

Political Guessing

The latest returns in the Gallup poll continue to show a majority for President Eisenhower in the White House and almost a majority for the Democrats in Congress. Eisenhower's popularity, which is 62 per cent, would carry him to a huge landslide. The Democratic party's majority for Congress, which is 59 per cent, would be sufficient on election day to give it an even bigger majority in both Houses than the big majority it already has today.

The Gallup poll is not infallible. But in forecasting elections its range of error is never nearly so big that it would change the general conclusions. The country would vote now, as it did in 1956, for Eisenhower and a Democratic Congress.

For 1960, the first question then is whether Eisenhower's popularity is personal and special to him, or whether it is, so to speak, "Republican" and can be inherited by Nixon or Rockefeller. There is no sure answer. One can only guess. My guess is that for the presidency there may well be a Republican majority brought together by two main popular beliefs and one political tradition. A majority of the people may think that the Republicans are more likely to avoid war than are the Democrats. The second popular belief is that with business booming, the Republicans are more likely to resist the inflation of money and to keep taxes from rising.

The third is the circumstance that because the Democratic party consists of several different factions, it has a sure majority only in congressional elections. For in them each faction can vote separately—for example for segregation in Mississippi and against segregation in New York. These separate votes for factional representatives, when combined in Congress, are a large majority. But when all the factions have to unite on one candidate for President, it is not at all certain that there is a sure Democratic majority.

If there is in fact some such Republican majority in the presidential contest it is obviously a fragile and precarious majority. There are many more Democrats than there are Republicans, and this means that the Republican candidate must attract while the Democratic candidate repels a great many Democrats—something on the order of 10 per cent.

It is not easy for the Republican candidate to do if the Democrats are able to compromise their worst differences on civil rights, are able to present a candidate who creates confidence in his ability to conduct foreign affairs and who does not frighten the taxpayers and those living on fixed incomes—including fixed salaries and wages.

For while there may be a Republican majority for the presidency, it can exist only while the Republican candidate can, like General Eisenhower, attract Democrats. This is critical for

Public Pulse

Auto Insurance

Editor of the Daily News:

Your editorial of June 16, "Give Insurance Buyers a Break," was disturbing to me as it is to others in my profession. This letter is written in the hope that it may present a somewhat different picture of the automobile liability insurance situation from that painted in your editorial.

The editorial referred to a "bill" being rushed through the General Assembly during its waning days.

The bill was introduced during the latter part of May—in the Senate by Senator Frank P. Cooke of Gaston County. It was carefully considered in the Senate Insurance Committee, reported out favorably and passed its third reading on June 9 by a vote of 29 to nine—over the 20-one majority. I fail to see where this constitutes undue haste.

The bill was referred to the House on June 9 and was promptly yest-pocked by the chairman of the Insurance Committee and no hearing conducted. There it rested for 11 days until adjournment on June 20.

On May 31 an ad was run in "North Carolina's Finest Newspaper" inviting those opposed to increased limits to write to their representative in the General Assembly. The ad brought out the fact that only North Carolina and South Carolina on the eastern seaboard south of Massachusetts had \$5/10/15 limits.

A few days after the ad was run the South Carolina General Assembly passed a law providing \$10/20/5 limits thus making of this state the only one on the eastern seaboard with an unrealistic \$5/10/15 limit thus depriving citizens of this state who merely comply with our state law of valid limits required in any state other than Rhode Island and Massachusetts on the eastern seaboard where they might travel and depriving fellow citizens of this state from realistic protection against our drivers.

You refer to "hiked compulsory insurance rates." By "compulsory" I assume that you refer to the "compulsory" liability responsibility law which is applicable to all motorists. Every state on the eastern seaboard where the increased limits prevail has a tough financial responsibility law. Certainly you do not mean to infer that the financial responsibility law has caused the increased premium charges. The commissioner of insurance can properly and honestly advise you that

C. C. WIMBISH
Greensboro.



Paragraphics

DREW PEARSON

Merry-Go-Round

Inflation's spiral isn't necessarily a new twist.

Add Fairy Tales: A tentative tax hike.

A nation on wheels should expect quite a turnover.

Dog days wouldn't be so bad if the principals would keep quiet at night.

Strange, isn't it, how sharp arguments bring on blunt words.

A deep freeze is no place in which to keep food for thought.

Add Fourth of July Notes: Independence is in jeopardy when it takes to the highways.

All this argument over for the U. S. exhibit in Moscow must be aimed at giving somebody the brush-off.

Political candidate who used to take the stump is now more likely to ditto the microphone.

Two inches of rain were dumped on Raleigh Thursday. And it wasn't a legislative wash-out either.

Draw a circle around those hours which saw us blessed with cooling showers.

So far nobody has suggested that that Pentagon jet might have been caused by inter-service friction.

Foreign aid doesn't stand much chance when its recipients can't vote in U.S. elections.

Just think of the Fourth of July fireworks who might be having if Congress and the General Assembly met right on through the holiday.

Department of Red Faces: Buffalo police commissioner learned during a recent testimonial dinner that two of the three gifts he was to present to the guest of honor had been stolen.

Triumph For Pasternak

(The Denver Post)

Boris Pasternak has scored a major triumph among the literary men of the Soviet Union, even though few of them consider it wise to mention his name.

At a meeting of the Union of Soviet Writers in the Kremlin recently, the author of "Dr. Zhivago" was conspicuously absent, and there was only one reference to him—unfavorable—in the official proceedings.

But the ideas that Pasternak has come to symbolize—Independence, originality, impatience with the literary restraints of the Communist regime—were very much alive among the colleagues who disown him.

There were complaints about books that ignore the real hardships of Soviet life, of characters who never do anything disapproved by Soviet society, of writers who bow and scrape like circus clowns for public favor.

The writer Konstantin Pavlovsky complained that Tolstoy's "Anna Karenina" could not have been written under the Communists because it involves her

ride and the breakup of her marriage.

The voices of contemporary Soviet fiction, Pasternak said, are not permitted to behave that way.

The quantity of criticism and the frankness of it showed that the spirit of Pasternak is still strong in the very union that attacked and expelled him.

Pasternak himself was, in part, a response to the new freedom that pervaded Soviet letters in the months following the death of Stalin.

The Kremlin cut that freedom short when writers went too far and used it to attack Soviet society and the Communist bureaucracy. Pasternak himself was found to be dangerous.

Yet, Soviet literature and the arts have never returned to the state of close regulation and suppression that prevailed under Stalin.

And Pasternak, though he lost a battle, has the satisfaction of knowing the war is a freer, more relevant, more honest and more meaningful Soviet literature is still going on.

The Declaration: Jefferson And Pasternak

The Declaration of Independence, like so many cornerstones of the republic, is enshrined in American mythology. It is as difficult to see clearly as the essential character of Washington or Lincoln.

Fourth of July oratory and the American penchant for myth-making have covered our great documents and men of history in a kind of stereotyped cloak which hides their true nature. Men coming after have used them to prove widely varying views of history. Thus Jeffersonian democracy means one thing to some, another thing to others. Thomas Jefferson himself, the red-headed author of the Declaration, becomes a champion of all kinds of philosophies. Some of them would have shocked him greatly.

What we begin with is this: Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence.

"Whether I had gathered my ideas from reading or reflecting, I do not know," Jefferson later told James Madison. "I know only that I turned to neither book nor pamphlet while writing it. I did not consider it as any part of my charge to invent new ideas altogether, and to offer no sentiment that had never been expressed before."

But Jefferson, the young student of law, was steeped in the philosophies of Hobbes and Locke, borrowed from a theologian named Hooker, who, in turn, borrowed them from St. Augustine. Jefferson's source material stretched back to King Alfred, framer and establisher of the Common Law (or "folk right") and to the Anglo-Saxon.

But it is also true that Thomas Jefferson put these ideas together in a new way.

The Declaration expresses the five cornerstones of liberty which have become deeply embedded in all the laws and customs and folkways of the United States. These ideas have spread, in turn, to other parts of the free world—to revolutionary

France, to evolutionary Britain, to the old nations of Europe and the new nations of Africa and Asia.

These truths, which Thomas Jefferson set down in memorable language, have become the bulwark of man's fight against tyrannies everywhere—from the petty demagogues of America to the tyrants of Boris Pasternak's Russia.

Here is what Jefferson had in mind—and it is best to state his ideas in some-what different language so that they do not slip off our heads or tongues as easily as the more familiar words.

1. All men have certain rights.
2. These rights were given them by the Maker who created all men equal in his sight and the sight of the law.
3. Since these rights were not granted by any group of men or any government they cannot be taken away by any government or any group of men.

4. The business of government is to preserve these rights.
5. When a government ceases to do that, then the people ought to throw away the old government and get a new government which will preserve their rights.

That is what Jefferson meant. The words are simple. The ideas are not.

When Nikita Khrushchev says of the free world, "We will bury you," he is trying to bury the revolutionary spirit of the Declaration.

For these five ideas are anathema to all tyrants. They offer hope to the down-trodden—whether in Hungary, Tibet or Mississippi. No Hitler or would-be Hitler can allow them to survive.

Here, then, is the indelible link between Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and Boris Pasternak's *Dr. Zhivago*.

The ideas of the Declaration are as fresh and meaningful today as they were in Jefferson's time.

We will forget them, or suffer them to be demokeloh, at our peril.

Hocutt Affair: No Help To ABC System

One thing is clear about the barages and counterbarages in the State Alcohol Board of Control controversy at Raleigh: They have done nothing to enhance the reputation of the ABC System.

ABC Chairman William S. Hunt, backed by fellow board members, had the authority to dismiss Ronald Hocutt, director of the Mail Beverage and Wine Division. Obviously Hunt, as chairman of the board and chief administrative officer, should not retain employees who do not meet minimum standards of competency and loyalty.

But the manner in which Hunt handled the firing leaves something to be desired. His blistering four-page letter, in which Hocutt was dismissed, was released to the press simultaneously with its delivery to Hocutt.

While this could have been done to get the jump on Hocutt (who had been apprehensive about his job for some months), it practically guaranteed counterattack and unseemly public bickering.

The North Carolina ABC system demands high caliber personnel in its operation from top to bottom. Anything

less weakens its reputation and leaves it open to charges that political hacks and partisan politics are tied up in its operation. This cannot be tolerated.

There is evidence that Hunt sought to remove some of that aura of politics from a vital division of the board's management. The state beer and wine inspection system deserves the services of competent and fair-minded law enforcement officials. Lee Phillips, Hocutt's replacement, seems to have these qualifications. He has served eight years with the State Highway Patrol and 11 years as special agent of the State Bureau of Investigation.

Governor Hodges' proposed reorganization of the State ABC system failed to pass the 1959 General Assembly. It would have increased board membership to five and divorced the board's administrative and policy making functions (now incorporated in the chairmanship).

The Hocutt affair may well demonstrate the need for such a division; for in this case the man who actively administered the ABC system activities also is chief of its policy-making duties.

Education By Osmosis

The old one-room schoolhouse wasn't so bad after all.

We say this not out of nostalgia for a phenomenon that has all but disappeared from the scene but on the basis of "multi-grade" classroom experiments carried on in the Watteria, Calif., Elementary School.

Credit for the idea should go to Dr. Walter Rehboldt, who was reared in a Nebraska farm family of eight, and his wife Ruth, who was one of nine children in an Eastern Colorado family.

Both attended, and later taught in, one-room and two-room schoolhouses in Colorado. Both subconsciously wondered for years why so many of their childhood classmates, and later their pupils, stood so high in high school and college and in later life.

Finally the answer occurred to them, and from it has sprung this new—and surprising—movement in American elementary education.

In the "one big family" atmosphere of the pioneer era, the Rehboldts reasoned, children actually started learning a subject perhaps years ahead, as they heard the older ones recite. Older children got a review of last year's subject to strengthen their weak spots, by hearing the teacher work with a younger class.

Going against all trends in current U. S. educational theory, Dr. Rehboldt persuaded a California school superintendent to let him try "multi-grade" classrooms in an experimental and strictly voluntary way. Here is how it worked:

The children of three elementary grades are mingled in one classroom under one teacher. The standard class contains 33 children, so 11 from each of three grades were assigned to the first classrooms. Four rooms held children from first to third grade, three rooms children from fourth through sixth grade, or seven rooms in all. Eight rooms remained single-grade as control.

Parents' permission was always obtained before children were assigned to the multi-grade rooms, but otherwise every effort was made to see that there was no difference between the children

in these rooms and those remaining in the single-grade rooms. Teachers for the former were selected by lot, were given no preliminary training and were treated in all respects like the other teachers throughout the year, with no special help, inspection or supervision.

The result? Success from the start. Pupils like it, teachers like it and parents like it—amazed with the progress that their children have made.

Progress in character, Dr. Rehboldt claims, is a by-product. Older children grow to feel responsible for younger ones. Chums pair off from different age groups. After all, U. S. society does not remain stratified according to age groups such as present-day classrooms decree.

All this, as we said, goes against current educational trends, but it is beginning to spread. Children in multi-grade classrooms learn by osmosis. Those who can go ahead in subjects that interest them are encouraged; those who want to go over work again can listen as it is repeated. If they are diverted from what they are doing, they profit by it.

Following the multi-grade experiment several California school systems adopted it. Others are investigating.

Surely it is a new twist—or rather the revival of an old necessity—worth considering.

Comment of the Week (By Ben Vaughan in The Milwaukee Journal): "The bones in boats indicate that the Joneses we are trying to keep up with must be Admiral and Mrs. John Paul."

Red Chinese authorities advise joining the Communist Party as a way of getting along with mothers-in-law. Even in Red China that's a pretty drastic solution.

Man After Our Own Heart Division: President Lemus of El Salvador is in Washington trying to find out why coffee prices stay up only in United States restaurants.

The poultry industry wants us to eat more eggs. At least until the egg crisis is unbecombed.