



THOMAS L. ROBINSON, President and Publisher
BRODIE S. GRIFITH, General Manager
ROBERT H. LAMPE, Advertising Director
CECIL PRINCE, Editor
PERRY MORGAN, Associate Editor
R. L. YOUNG JR., Managing Editor
JAMES McDOWELL, Circulation Manager

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1958

City Council Must Go All The Way

Twinges of conscience were clearly discernible yesterday as the City Council owned up publicly to its responsibility for laundering the dirty linen of City Recorder's Court.

Mayor James Saxon Smith's S-O-S to the Institute of Government for expert advice was both timely and proper. Aside from any wrongdoing which may or may not have occurred, the Council has a plain duty to provide the people of Charlotte with a court that will administer justice efficiently and exactly.

Improvements in the system are necessary. But improvements in the personnel operating the system are more than a little necessary, too. It should be clear to Councilmen and citizens alike that the latter would be served by the immediate departure of Judge Basil Boyd from the bench. The public should not be asked to swallow a "new" system under the same old management—the very management that allowed the present system to fall in shameful disrepair. The grand jury has an independent task to do. But the task of providing a local judicial system that can do an effective job without stripping its gears in public is wholly the Council's. It can't hide behind the skirts of a grand jury or transfer the whole load of responsibility to the shoulders of a solicitor or a police chief. The public knows whose business it is to see that Charlotte has an efficient court. And the public will tolerate no shilly-shallying or buck-passing. It wants action—clear, simple and resolute.

City Councilman Herbert H. Baxter's statement that nothing can or should be done until the grand jury determines if there is evidence of possible criminal

acts is plainly ridiculous. A grand jury cannot reform a system or select the people to run it properly. A grand jury cannot mend a community's confidence in the manner in which justice is being administered. In fact, a grand jury's contributions are at best negative in remedy of the scandalous mess in City Recorder's Court some positive contributions will also be needed—the kind of positive contributions only the City Council can initiate.

Slowly, almost laboriously, individual members of the Council seem to be coming around to this conviction. It was apparent in Mayor Smith's appeal for an Institute of Government survey of court operations.

It was noticeable, too, in Councilman Steve Dellinger's motion to make transcripts of testimony concerning the court scandal available to Council members.

It was clearly mirrored in the earnest but unsuccessful effort of Councilwoman Martha Evans to have Judge Boyd "re-heard" while his court is under investigation.

Furthermore, Councilman Baxter could muster only one other vote, that of Councilman Claude Albee, for his delaying action on the proposed Institute of Government study. Mr. Albee later joined the majority.

Still, a wholly satisfactory sense of urgency is lacking.

There is a mess in Charlotte. It is overripe and ugly. It is going to have to be scrubbed up before decent citizens can rest easily again. Sooner or later, the City Council is going to have to make the mess and do its duty.

Better sooner than later.

For Adams, Ike Drops The Standard

President Eisenhower is going to keep beside him a man that should be fired because he cannot run the government without him.

This seems a fair and accurate translation of Mr. Eisenhower's pathetic statement on Sherman Adams. Nothing but the "indispensable man" theory, an epithet in Republican oratory during the Roosevelt years, can lend a shred of logic to what the President had to say.

Judged by ethical standards laid down by the President, Adams would have been fired as often as he has been fired. As Air Force Secretary Harold Talbot had been fired—and in whose outers Sherman Adams doubtless had an approving hand. Judged by standards Adams himself has preached on the stump and enforced against lesser officials he would have been fired. But Mr. Adams, of course, did not want to be judged by those standards, although by reason of his position and prestige he was amply equipped to live up to them.

He asked investigating congressmen to judge him by standards they might

apply to themselves—a request absolutely without bearing on his case. The administration is responsible for its own ethics. It has made a point of setting its standards high, and inviting public attention to the fact. It has cast out high and capable officials protesting hotly that their indiscretions amounted to nothing more than small favors for old friends.

But when it came to judging the very high priest of administration piety, the President was reduced to saying: "I need him." Doubtless he does. "I need him" is a repeated refrain. That is the operating head of the government and that without him the whole force and momentum of the government would suffer.

This force and momentum may be maintained by reason of Adams' continued presence in the White House. But at the moment the President decided to keep him the core of administration virtue collapsed.

As we said, pathetic.

Old, unshored crusaders don't even fade away.

Far Too Many Prophets of Doom

SINCE a burden in the bush is worth two in the hand, it is distressing to learn that most 1958 commencement speakers emphasize the gloom, the gloom, and tribulations this year's crop of graduates must bear during these tortured times.

Where was the hope that goes traditionally with this season? Where was the optimism? Where were the invitations to ride forth to triumph and greater glory? Nowhere, that's where.

From Michigan State, where Adlai Stevenson held forth, to DePaul, where Prime Minister Macmillan spoke, the subject eventually turned around to global woes and the era of peril.

The consensus on many platforms seemed to be that we are all hopeless

prisoners of history and, really, what's the use?

Next year, if we have our choice of commencement clichés, we'll take the happy, hopeful ones, thank you. Youngsters have been boldly challenging the gloom of darkness since the Lower Paleolithic epoch. They've been doing it mercurially, confidently and with considerable demerol. It's repeating the way it ought to be until the last ding-dong of doom.

Every generation lives within history. But every generation must try to transcend history, too. History becomes, as James Joyce put it, a nightmare from which we must try to awaken. Maybe this new generation can pull it off—if sufficiently encouraged. Anyway, let's let them try.

From The New York Times

THE WHIPPOORWILL

Few birds are more seldom seen or better known by call and imitation than the whippoorwill here in the north-east. The bird's call is fascinating to the uninitiated; it is also one of the most insistently repetitious bird calls ever uttered, and two whippoorwills challenging each other vocally is heard several hundred times hours. Yet those who heard the whippoorwill's calls in youth will go miles to hear it again. It isn't a song; it is a memory, a legend.

Even in the name the whippoorwill is a legend. It belongs to the scientific family called Caprimulgidae, and caprimulgus is Latin for goatsucker. Because members of the family haunted herds of goats at dusk they long ago were believed to milk the goats and live on milk. Later it was learned that they live on flying insects and followed the goats because they attracted such insects. But the name persisted, finally outlived the English common name, nightjar, which at least has the right ring to it for any bird can jar and jolt the nightjar for one can. But the family name is goatsucker, even to ornithologists.

There are other members of the family. In the South, chuck-will's-widow and screech owl, and in the north, the least vocal one of all. But we know

best and remember longest the whippoorwill, which comes north in mid-spring, summers here, and goes south again for the winter. It builds no nest worthy of the name. It hatches two eggs on a pile of dead leaves, and it sleeps all day. It is seldom seen. But its call, which sometimes is repeated several hundred times almost without pause, is seldom forgotten. Old men who haven't heard a whippoorwill in years smile with remembering at the very name—whippoorwill—and wish to hear it again.

We are not disparaging our American system of education or criticizing our American parenthood in general when we say that a far greater number of our American teenagers are acquainted with the story of Billy the Kid than are acquainted with the story of George Washington.—DAILY OKLAHOMAN

Twenty-seven natives of 15 foreign countries received their U.S. citizenship papers in federal court here Wednesday. It would be interesting to know how many foreigners living in the USSR "workers' paradise" have applied for Soviet citizenship lately.—ASHVELEY CITIZEN-TIMES

'Added Idealist' Leads Lebanese Druses In Rebellion



JORDAN'S HUSSEIN

A Victim Trapped

By JOSEPH ALSOP

THE CASTLE at Mukhtara is in fact a dilapidated but wonderful jumble of big old Arab houses, rising from courtyard to sunny courtyard on a steep hillside, and the view from the hill and the valley towards the sea are so magnificent that you would not think of the old castle as a castle.

Such is the physical setting of the headquarters of the rebels in the Lebanon. You get there by taxi. This little hill town, where

these words are written, is the last government outpost. A few kilometers from here, there is a broken bridge. Your driver stops and says: "This is as far as we can go. A ragamuffin rifleman appears from nowhere. After a long wait, an ancient motorcar also appears. And you drive on through the mountain to Mukhtara."

BRAVE TRY

The reasons for Mukhtara stand in the remote past. Back in the 16th century, there was a brave attempt to throw off the Turkish yoke in the Lebanon. The people of the Druse sect, who live in these high hills, joined enthusiastically in the fight under the leadership of the first of the Jumblatt Emirs. The Emir had his stronghold at Mukhtara, and from that day onward, the Jumblatts have ruled the Lebanese Druses from their hilltop castle.

When you reach the castle, you find the atmosphere of "Scottish chiefs" brought rather inadequately up to date. Scores of men-at-arms—Druse tribesmen with bandoliers of cartridges and well-polished rifles—are lounging everywhere. Chickens and children play underfoot in the courtyard. The main reception room is full of the chief's retainers who never tire of singing the chief's praises. The impression begins to be less romantic, however, when the principal retainers start to squawk like a bunch of noisy cheap recording of the Cairo radio. Then the chief himself enters, or rather floats into the room, with the motion of a sea of seaweed carried by a gentle tide.

Kamal Jumblatt, present chieftain of the Lebanese Druses, son of the great leader of the Druse tribe who caused the French long years of war in the Lebanon. He is a pale, attenuated, cadaverous man. He has a high voice raised, in moments of emotion, to an almost whistle squeal.

Here, in his hill castle swarming with men at arms, he ramble amiably on and on about Pascal, Henri Bergson, and the early Hindu mystics. He is, it appears, a long-time convert to the very best of modern mysticism. But he says there are also times when "violence becomes a duty."

Violence is a duty now, he explains, because it is necessary to drive Camille Chamoun from the presidency of Lebanon. "But did not Chamoun's government support Jumblatt's power in his own hills in the last election?" It is ludicrous, he says, it is outrageous that the rebellion against Chamoun has been inspired by Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser or any other outsider. Chamoun must go, must go at once, but only because the people of the Lebanon insist on his going. "What about the report that Gen. Shauki Shukri is with you?" Jumblatt is asked.

LONG ABSENCE

"Oh," he answers, with a friendly wave of his long slim hands, "naturally Gen. Shukri pays me a visit from time to time. But it is very long since I have seen him."

At that moment, one can discern, Shukri, in the corner of the room, seemingly giving orders to two of Jumblatt's officers, who

are mightily respectful, although the general is wearing civilian clothes. Nor is this border-crossing by the Druse general, who used to be chief of staff of the Syrian Army, the end of the story.

SERIOUS PHENOMENON

The taxi driver who arranged this odd pilgrimage subsequently reports that at least half of the Druse men-at-arms are Lebanese Druses. It is pretty certain that the other military leader of the Jumblatt forces is the Jordanian Emir Huzayl, exiled for his role in last year's Nasserite plot on the life of King Hussein. In truth, although he may not know it, it is pretty doubtful whether Kamal Jumblatt, the Druse chieftain, any longer controls his own revolt in the hills.

It is easy enough not to take Jumblatt seriously, but in fact, on his almost unattainable hills, with something like 2,000 tough Syrian and Lebanese Druses fighting under his peculiar command, Jumblatt is a very serious phenomenon indeed.

PERSONAL REASONS

Who are the other elements in this fantastic civil war in Lebanon? The pattern is everywhere approximately the same. It does not matter whether the local leader is the added idealist, Jumblatt, or the unsavory chieftain of the Beirut Basta, Saeb Salam, or Hashid Karami in Tripoli. In each center of revolt, you'll find a man enjoying a strong local following for one reason or another, who dislikes the Chamoun regime for one personal reason or another.



EGYPT'S NASSER

A Victim Trapped

And always this man is both resourceful, strong, and increasingly respected by aid from Egypt's Nasser. This is a drama, indeed, much more odd and more profound than last year's Jordanian drama, but every bit as crucial. Last year, Nasser tried to win all the Middle East by destroying King Hussein in Jordan. This year, skillfully turning to account all sorts of internal Lebanese dissensions and rivalries, Nasser is again trying to win all the Middle East by destroying Camille Chamoun in Lebanon. And as these words are written, the outlook is far from bright.

House Accepts Ike As Warrior But Not As Strategist

By WALTER LIPPMAN

WASHINGTON ON THE bill to reorganize the Pentagon the President got from the House most but not all of what he wanted. Broadly speaking, the House which is Democratic control, followed him in everything that has to do with the command of the armed forces. But the House opposed and defeated him on certain basic questions which have to do with strategic planning and the responsibility of the services.

During the past months since the President put forward his proposals, it has been seen that the country was bound to accept the views of its most famous soldier. But the majority in the House drew a line between the President's recommendations which they would accept and those which they rejected. They followed Gen. Eisenhower on those military questions where as the former Supreme Commander, during the World War he could speak with great experience and authority—on the questions which relate to the command and operation of great complicated forces. But the majority did not follow him in the field where he has not had great experience, and has not earned any special distinction. This is the field of strategic planning.

HIGHER LEVEL

Thus during the Second World War Gen. Eisenhower was a successful Supreme Commander. But he did not do the strategic planning of the war. That was done at a much higher level than his at the level of Churchill and Roosevelt and of the combined Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Eisenhower was in the European theater the supreme operator, not the supreme planner. When for a time after the war he was the Pentagon's Chief of Staff of the Army, which was before the Korean war, he did not make a record for strategic insight and foresight. And later, when he became Supreme Commander of NATO, there is little to record to show that he was in the field of nuclear weapons on the strategic planning of the NATO forces.

There is, therefore, substantial

ground for the discrimination shown by the House in opposing him on operational matters but not on strategic planning.

The basic issue between the President and the leadership of

the House is expended in the very title brought in by Rep. Vinson for the Committee on Armed Services.

"There are," says the report, "two well defined systems of

strategic planning and direction of military operations. One is the authoritarian system, topped by an all powerful single military Chief of Staff, supported by an overall Armed Forces General Staff

which he dominates and controls. This system is superficially effective in arriving at swift decisions—a faculty which it possesses because it is shaped to eliminate from consideration alternative courses of action. The second system for strategic planning is exemplified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, each of whom is subject to the civilian authority of the Secretary of Defense. It is free to express and to advocate his views and to present and press for the full, proper and effective employment of the particular capabilities of his own service.

RIGHT OF APPEAL

What the President asked for was not in name a General Staff system. But he did ask for something very close to it in principle. He asked for the virtual suppression of the civilian secretaries of the various services and he wanted to take away from the Chiefs of Staff their present right to appeal to Congress. It is this right of appeal which prevents any of the services from being overruled by a combination of the other two and makes certain that on a great issue its views cannot be suppressed and must be debated.

KEY POINT

It was on this point that the House opposed the President. It is a point of great importance. In the President's hot-tempered statement of May 28, he described the right of appeal to Congress as "a legalized insubordination."

It is a revealing and telltale phrase. For it shows that the President is fundamentally opposed to the principle of strategic planning by the Joint Chiefs. He is really in favor of a staff system of planning which will give quick and uncontested decisions "so that the man at the top has only to approve or disapprove—but not to weigh alternatives."

That is the most effective way to command and operate an army. It would be a dangerously inadequate way to make high military policy, to do the strategic planning for our global commitments and our rapidly evolving weapons.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

INASMUCH as this writer incurred Harry Truman's explosive wrath for drawing attention to Gen. Vaughan's operations in the White House, perhaps I can be forgiven for making some comparisons between free hotel bills in Republican days and free hotel bills in Democratic days.

Sherman Adams has now been shown to have received the following free hotel accommodations, all paid for by his friend, Bernard Goldfine:

Sheraton-Plaza Hotel in Boston—about \$2,000

Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York—\$2,500

Mayflower in Plymouth, Mass.—\$262.29

Dawson's Bill

The total Mayflower bill covering the Goldfines, the Adamses, and Mr. Adams' of Worcester totaled \$1,206 for five days. The total amount paid by Goldfine for Mr. and Mrs. Adams at the various hotels was over \$2,500.

Let's compare this with another hotel bill which also won headlines as the result of another congressional committee probe. In 1951, the Senate Banking Committee, headed by Sen. Fulbright of Arkansas, a Democrat who investigated other Democrats, revealed that Donald Dawson, Truman's staff, had spent 22 days at the Hotel Saxon in Miami Beach in March and April, 1950. When he went to pay his bill the public relations office told him the bill was already paid. Total \$500.

Never Known Him

The Saxony had previously borrowed \$150,000 from the RFC, and Dawson

Truman Aide's Hotel Bill Is Recalled

previously handled personnel at the RFC. When the facts were disclosed, Dawson promptly went before the Senate Banking Committee. He testified that he had never before known George Sax, owner of the hotel, had not known that he received an RFC loan, and as personnel director at the RFC was in no position to scrutinize or pass upon loans.

Sherman Adams had admitted intervening on behalf of the man who paid his bills. Dawson testified he did not intervene on behalf of the Hotel Saxony.

Press Comparison

The comparison might be carried one step further to include public reaction. Said the New York Herald Tribune, May 12, 1951, of Donald Dawson: "Mr. Dawson has very little notion of what is proper or improper. The best proof of that rests on his own story of staying free in a \$30-a-day room at the Saxony Hotel at Miami Beach. . . . The people expect a high official in the White House to know the difference between proper and improper, and the Saxony episode will be remembered."

The 'Pure'

Said the New York Herald Tribune, June 13, 1953 of Sherman Adams: "Who ever knows Sherman Adams knows that he is as honest as the day is long. His personal integrity is as fine as the only boomerang against themselves. The accommodations in question had been rented

originally on a continuing basis by a long time personal friend, Bernard Goldfine."

House sleuths have been checking rooms that textile millionaire Bernard Goldfine put up the money for Sherman Adams' home in Washington. However, they found that the embattled assistant president leased his home and pays the rent by personal check. . . . The worst the investigators could prove was that Adams used to be slow paying his \$10-per-month garage bill to Mrs. James Noonan, an elderly woman. She phoned the real estate agency repeatedly and begged it to collect Adams' tardy rent. (He has now moved his car to another garage.)

Stock Purchases

Congressional probes are also investigating the stock purchases of Andrew Orrick, senior Republican on the Securities and Exchange Commission. He purchased some General Motors stock within 60 days of a new issue, which is against the law. When it was called to the attention of the committee, he said he had lost it. . . . The investigators are now checking whether Orrick profited in stock gains from the disclosures he made as a SEC commissioner. They have also learned he took free trips to White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., courtesy of a bankers' association, and to Hot Springs, Va., courtesy of the American Society of Corporation Secretaries. Yet he sits on the committee which regulates banks and corporations.

Tossing The Sponges

It's interesting to note that GOP Congressman John Heston of Massachusetts

threw in the sponge on exactly the same day the Harris subcommittee, of which he is a member, opened its explosive TV channel. On that day, Heston announced he was not running for re-election. He is a close friend of Adams, had been up to his eyebrows in the fight to prevent the congressional probe of Channel 5 in Boston and Adams' operations.

A Stranger

Congressman Bob Hale of Maine, also a member of the Harris subcommittee, has been conspicuously absent during several recent hearings. Hale was re-elected by a margin of about 30 votes last time, and probably won't be re-elected this fall. He is a 19th century gentleman, close friend of Sherman Adams, has been troubled over the number of French-Canadians now being elected mayors of Maine cities. He is a Yankee of the old school, has become almost a stranger.

Personal Favor

Sen. Frederick Payne of Maine had the late ex-GOP Paul Devere, Democrat, of Massachusetts working for him as a personal favor when Sen. Owen Brewster of Maine was trying to block Payne's carrying his seat. Ironically, Brewster has recently been Payne's campaign adviser. . . . Sen. Sam Sen. Heston attacked the Harris subcommittee of "McCarthyism" is the same lawyer who was considered as attorney for the Senate committee investigating the Army but was turned down because he was too pro-McCarthy.

se he was too pro-McCarthy.