



THOMAS L. ROBINSON... President and Publisher
ROBERT H. GRAY... General Manager
ROBERT H. LAMPE... Advertising Director
GLEN FRISCH... Editor
FRANK MORGAN... Associate Editor
R. L. YOUNG JR... Managing Editor
JAMES McDOWELL... Circulation Manager

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1958

The Attorney General Devises A Gem

It let up over Alabama election of officials, U. S. Attorney General William Rogers has devised a gem of retaliation.

Does Alabama defy liberal principles? Remove federal expenditures from which she benefits. The proposal, attributed to Attorney General Rogers by Doris Flesoon in her column today, is that "military and other federal installations in states which defy the federal government be abandoned, moved, or reduced."

No question — a lot of tempers are burning short on the focal question of Negro voting rights in the South. On the most rudimentary democratic principle — one citizen, one ballot — no one can quarrel with quick tempers here. Nor, we suspect, does the Department of Justice have a monopoly on indignation.

But in a rush to discipline vagrant southern states for the abuse of registration and ballot procedures, Attorney Gen. Rogers may have lost sight of a distinction between justice and punishment.

And it is now hawking the latter as the former. The attorney general has at his command regular ways to ensure that justice is done to citizens wrongly deprived of the ballot; but to dream up harsh economic sanctions against states whose electoral methods are under investigation is practically to confess that ordinary means are bankrupt.

Many arches of legal equality in polling places and in schools have resorted to economic boycott, and it has not been a pretty spectacle to behold. Is this lever now to be adopted officially by the Department of Justice, to which the nation looks for example of just procedure? Is group punishment to be the new ideal of federal justice and the attorney general? Is job-making federal expenditure for which Alabama and other southern states are as heavily taxed as states elsewhere, to be removed to spit a few blindly cantankerous poll-tenders?

Lower, we suppose, is the nemesis of justice; let an attorney general have a sniff and, equily is quickly forgotten.

Fort Knox's Big Hoard Begins To Leak

OUR fondest illusion — economic self-sufficiency — is getting a faint tweak on the nose this year. The hoard of gold at Fort Knox, Ky., supposed by many economic innocents to be the fundament of America's wealth, has dwindled by some \$2 million during 1958.

This foreboding event has brought the cash-conscious U. S. News & World Report to wonder, in an article, "Why Is U. S. Losing Gold?"

Gold moves from shore to shore, of course, as a final standard of settlement between international trade balances, since all reputable currencies (presently the dollar, British sterling, German marks, and Swiss francs are "hard") have more or less fixed values in gold terms. Not since the immediate post-war era, however, has American gold flowed abroad in such amounts. In most recent years, the U. S., as the world's best-heeled manufacturer of goods everywhere wants, has found itself on the long end of the stick, while Western countries who trade with us have been hard-put to get together gold and dollars to pay our big invoices.

With simplicity which jargon-loving economists would sneer at, the reason we are losing gold is that our customers aren't buying as much this year. Foreign nations have felt the slack in the American economy (known economically as the "whip-lash effect") and must have the money to spend. Another factor may be, as many suggest, the inflation of the dollar, pricing our goods higher in terms of other currencies. (Yet our inflation has not outpaced that in most European countries. Undoubtedly, an important factor in the gold drainage itself is that some of the idle investment money has flowed abroad, lured by the higher interest rates which for some time have prevailed in Europe.

Just over a year ago, the British treasury, to strengthen the pound, hiked the Bank Rate (its interest-rate thermostat) to 7 per cent. (But now interest rates are equalizing as Europe's economies and ours creep up.) Finally, a decline in world commodity prices has raised gold and dollar reserves in European countries to post-war highs, automatically "hardening" their dough in terms of dollars.

Barring an unlikely run on the dollar in the world's finance markets, however, with investors converting dollar accounts to other currencies, the dire warnings about a softening dollar are too dire. We remain the world's strong creditor. The dollar, not gold, remains the actual basis of many western currencies. That situation will endure so long as our practices retain world confidence.

But this negligible drain could be the faint warning of a bad omen. We stop buying, and our foreign customers stop buying; gold begins to leak somewhere. In the past, European gold has leaked to Fort Knox. Now, as Europe's growing economic vigor keeps her healthy, it is Fort Knox's imitable hoard which begins to leak a bit.

Simple Eccentricity

USED to be, the routine for would-be eccentrics was very complicated. You had to get goldfish, sit on diaplopes, grow a knee-length beard, Inter alia. Now the life for eccentrics is simple. All you need is a pair of stout walking shoes and the yen to walk a few blocks to and fro down the sidewalk. Just see if people don't stare.

Just What Do They Take Us For?

WE fear that the good, gray GREENSBORO DAILY NEWS has tarried too long in the corn patch.

Just the other day, we were informed by its columns that the Piedmont "has no real metropolis."

Let's run through that again. The GREENSBORO DAILY NEWS said the Piedmont "has NO REAL METROPOLIS."

Well, sir, we've heard of the rural mystique that infects those folks up that way but we never knew it struck people

deaf and blind. Just what do you suppose they take us for — a field of winter wheat?

If they would just peer through the slats or put an ear to the ground they would get the message. Things have happened since the Battle of Guilford Courthouse. Mostly the things happened in Mecklenburg. Out of the cotton fields has grown a great metropolis that already towers over everything in sight. Too bad Greensboro is not in sight.

Paul Crume In The Dollars Morning News

IT'S LIGHT-UP TIME

AS Julius Caesar once said, kids nowadays don't have the fun we used to. Most boys now can afford a pack of cigarettes when they decide to learn to smoke.

It was different in the days of our first puffs. Half the barns in West Texas used to be hidden in great, billowing clouds of blue smoke, indicating that the kids were safely hidden from the adults while practicing their star bark.

You got the bark by stripping it off new fence posts. It was long, stringy stuff, and the cigarette you rolled had to be about two feet long and as large around as a softball ball. No question about it, though, it smoked.

These cigarettes were wrapped with old newspaper pages in the shape of The Saturday Evening Post. The magazine's pages imparted a fine flavor of old burning rags to the stinging fumes of the cedar, and forever after, tobacco smoke would taste a little mild.

It wasn't exactly the thinking man's cigarette. When you had hold of one of those, you didn't have time to think.

If all the fence posts got stripped pretty clean, there were other substitutes for burley. Most kids have smoked coffee because, after all, it looks like tobacco. Coffee tends to run out the end of your cigarette if you duck your

head while smoking. You can smoke coffee very well, though by tilting your head back so that the burning end of the cigarette is in the air—if you also tightly clamp the other end in your mouth. You can also get the coffee from flowing into your mouth, fire and all. After a few minutes of smoking coffee, you feel seared inside right down to your ankles.

Fuzzy whip is very good smoking material, too. If you chop it at the right place, it is almost the same size as a cigarette. You chop off a 3-inch section, light up and smoke.

As we remember it, buggy whip tasted a lot like fillers. It didn't taste.

Corn silk was supposed to be good cigarette filler, but we never cared much for it. No character. It was useful in an emergency.

Matter of fact, at times when we were desperate for something to smoke, we have smoked dried prairie grass. You have to work pretty hard to keep the smoke alive, and you can't taste much smoke, but it's there.

After all, if a man has to smoke, he can manage it somehow.

Friend and foe agree that Maria Callas, the opera star, is a good singer. Screams well, too.—MIAMI HERALD.

Amending Rule XXII: 'A Majority May Be Tyrannical'

By WALTER LIPPMANN

PRESUMABLY, the first business before the 86th Congress which opens on Jan. 3 will be the question of amending the rules to prevent filibusters. Under the existing rules, which were adopted in 1949, debate can be ended by what is called cloture only when two-thirds of the entire Senate—least 66 senators—vote in favor of it.

There is one exception. If the question is on amending the rules of the Senate, there can be no cloture.

HOW FAR?

Probably not more than 20 senators in the new Congress will want to keep Rule XXII exactly as it is. A great and overwhelming majority will support amendments to Rule XXII. But they differ on how far they want to go. There are two main choices. The one is supported by Sen. Lyndon Johnson of Texas and the other by Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois. Under the Johnson proposal, cloture can be ended by two-thirds of the senators present and voting. In theory, this could mean that cloture might be applied by as few as 34 senators, that is to say two-thirds of a quorum which is 50 senators.

REAL ISSUE

The proposal of Sen. Douglas, which has the support of men like Javits, Keating, Humphrey, and Case, also provides that within two days of the filing of a cloture petition debate can only be closed by a two-thirds vote of those present. But if debate continues for as long as 15 days, cloture can then be voted by a simple majority of the whole Senate, or 50 affirmative votes. Under the Douglas proposal there could be a long debate, perhaps as much as eight or nine weeks, before the end 50 senators could bring the bill to a vote.

The choice will be between the Johnson and the Douglas proposals, and in all probability the Johnson proposal will prevail. The real issue at the bottom of this complicated argument about the rules of the Senate is, I believe,



LYNDON JOHNSON

here, a constitutional question. It is not what the letter of the constitution says. For it says nothing. It is about what is in accord with the spirit of the constitution.

The question is how big a majority must there be in order to override the opposition of a determined minority. Rule XXII, as it now exists, says that 66 senators must favor the legislation before a determined minority can be over-ruled. The Johnson proposal says that a determined minority can be over-ruled, in theory at least, by as few as 34 senators. In practice, on a controversial measure there is, of course, likely to be a very full attendance. So, the Johnson proposal is not substantially different from the existing rule. There is one exception to this. It does contain the indefensible provision of the present rule, which is that there never can be cloture on any proposal to amend the rules.

TROUBLE-SOME MINORITY

Having read carefully the material being circulated by Sen. Douglas, I have come to think that he has not dealt with the real issue. The real issue is not whether measures shall be fully

debated. The question is how they can be passed. There is no doubt that eight or nine weeks of debate is quite sufficient for any measure, and that after that there is no hope of anybody's mind being changed by the debate itself. The real question is what are you to do with a minority which is not open to being converted by a debate. Under what conditions should you over-ride it?

GREAT MOMENT

In my mind, the proposal to decide highly controversial questions by a vote of no more than one plus one-half of the Senate is not good enough. While the constitution itself says nothing about the question, it is a fact that the constitution is by no means devoted to the principle that a simple majority should rule. Treaties and impeachments require two-thirds of those present and voting. Constitutional amendments, the expulsion of members, the overriding of the President's veto, require two-thirds of all the senators elected. What is the reason



PAUL DOUGLAS

for these exceptions to simple majority rule? Is it not that what is at stake is of such great moment that it should have the concurrence of more than half of the representatives of the states? Why should it have this concurrence? Because when contro-



PAUL DOUGLAS

versal matters are decided by a two-narrow majority, the prospect of resistance and nullification is increased. To enforce difficult laws, there should be a very large majority which concurs in them. The issue of the rules is a hot one because the filibuster is a principal instrument of obstruction against federal legislation on behalf of the civil rights of Negroes.

Struggle Brewing

A Mile To Be Lost?

By DORIS FLEESON

On both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle, in both houses of the new Congress, will be men eager to push a more effective Civil Rights Act. The votes will be there to pass it. This is what is behind the last-ditch effort which southern members of Congress are making to maintain the filibuster rule of the Senate and the veto power of the conservative Rules Committee of the House.

Although the convening of Congress is still two weeks away, members have begun streaming back to the capital, most of them intent on getting into the struggle which is already well underway.

CREDIT TO ROGERS

The degree to which some important opinion in Washington has hardened against the South is obvious from the fact that serious proposals for economic sanctions against intransigent states are being made. Attorney Gen. Rogers is given credit for the proposals that military and other federal installations in states which defy the federal government be abandoned, moved, or reduced.

Even President Eisenhower, who has gone far to attempt to conciliate the South and sought to do so in his appointments to the Civil Rights Commission, seems to have lost much of his patience. The part of the South which has failed to give an inch may now find it has lost a mile.

FATIENCE WORN THIN

There is no question but that the patience of many powerful people in some of the Democratic States to sympathize with the South's position, has been worn thin by the two-year extension of the Civil Rights Act. The Civil Rights Act was watered down in agreement with southern states. President Eisenhower took pains to give the South strong representation on the commission.

Alabama's failure to comply with its orders, and the character of its reluctance, have led to a hardening attitude here than the troubles over compliance with the Supreme Court opinions in the school integration cases.

People's Platform

We Have No Place For One-Man Power

Franklin Roosevelt did a good job of it so far as his limited knowledge would let him.

Salisbury

But we have these authoritarianism in every county seat in the United States. Late these days in our churches and in all phases of American life. When they are honest, they may not do you too much harm. But why have such people at all in a democracy? There are ways of guarding our liberties and not allowing tyrants to seize and exercise the power that belongs to all the people.

It will not do to sell our liberty for security. Most of us can work out some sort of a living as long as we are able to work and there is some way to take care of those who are disabled. Liberty is the most precious thing we have, and we should not give an ambitious preacher to usurp it.

—J. W. JEWELL.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Editors' Note: While Drew Pearson is in Alaska on his annual Christmas trip to entertain American troops, his column is written by his assistant, Jack Anderson.

WASHINGTON SENATE Leader Lyndon Johnson, who easily won Senate jurisdiction over outer space, hasn't fared so well in his grab for office space. He felt his position entitled him to first pick of the suites in the Senate's new, marble-plated office building. After a grand inspection of the premises, he selected a third-floor corner suite overlooking the Capitol grounds.

Gets What He Wants

Preclaiming his rights as Senate majority leader, he let it be known he had staked out this choice suite for himself. Now, like Lyndon, he is accustomed to getting what he wants around the Senate. He had no trouble, for instance, taking over the chairmanship of the hearing-making, therefore highly coveted, Senate Space Committee.

No Meteors, But—

But the man in charge of outer space encountered an obstacle more formidable than flying meteors in negotiating for mandated office space. He bumped up against the hallowed Senate majority system. Senate Rules Chairman Tom Hennings advised him tactfully that office space

Seniority Thwarts Likeable Lyndon

is always allocated according to seniority. Johnson may hold the top Senate position, but he ranks an unimpressive 34th in seniority.

Conservatives Stay Put

The suite Lyndon wanted was offered first to Arizona's kindly Sen. Carl Hayden, who has served in the Senate 32 years. The old timers, tired and worn in the same office for 27 years and had become attached to it.

Next in line were Sens. Dick Russell of Georgia and Harry Byrd of Virginia, both solid conservatives who also dislike change. But the fourth in seniority, Montana liberal Sen. Jim Murray, liked the view Lyndon had reserved and took custody of the suite Johnson good-naturedly waited his turn and accepted less pretentious quarters.

Still A Junior

Vice President Nixon, who presides over the Senate but is still considered a junior by the oldtimers, fared even worse. He was offered so little space in the new building that he decided to keep his present office in the old building.

The news was broken to him by Rules Committee clerk Frank Dryden, who has to divide 98 senators, 27 committees and one vice president in the available office space. He must follow the seniority rule strictly, giving priority in case of a former senator, congressman and governor.

"I wouldn't have your job," the vice president told him.

"And I wouldn't have your job," reported Dryden.

Dryden's worst priority problem was to figure whether Connecticut's Sen. Robert Byrd deserves first crack at an office suite. Both will be sworn into the Senate Jan. 7; both are former congressmen who entered the Senate on the same day. Dryden solved the problem by looking up the state population figures. Since Connecticut has more people than West Virginia, Dadd will be given the seniority edge.

Low Man

The low man on the seniority pole, who will have to take whatever office space is left on Jan. 7, will be incoming Sen. Howard Cannon of sparsely populated Nevada.

Note: By coincidence, 21 Democrats and 21 Republicans had claimed space in the new building. Then the election knocked out six Republicans of varying seniority. This caused a complete reshuffle, like a game of musical chairs, as the surviving senators moved up in seniority and staked claims for better offices.

Behind The Headlines

Soviet dictator Khrushchev confided to Minnesota's Sen. Hubert Humphrey

during their Kremlin visit that the Politburo once had lined up against him, seen to date, no opposition was given in arithmetic but poor commented Khrushchev. In the showdown, he got all 11 votes . . .

Poor In Politics

Sens. Russell of Georgia and Byrd of Virginia, speaking for the South, assured President Eisenhower last year that southern states would never deny qualified Negroes the right to vote. Regarding the prospect of a recent Cabinet meeting, the remarked readily that Russell and Byrd apparently didn't speak for Alabama. He referred to the Montgomery, Ala., civil rights hearing which discovered qualified Negroes had been barred from the polls . . .

Tell-Tale Conference

Although just about everyone in Arkansas considered segregationist Dale Alford the puppet candidate of Gov. Orval Faubus, Alford blandly told the House Elections Committee that he made up his mind to run and that Faubus had nothing to do with it. But the investigating congressmen have learned of a press conference Alford held on Oct. 28. At that time, he told reporters he had discussed his candidacy with Gov. Faubus before making his announcement.