, Sen. Hennings also asked the Justice Department for its view on Senate Bill 90, an omnibus bill in which was combined many provisions of the present civil rights bill protecting the vote in the Republican Party's high command are taking justice for Negroes?" he continued.

Probably he didn't expect an answer. But Congressman Dick Simpson of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Republican committee for re-electing congressmen, gave it in a private remark to other Republicans.

"If we pass a civil rights bill," he confided, "we can pick up almost every

Justice Dept. Digs For Political Gold

On March 22, 1955, Sen. Hennings also wrote the Justice Department asking its opinion on his bill to "amend and supplement existing civil rights statutes."

On March 22, 1955, Sen. Hennings also asked the Justice Department for its view on Senate Bill 90, an omnibus bill in which was combined many provisions of the present civil rights bill protecting the vote in the Republican Party's high command are taking justice for Negroes?" he continued.

Probably he didn't expect an answer. But Congressman Dick Simpson of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Republican committee for re-electing congressmen, gave it in a private remark to other Republicans.

"If we pass a civil rights bill," he confided, "we can pick up almost every