WINSTON-SALEM JOURNAL

Editorial Page Staff: A. Reed Sarratt Jr., Director, H. Clay Ferree, A. G. Ivey, Hoke Norris, James B. L. Rush.

WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA, FRIDAY, AUGUST 14, 1953

No End to Communist Treachery

THE Communists do not intend to return American prisoners whom they have convicted of "crimes." This is the only interpretation that makes any sense out of the news reports from Korea these days.

The first indication that the Reds had no intention of returning all the Allied prisoners they held came from some of the first Americans they did release. These Americans said the Communists had convicted some of their buddies of such things as "instigating against peace" just before the exchange began. This was followed by a warning from the State Department which said the department "is gravely concerned by reports that the Communists may not intend to return all of our prisoners now in their custody. It has long been believed on good authority that the Soviet Union still holds an unknown number of World War II prisoners of different nationalities, and it was with this in mind that we insisted on a clause in the armistice agreement which provided that any United Nations personnel who are said not to desire repatriation must nevertheless be transferred to the custody of the Repatriation Commission where United Nations and United States officials will have access to them. This would include any prisoners alleged to have been given 'jail sentences.' None is exempt."

This declaration was in turn followed by a Peiping Radio broadcast that "prisoners of war against whom criminal proceedings for an indictable offense are pending or who have already been convicted . . . should be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention." The provisions of the convention are complicated, but neither China nor North Korea has signed the convention, nor has either of them lived up to its provisions in the past. They are a little late in putting themselves under the terms at this time. Secretary of State Dulles has now bluntly warned the Reds that retention of Allied prisoners will be regarded as a violation of the armistice terms and that the United Nations Command is prepared to take counter measures, which means holding back a large batch of Red prisoners.

It should be clear by now that no rules, no laws, no agreements, no tenets of human decency apply when we deal with the Communists. Their plan to hold back Allied prisoners, obviously as a sort of blackmail, makes it clear once again that no holds are barred when we deal with them. Unfortunately, our plan to hold some Red prisoners will probably not act as a lever to pry our own prisoners loose. The Communists don't care about human life, that of the enemy or of their own people. Our best hope of getting our soldiers back lies in the faith that there resides in the Red leaders some small spark of human decency after all. It is a faint hope, but it's about all there is.

Decide It Now

THE State Prison Advisory Council has urged Governor Umstead to make known his choice of a State Prisons Director immediately. The request is based upon a reported "impossible muddle" that is developing in the prison system because of the uncertainty regarding the directorship.

It is not hard to conceive of serious administrative difficulties arising out of such uncertainty. The present Director, Walter F. Anderson, is handicapped in making and implementing plans for the prison system by the fact that he does not know whether he is to be continued in his post. And it is possible that the attitude of his subordinates may be affected by the same uncertainty. If this situation continues it could lead to chaos in prison management and operation.

The Advisory Council at its meeting in Raleigh on Wednesday voted to authorize its chairman, Dr. William McGhee, to write the Governor asking: (1) That a prisons director be appointed immediately; (2) that rules and regulations for operation of the prisons be adopted promptly; (3) that closer liaison between the council and other groups legally concerned with prisoners be arranged; and (4) that steps be taken so the prisons eventually may be separated from the State Highway and Public Works Commission. Members of the board made it clear that they wanted the letter to show they thought Anderson has done a fine job.

These and other prison department problems deserve early and intensive study. But the most pressing matter is that of ending the uncertainty as to the tenure of Mr. Anderson and the speculation concerning his possible successor. Until this step is taken the prison department will operate largely in a vacuum insofar as policy-making is concerned, and administrative direction may become hesitant and lax.

Where's the Whole Animal?

GOP-sponsored television accounts of Republican triumphs since President Eisenhower went into office vary sharply (to understate the case) from the interpretation of the same era by the magazine sponsored by the Democrats.

The way the Republican National Committee, with the aid of TV cameras, scrutinizes Ike's achievements bears little resemblance to the way the Democratic National Committee sizes up the President and the doings of the 83rd Congress in the new issue of *The Democratic Digest*.

It's like the old story of the group of blind men who went out to examine an elephant and to describe the beast. The man who felt the elephant's leg said, "Why, the elephant is exactly like a tree." Another who placed his hand on the elephant's ear said the animal is like a large leaf. The man who grabbed the elephant by the tail said the beast is exactly like a snake. And the one who felt the pachyderm's side found it is just like a wall.

So it is with the men who are examining the GOP and attempting to express just what the present administration has accomplished in its first few months in office. Republican House Leader Joseph Martin sees Eisenhower and his associates "cracking the Iron Curtain" and successfully bringing an end to the war in Korea. *The Democratic Digest* points to the drastic cuts in the defense budget, especially the curtailing of funds for the Air Force.

How the Democrats and the Republicans view the GOP depends upon whether they are feeling the head or the tail, the legs or the tusks, the ears or the trunk. Mr. Martin lists the thirteen billion dollars of appropriations slashed, the admission of immigrants, turning over tidelands oil reserves to the states, organization of a new Hoover commission and the commission to study federal-state-local relationships, drought relief, halts in price declines.

But feel over here, say the Democrats. Many of the good things that Eisenhower has done, they say he has been able to accomplish largely with the help of Democrats and in the face of considerable Republican opposition. "The Democrats have supported Eisenhower foreign policy measures, while many Republicans have tried to scuttle them." The *Digest* contends that Democratic votes saved Eisenhower "from humiliating defeat" on excess profits tax extension, on the foreign aid program, on extension of reciprocal trade agreements law, all the while opposing Republican moves to cut the defense budget.

The GOP invites public attention to the fact that the budget can't be balanced now and taxes can't be cut, because Eisenhower "inherited" so many problems from President Truman. So the continued taxation can be looked upon as an inheritance tax, with all taxpayers as heirs.

Perhaps the truth is that both the Democrats and the Republicans are partly right. But neither party has yet looked at the entire animal. Politics being politics, they probably never will, at least publicly.

The French Strikes

CABINET crises and general strikes afflict France even more than the law of averages would seem to allow. If the French are now so used to falling governments that life goes on pretty much as though nothing had happened, they have not yet found a way to ignore a widespread strike. Right now hundreds of thousands of workers are on strike, and it appears hundreds of thousands more will follow suit.

The cause of the current wave of strikes is a plan of the present Premier, Joseph Laniel, to cut thousands of Civil Service workers from the public payrolls and to increase the retirement age of those remaining. The first workers to go out on strike are those in the railroads, electricity plants, public health, garbage disposal, telephone and telegraph services, all of them government operated. These workers are protesting actions which will have an immediate effect on them. But now workers in private industry who belong to such groups as the Socialist Workers' Force, the Christian Trades Federation and the Communist-led General Trade Federation are expected to walk out in sympathy.

Those who worry about the size of our Civil Service should take a look at the French counterpart. It is much larger proportionately than ours for several reasons. In the first place the French Government runs the railroads, the telephones and the telegraph, which means more people working for the government. And secondly, the French Civil Service is very receptive to veterans (of which France has a tremendous number) and to relatives of veterans. This makes for a bureaucracy of such lush growth as to make Washington appear streamlined and efficient.

Thus, when anything happens that affects the French Civil Service, such as a mass firing or lengthening of years of service, the entire country is directly and immediately affected. And when a Frenchman is affected by something, there is an immediate reaction—in this case, a spreading general strike. Tomorrow, it may well be the collapse of the Laniel Government. The French, as they have in the past, will undoubtedly pull out of the contretemps somehow. They always seem to manage to do that. For the United States, the lesson is obvious: Don't let the Civil Service or any other group in the country get so numerous and so all-powerful that it can express its displeasure with such effectiveness as the French Civil Service is now demonstrating to a somewhat startled world.

New Job for Truman?

IF Harry Truman becomes president of the University of Maryland, will Jim Tatum be able to draw recruits for his football team from Missouri as well as from Pennsylvania?

Will Margaret head the U. of M. school of music?

What does Bess feel about all this?

These and other questions pop up in the wake of a rumor that former President Truman may be in the running to become president at College Park, Md., succeeding Curley Byrd.

It has been known for some time that Mr. Truman has aspirations to settle down eventually as a teacher of history at some college. Nothing very definite has been said, but at a meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington in 1952, the President was queried about it. One editor asked whether it was true that Truman might become a history professor at the University of North Carolina. The President answered that he was no historian, that he has no college degrees except honorary ones, and that, furthermore, he did not believe there is any college in the country which would consider him qualified to teach. Quite a modest remark for Mr. Truman to make, and very proper under the circumstances.

The former President of the United States, however, might well make an appropriate president for the University of Maryland. There is only one drawback: Could he handle the football team as well as outgoing President Curley Byrd did?

Talk With Frank Lloyd Wright

Frank Lloyd Wright, the 84-year-old Wisconsin architect whose philosophy of organic architecture has had world-wide impact, was interviewed by Hugh Downs of National Broadcasting Co. in a television film. From the script the following extract has been taken:

DOWNS: We'd like to get as clear a picture as possible, Mr. Wright, of the essence of your thinking about American architecture in American life. How did you get started as an architect?

WRIGHT: We were poor, we had no money to send me to an architectural school—and at Madison, our home, the University of Wisconsin had an engineering school, and a very kind dean, Prof. Conover, gave me a stipened to work for him. If I had stayed three months longer I would have been given a degree as an engineer, but I was anxious to be an architect. So I started.

DOWNS: Most people who are at all acquainted with your work know that your work is organic and intimately bound up with the lives of people. When did this idea first begin to take shape in your work?

WRIGHT: Out here on the western prairies of Chicago came the first expression in humane terms of what we call now organic architecture.

What Is Organic?

DOWNS: You use the word organic. Is that any different from modern architecture, in your opinion?

WRIGHT: Very different, because modern architecture is merely something which may be built today, but organic architecture is an architecture from within outward, in which entity is the ideal. Organic means, in the philosophic sense, entity—where the whole is to the part as the part is to the whole, and where the nature of the materials, the purpose, the entire performance becomes a necessity, and out of that comes what situation you can give to the building as a creative artist.

DOWNS: Well, now, with that in mind, what do you try to put into a house when you design one?

WRIGHT: First of all, we consider the family it is designed for. And we try to put into that house a sense of unity—of all together that makes it a part of the site. If the architect's effort is successful you can't imagine that house anywhere else than right where it is. It is a part of its environment, and it graces its environment, rather than disgraces it.

DOWNS: Tell us about your own home, Mr. Wright, Taliesin.

WRIGHT: Well, Taliesin was built in 1911, and was a kind of refuge at the time. I was getting a worm's eye view of society, and needed to get into the country, and my mother had prepared this site for me and asked me to take it. The countryside is southern Wisconsin, with low hills, protruding rock ledges, wooded site. The site determined the features and character of the house. Taliesin really is a stone house and it is a house of the north. I loved the icicles that came on the eaves. In the winter the snow would sweep up over it and it would look like a hill itself. It was built to belong to the region.

DOWNS: Where did the name "Taliesin" come from, Mr. Wright?

Not the Hilltop

WRIGHT: My people were Welsh, my mother's people were Welsh immigrants, my old grandfather was a hatter and a preacher. Taliesin means shining brow and Taliesin is built like a brow on the edge of the hill—not on top of the hill—because I believe you should never build on top of anything directly. If you build on top of the hill, you lose the hill. If you build one side of the top, you have the hill and the eminence that you desire.

DOWNS: What is the difference between organic architecture and conventional architecture

WRIGHT: You mean structurally, I imagine.

DOWNS: Yes.

WRIGHT: The old post and beam construction is a kind of superimposition. If builders wanted partitions, they would cut, and they would butt and slash and if they wanted tension, they had to rivet something to something and make a connection. It might give way. Well, organic architecture brought the principle together so that you could pull on the structure. It had tensile strength owing to steel, and owing to steel it could have great spaces. And the great spaces could be protected with glass. The Greeks never had any such facility. If they had had steel and glass, we wouldn't have to do any thinking today—we'd be copying. But something had to be done with these new materials. Because of that principle of tenuity, we could use the cantilever, and into structure came this element of continuity. You see one thing merging into another rather than this cut, butt and slash. This same element of strength brought the Tokyo Imperial Hotel intact through the earthquake. That is the principle of tenuity and of flexibility of earth, instead of rigidity, which could be broken.

DOWNS: Would you recount for us some of the things which are fundamentally your own innovations in architecture?

WRIGHT: Well, first of all came this new sense of space, as a reality of the building. Then came the countenance of that space which is more or less what I termed streamlined. That word "streamlined" got into the language about that time through my effort.

Then there was the open plan. Instead of a building being a series of boxes and closets it became more and more open—with more and more sense of space. The outside came in more and more and the inside went out more. That went along until we had practically a new floor plan, and it has been referred to always as the open plan.

Warmth From Below

Then, of course, there were structural implications which we hinted at a little while ago of a building that had tenuity instead of a building without any, which could fall apart. These houses built upon this plan are good for 300 years, I should think. And in that structural dispensation, a great many features arose. The most important one was gravity heat, where the heat is in the floor, underneath the

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT

slab and in a broken stone bed. With a thick rug on the floor, you have a reservoir of heat underneath you. You can open the windows and still be comfortable. The children play on a nice warm surface. If you sit warm and your feet are warm, you are warm.

The corner window is something we should mention in connection with innovation. The corner window is indicative of an idea conceived early in my work that the box was a fascist symbol, and the architecture of freedom and democracy needed something besides the box, so I started out to destroy the box as a building. Well, the corner window came in. The light came in where it had never come before, vision went out, and you had screens instead of walls. Here the walls vanished as walls and the box vanished as a box, and the corner window went around the world, but the idea of the thing never followed it, and it became merely a window instead of the release of an entire sense of structure.

DOWNS: I've heard indirect lighting attributed to you.

WRIGHT: I did the first so-called indirect lighting very, very early. I guess it was about 50 years ago.

DOWNS: Through the span of your life there have been great changes in the world, economically, socially and ideologically. Have any of these changes influenced your work or your thinking?

WRIGHT: No, and it is a little unfortunate that my work couldn't have influenced those changes. Probably if it had been better understood, I might have had a very beneficial influence on those changes, but I can't say that those changes had any effect on my work. My ideal was pretty well fixed—I was pretty sure of my ground and my star and I saw no occasion to change. Early in life I had to choose between honest arrogance and hypocritical humility. I chose honest arrogance, and have seen no occasion to change, even now.

Teacher and Student

DOWNS: Among other things, you are a teacher, Mr. Wright. In your years of experience, what conclusions have you reached of the roles and duties of the teacher and those of the students.

WRIGHT: I'm no teacher. Never wanted to teach, and don't believe in teaching an art. A science, yes; business, of course; but an art cannot be taught. You can only inculcate it. You can be an exemplar. You can create an atmosphere in which it can grow. But I suppose I being an exemplar would be called a teacher in spite of myself.

DOWNS: Do you feel that American architecture has progressed generally over a—well—the last several years?

WRIGHT: No, I'm afraid it has not. I think that the effects have been sought and multiplied and the "why" of the effect, the real cause of the center of the thing, seems to have languished. If they once mastered the inner principle, infinite variety would result. No one would have to copy anybody else. My great disappointment is that instead of emulation, what I see is a wave of imitation.

DOWNS: In your long life of practical and artistic endeavor, what do you consider as your most satisfactory achievement?

WRIGHT: Oh, my dear boy—the next building I build.

Do Russians Have H-Bomb?

By Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON. — One week after Premier Malenkov's surprise announcement that Russia has the hydrogen bomb, U. S. scientists and intelligence experts have come to the flat conclusion that this is not the case.

Russia, they conclude, simply does not have the H-bomb. Nor is there a scintilla of evidence to prove that an explosion faintly resembling a hydrogen blast has been touched off.

Reason for such a positive conclusion is that it is impossible to set off either a hydrogen or an atomic blast without filling the air with radiation. These particles drift great distances. Regardless of distance, however, allied planes, policing the atmosphere around the Soviet Union, scoop up samples of the air which tell the complete story of how big an explosion is, when it took place, and its general location.

The height of the radiation tells the size of the explosion. The wind drift gives its location. The texture of the particles tells what kind of explosion it was—whether accidental, an A-bomb, or a hydrogen blast.

Four Russian Explosions

As it now stands, we have conclusive evidence that four atomic explosions have taken place inside the Soviet Union. And we know pretty well their nature.

On the other hand, and drawing a line between the explosion of an H-bomb and possession of a hydrogen device, our scientific agencies pretty well accept the fact that Russia probably has some kind of a hydrogen device which could be exploded. However, we are equally convinced that the Russians do not have a hydrogen bomb which could be put in a plane and carried to an enemy country.

Reason for such a positive conclusion is hydrogen explosion which we touched off in the mid-Pacific last year and which blew up an entire island, was not a bomb. It was called a hydrogen house, and though it contained all the ingredients of a bomb, it was exploded from the land, not the air.

So far we have never dropped a hydrogen bomb, and probably won't even put one together until shortly before it is to be dropped.

Even if the Russians have been able to squeeze the right ingredients into an actual H-bomb, however, they don't have the planes to carry it. Our H-bomb, when finally completed, will be so large it will require certain changes even of our biggest long-range bombers; and the Red Air Force has no planes, so far as we know, as big as our B-36.

Award to Italian

The assumption that Russia is almost certain to have a hydrogen device is based on the fact that Bruno Pontecorvo, an Italian expert on the H-bomb, disappeared behind the Iron Curtain three years ago and undoubtedly is working for the Reds.

Pontecorvo was one of seven Italian scientists who were so much in the lead of other scientists in splitting the atom that the Atomic Energy Commission has just awarded them $300,000 for patent infringement. And though Pontecorvo is now in Russia, his share, one-eighth, is being set aside for him in the U. S. Treasury under U. S. patent law. He has assigned one-half his interest to Eugene Chiron-Fubini of Glen Head, Long Island.

Leader of the Italian group is Dr. Enrico Fermi, now at Columbia, who was one of the chief contributors to the atom bomb in this country during the war. However, he actually began work on splitting the atom in the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Berlin many years ago. Others in the group include Oscar D'Agostino, Giulio Trabacchi, and Dr. Edoardo Amaldi of Rome, with Dr. Emilio Segre of the University of California. And Dr. Franco Rasetti of Johns Hopkins.

The Atomic Energy Commission has now held that the U. S. Army infringed on their basic patent; all of which indicates how widely the secret of the atom has been known in various parts of the world.

Unhappy Hollywood

President Eisenhower's pocket veto of the movie-theatre tax has made some of his best friends most unhappy.

During last year's political campaign, the movie moguls were among the most enthusiastic of the Ike-rooters. Darryl Zanuck of 20th Century-Fox sold the charms and assets of Ike at every luncheon "on the lot" in Hollywood. George Skouras of the Skouras Theatres sported an Ike button almost as big as a barn door. The Warner Brothers all plugged for Ike. In fact, there was hardly one movie executive, except for Dore Schary, host to Adlai Stevenson when he came to Los Angeles, who did not contribute dollars, work, or enthusiasm to Ike.

Today some of them are disappointed, some sore, some even say Ike is an ingrate.

What adds to their disappointment is the way another group of Ike-rooters has had the carpet rolled out at the White House—the airline executives.

The airline moguls also went down the line for Ike, contributed around $150,000 to his campaign. And when it comes to backstage wire-pulling, they haven't done badly at all.

When Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts introduced a bill to separate airline subsidies from legitimate mail pay, the airline lobby did some neat wire-pulling at the White House as well as on Capitol Hill. So far, the subsidies have not been separated. The public still has no way of knowing how many millions in gravy the airlines get.

Later, when the Civil Aeronautics Board proposed a working agreement between Pan American and National Airlines, also between Braniff and Eastern Airlines, Pan American wire-pullers reached a powerful hand into the Eisenhower Administration and blocked the CAB ruling.

No wonder the movie moguls, ruefully watching all the gravy and influence reaped by the airline people, feel a little sad.

Note—Democrats will tell you the reason Ike did favors for the airlines was that the controversy didn't get into the papers. The movie tax, they claim, was too much publicized by debate in Congress. But Republicans will tell you that the reason Eisenhower vetoed the movie-theatre tax was the strong and persuasive personality of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, who needed the tax money.

My Pop's Bigger'n Your Pop

By Thomas L. Stokes

WASHINGTON.—The voice on the radio often seems to come from another world, a world of wild fantasies, if you are temporarily in retreat, as over a week end, in the world of grass and trees and flowers and birds and a river flowing by and a porch from which to enjoy it all.

This particular voice was telling about the announcement by Soviet Premier Georgi M. Malenkov designed to indicate that Russia now also has the H-bomb. No longer, said he, has the United States a monopoly on the H-bomb, that imp from the bottle of the scientists that's bigger than the A-bomb.

The zaniest picture popped into the mind, of the little boy who says to the other little boy:

"I've got a bigger pop than you, and my pop can beat your pop."

Suddenly, with a shock, you perceive the immaturity, almost infantilism, of the state of mind into which the directors of the fate of the human race have descended. It seems almost lower than boys in a neighborhood gang, and almost approaches monkeys collecting their horde of coconuts and squatting on top of them and jabbering defiance back and forth at one another.

This simile is grimmer than it appears; for, if we choose, we can again produce a world which the jabbering monkeys will inherit. They can start all over again in keeping with the first "joke" after invention of the atomic bomb.

We Show 'Em

We here in the United States, who first devised and exploded the new mass form of destruction, have played our part, too, in this international monkey-with-the-atomic coconut game—taking time out every so often to shoot off more of our big apples—out on a Pacific island, or on the Nevada flats. We do this to see what we've got—and also to show Russia what we've got.

Our pop's bigger than their pop. We assure ourselves and them of that — and we're probably right.

Infatuation with an explosive that can wipe out whole cities in a flash has brought us to this across-the-world game of boom, zoom and boast, like very small fry with new cap pistols, except these aren't cap pistols. The infatuation is composed of part abject fear and part hope, both of which can paralyze the judgment, as that of statesmen today all over the world seems to be slowly undergoing paralysis.

Why did Joseph Stalin's successor throw in his boast about Russia having the H-bomb in his speech before the Supreme Soviet, just tossing it in, as if incidentally, so that it was a smug gesture; that did not necessarily mean that Russia has a workable bomb. No—Premier Malenkov very obviously needed something to reassure his people in order to set at rest their own doubts about the new regime. What has become the biggest thing a nation can have today and boast about? Why, the biggest bomb to kill the most people on the other side, of course.

So he told the Russians that their pop is as big as our pop and hopes, naturally, that will also have its effect with us as with our allies, as well as with Russia's satellites. This is international politics played with tragicodecic, out of fear. Only the atomic scientists who created the imp have humility.

Fears and Disturbances

The Russian Premier obviously spoke from fears and disturbances of his own, judging from the great flood of words he devoted to explaining to the Russian people how their economic lot is going to be improved, indicating that the Utopia is rather shabby just now; and also judging from his insistence that Russia is not weak, as he claimed "capitalist" politicians are saying. It was in that connection that he gave them the hopeful hint about possession of the H-bomb.

You can sit aside and look at the international nose-thumbing and boasting and the piling up of atomic bombs philosophically as the antics of a gang of boys; but the trouble is, you have to take it very seriously in actuality—for these are not boys, nor even monkeys, but grown men who can blow us all off the map, and give the debris back to the monkeys.

So what do we do? What can we do? We seem to have little choice except to keep piling up the bombs and trust to luck nobody is fool enough, on either side, to start setting them off—until, and unless, the human race can acquire the faith of those 250,000 people who knelt down at Nagasaki last Sunday on the eighth anniversary of the atomic bombing by us of that Japanese city and prayed for peace, and as the people of Hiroshima had done three days before on the anniversary of the first atomic bomb that all but wiped out their city.

My Notions

By John Wesley Clay

For several days now I have had a dreadful crick in the back. I do not know what brought it on. Perhaps it was a result of shoving a six foot stack of paper around, or perhaps from sleeping near an open window. At any rate it is so painful that I can hardly sit down, and when down can hardly get up.

Then last Monday night when the shooting stars were supposed to put on a show I went out into the back yard and I gazed into the sky for about two hours. I was rewarded by seeing six lovely stars shoot across the sky, but next morning I awoke with a dreadful crick in my neck. It was nearly as bad as the crick in my back. Couldn't look backward without turning completely around.

Then last night I decided to take another look for the shooting stars. As I couldn't lift my head, but had to look straight ahead I lay flat of my back on the cool grass and had a splendid view of the starry heavens. After I got down and stretched out there was no more pain from my back or neck either. It was really glorious.

But shucks! This morning I awoke with a dreadful crick in my shoulder. Can't move it without excruciating pain. Now when I am down can't get up. When I'm up can't get down. Can't look in any direction except straight ahead. And I have to carry my shoulde: snug up against my neck and ear and dare not move a finger.

But oh boy! Those two glorious hours in the cool grass with nary a pain in sight. It was wonderful.

The Nuts in Brazil

Carlsbad (N. M.) Current Argus

Brazil orders mental test for auto drivers.

This will get rid of the Brazil nut.

They want to locate the crackpots before they crack up.

Brazil has the idea that many a guy who is driving an auto is off his trolley. They want to test his attitudes while he can still move. Brazil has a lot of coffee, but the government is now going to look at a few more beans.

With the rumba, samba and mamba, Rio even has dangerous pedestrians.

We have some drivers who couldn't pass a psychiatrist, even on the left. They handle a vehicle like a veteran—of Patton's tank corps. They prove that a guy can have the price of a car, but not all his buttons.

It's true that you don't have to be smart to drive a car, but it helps you survive it.

Rio is the first place to find so many drivers with a loose screw that it decided to tighten up.