



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

FRIDAY, JULY 18, 1958

The Pearsall Plan's Medicine Is Harsh

A STEP which could conceivably lead to the closing of one or more public schools in Charlotte has been taken by attorney Parker Whedon.

In filing petitions for the designation of areas around Harding High and Piedmont Junior High Schools as local option units, Mr. Whedon is already wielding a legal weapon known as the Pearsall Plan.

This is only a preliminary move. But it can provide the means to an unhappy end—the suspension of public education in a sizable section of Charlotte.

The Pearsall Plan became law in 1956. Ostensibly designed to "preserve North Carolina's public schools," it gave the people the legal means to discontinue public education in areas where racial segregation created an "intolerable situation."

The medicine is harsh. Where it is used full strength in a local option unit, it would deny children of both races the right to be educated in a public school.

In a community where the preservation and improvement of public education has become a cherished ideal, Charlotteans do not regard their public schools lightly. Nor should they regard lightly any possible threat to the continued existence of those schools as public institutions.

It is most important that the citizens of Charlotte understand the Pearsall Plan perfectly. There are few who fool themselves about the possible consequences to themselves and their children if it is invoked. They cannot afford to permit themselves to be misled by well-meaning parties who have allowed their senses to be dulled by their emotions. The stakes are too high, the education of their children too important.

How can the Pearsall Plan be used to close a public school and what, precisely, are the consequences?

A school can be closed by a vote of the people residing in an area around the institution called a local option unit. The school board can order such an election on its own initiative, or 15 percent of the people in the school unit can demand it.

The boundaries of the local option unit would be set by the school board. If school patrons inside the local option unit vote by majority to close their school, then public education would stop immediately for pupils residing in the area.

Note of the children in that local

option area could attend another public school unless they moved to another school district.

They would, however, be eligible for state tuition grants for their private education—up to the amount provided for other children in the public schools. Estimated at the time the Pearsall Plan became law, this figure amounted to about \$135 per pupil year in state funds. The local school board could add to that amount in accordance with its own per-pupil costs.

The public school in the local option unit could be opened again only on another vote of the people.

That, in a nutshell, is what it means. There are other elements of the Pearsall Plan which deal specifically with the education expense grant, amendments to the school attendance law, the school board's authority, specific definitions and certain administrative details. But perhaps the darkest warning of all to citizens who would use the local option process is contained in this precise language taken from legislative proposals approved by the historic special session of the General Assembly in 1956:

"When a majority of the votes cast in such election are in favor of suspending the operation of the schools in such local option unit, the board of education shall suspend the operation of such public schools. Such suspension shall be accomplished in an orderly manner and the board of education shall take all steps necessary to preserve and protect school property during and after such closing. Any child living within a local option unit who could attend a public school in such local option unit except for the fact that operation of such school has been suspended under the provisions of the article of the constitution of a matter of *vitality to ensure any other public school* (our emphasis), but in lieu thereof shall be entitled to an education expense grant."

Needless to say, the expense grant would be ridiculously inadequate—even private schools are available in sufficient number and size to take care of the evicted student bodies.

Perhaps Mr. Whedon and his clients are merely conducting a form of psychological warfare against the City School Board. Perhaps his petitions merely represent a warning gesture. If so, let the warners themselves be aware of the whole meaning of what they are suggesting.

Iraq Is Only Prize Worth The Risk U. S. Is Taking

By JOSEPH ALSOP

THESE words are written in the chill moment of uncertainty, between the discussion and the decision. When they are written, the decision will be known. An operation will have been launched to rescue Iraq from a bloodstained hand, the Baghdad plotters, or the Western powers will almost surely have lost the chance.

If it is everything, the Lebanon nothing, Lebanon Foreign Minister Charles Malik has frankly admitted to all who would listen to him that the American landing in Beirut will be a fruitless, fooling gesture, unless the larger problem of Iraq is simultaneously solved. Iraq, not Lebanon, has been the chief subject of all the anguished consultations between the British and American governments in these last agonizing days.

THE TURNING POINT

While the decision of the leaders of the West is presently awaited, it is at least worth setting down the pros and cons. They are pros and cons unlike any that have been argued since the end of World War II, even in the tense days between President Truman's Korean decision. In



PRESIDENT CHAMOUN

A Brief Reprieve

Malik's admission above-quoted may seem very curious, indeed, coming from the representative of the Lebanese state. But it too is a simple statement of fact. The presence of the Marines may permit a president of Lebanon—perhaps Gen. Shihab—to be peacefully elected. It may permit President Chamoun to serve out his legal term. It may allow all the other outward signs of Lebanese independence to be devoutly preserved.

But Lebanon's alleged independence will not last long. It will hardly be worth a dried fig, if the independence of Iraq is not also restored. Neither will Kuwait or Bahrain or Saudi Arabia or Jordan, be worth a dried fig, if

more expensive and less fruitful in the end than a direct attack on the heart of the problem, which is now in Baghdad.

The rot will not end there, either. A neutralist Iraq, a neutralist Pakistan, a Turkey moving back to the position Turkey chose in the last war—these are further forms in the price of oil that have to be paid. And it will not end there, either. For the thrust will be felt in the very heart of the Western Alliance, where the Middle Eastern oil is cut by Nasser.

MORE TWADDLE

Such are the reasons for taking bold action in Iraq. Most of the reasons for not taking action are more twaddle—Hamamarskjold-twaddle, world-wide twaddle, other kinds of twaddle. When the knife is at the jugular, it becomes easier to tell twaddle from reality. Hence the twaddle reason have received significantly little attention in the recent exchanges between Washington and London.

There is in fact only one real reason for not taking action in Iraq—fear of what the Soviets may do about it. The Kremlin has, however, to recognize the insurrectionary government in Baghdad. It has consented to a call for help from King Hussein of Jordan.

dan, who has inherited the legitimate leadership of the merged Hashemite states, the Soviets want us to think they too will respond to a call for help from their Baghdad friends.

ONLY A FOOL

Only a fool would say, at this juncture, that the Soviets will not respond in this manner. If the Western nations take no action in Iraq, this crisis will be far worse than Munich. But if the West does take action, this crisis can be another Sarajevo. There is no use wrapping up that black fact in pink cotton wool.

There are two things, to be said about that fact, however. If the Western nations act with firm resolution and utmost speed (and it is already almost too late), they can hope the Soviet will only bluff and puff and finally do nothing, as we did in the very different case of Hungary. But let a double standard of behavior be established, preventing us from having our say about situations on their side of the line. After that, the cause of freedom will be lost almost. After that, the cause of freedom will be lost almost. After that, the cause of freedom will be lost almost.

President Made A Tragic Choice Between Two Evils

By WALTER LIPPMANN

WASHINGTON

THE MARINES have been landed at Beirut in the desperate hope of limiting the disaster which the Iraqi revolution has brought upon the Western position. It is likely to happen, if the landing is anywhere near sufficient to stabilize the situation. The Marines are able to protect the capital of the Lebanon just by their presence. But there is no doubt that it will bring the civil war to an end.

Moreover, Jordan, which is an artificial and fragile kingdom between the Arab states, has been sent in. British paratroopers have been sent in.

Possibly, Saudi Arabia will be able to get large bodies calling for help, largely to be sure by a policy of neutrality which is increasingly benevolent to Nasser.

Finally, it seems probable that the British will feel that they have to land troops in the little

sheldons of the Persian Gulf, where their main oil holdings in the Middle East.

Thus, there is a grim prospect that the British and the Americans will find themselves holding on to beheadings on the fringe of the Arab countries of the Middle East. In no Arab country, except Lebanon, which is about half Christian, does the West have any strong friends. As the cards now lie, the best that President Eisenhower can hope for is that the

Nigger Arab nations can be contained by a holding operation at the shores of the Eastern Mediterranean and of the Persian Gulf.

It will be a momentous question how deeply and for how long American forces are to be tied down in this holding operation.

For Nasser will not control, except for Israel, all that we do not hold out by military force.

TRAGIC CHOICE

The decision to send in the Marines was, as we all read, a tragic choice between two evils. After the Iraqi revolution, it was

a virtual certainty that the Lebanon, Jordan and the Persian Gulf states would fall too, if they were not supported from the outside. That was the evil the President decided to resist. The other evil, which he had, therefore to embrace, was that we are now in military opposition to the Arab revolution, and that in the Middle East the alignment is increasingly sharp and spectacular between the Moslem Arabs and the Western powers with their client states.

The President's speech on Tuesday evening took the unfortunate line of identifying Nasser both with Hitler and Stalin, and in declaring that amounts to an ideological war against him.

FUNDAMENTAL ERROR

My own view is that the age-old dilemma in which the President found himself on Monday morning is due to a fundamental error, which many have pointed out, in the conception and design of our Middle Eastern policy.

The error is in believing that the way to stabilize the Middle

People's Platform Do You Have An Opinion On Social Security Bill?

increase in benefits immediately, because it costs them nothing. But everyone whose benefits are still some years in the future can look forward to paying more taxes now but receiving poorer dollars in the future, so that he

has something to lose now and little to gain later. We join the fellow on the treadmill who has to run fast just to keep even. We will need to keep on increasing the benefits and the taxes in the future, just to get the purchasing

power we have today. It's a circle that's as vicious as a tornado until—and unless—Social Security gets back on a balanced basis again. Do you think an increase in benefits is wise right now?

Most Americans have no strong feelings either for or against the bill. This letter is to suggest that we should develop a definite point of view—and quickly—and that we should make it known to those in Washington who will be making a decision on the proposal within the next few days.

Few people realize that under our present law the Social Security tax is scheduled to rise in the most drastic way in its history. Right now an employee is paying 2 percent. Starting in 1960 he will pay 2 1/2 percent. In 1965 3 1/4 percent. In 1970 3 percent. In 1975 4 percent. The employer pays a similar amount, so the total tax in 1975 will be 8 1/2 percent. Consider what that amount of tax will do to your personal income and to the profitable operation of your company, and then decide whether you should be still further increased by the presently proposed legislation.

For the last year, the Social Security system has been operating in the red, with more money taken in than paid out. The managers in Washington say that this will continue until the next increase in tax takes place in 1960. When the federal government operates with deficit financing, it is inflationary. This is true of the federal budget, and proportionately it is true of the Social Security operation. Put them both together, and for they both are in the red this year, and will be next year—and you have increased inflationary pressures. This is of no concern to those who will receive an

increase in benefits immediately, because it costs them nothing. But everyone whose benefits are still some years in the future can look forward to paying more taxes now but receiving poorer dollars in the future, so that he

has something to lose now and little to gain later. We join the fellow on the treadmill who has to run fast just to keep even. We will need to keep on increasing the benefits and the taxes in the future, just to get the purchasing

Every increase in Social Security tax takes that much more out of our income that might otherwise be invested according to our personal plans. Granted that a basic income under a governmental plan is a good thing, it is also true that many people like to do their own saving. If that part of their retirement above the minimum level. If the government keeps on taking larger and larger bites out of our current income to provide retirement income for us, we have less and less—and finally nothing—that we can invest as we want. Some people like to plan for income after death through stocks and bonds or life insurance, or savings and loan or mutual funds, or some other method. It is wise to reduce these avenues of saving by increasing the Social Security tax above its present and future levels? We've seen ourselves becoming increasingly dependent on the government in many different ways during the past 25 years, and somewhere along the line we'll have to give up the trend or else resign ourselves to eventual complete regimentation.

An increase in benefits is politically popular, because it looks like you are getting something for nothing, or for very little, and that's an appealing prospect. Therefore a legislator is naturally inclined to vote for such an increase, unless thinking people let him know that they do not favor such action. If we are to let's tell him. If we are against it, let's tell him. Charles Raper Jones, our congressman, can be addressed in the House of Representatives. Sen. Sam Ervin is in the Senate Office Building. The chairman of the committee handling the legislation is Jere Cooper in the House of Representatives.

—C. E. BREWER

The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co. of New Jersey

Just Verdict Reached In Henkel Case

THE Civil Service Board's dismissal of Capt. Lloyd Henkel from the Charlotte police force was a just verdict in an unpleasant case.

There is no cause for rejoicing in the Civil Service Board's decision. There are few citizens who cannot exercise a measure of sympathy for Capt. Henkel. He is a likable person who apparently enjoys a number of friendships in the community. No one likes to see a man fired from an organization after 23 years of service. Thus there was a tempting quality to the defense argument that Henkel may have been a little careless but that he was merely doing what others had done.

But by accepting that argument the board would have sanctioned grossly improper activities on Henkel's part, invited more of the same by others, dealt a terrific blow to police discipline, and agreed that a police captain has no obligation to set a high standard of conduct.

The heart of the defense argument

seemed to us, was that, unless Capt. Henkel could be proved a crook, it was the duty of the city to forgive him. The prosecution argued that the captain did indeed break a law in cashing checks which he had no funds.

In regard to the question before the board, the matter was largely irrelevant. Morality is not synonymous with legality. Good conduct and proper performance of duties cannot be judged by a standard book. There are certain rules of conduct, written and unwritten, that must prevail among citizens generally and among public officials especially if decent standards are to be upheld in a community.

The evidence left no doubt that Capt. Henkel violated those rules. Contrary to the implication of the defense, everybody is not doing what Capt. Henkel did.

But if his offenses had gone unpunished, a great many more officials and citizens would have been encouraged to do what he did.

After extensive experiment we have found that something like the right viewing angle can be achieved by placing the television set on the mantelpiece and watching from a rather high kitchen chair mounted on the first eight vol-

umes of either the ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA or GROVE'S DICTIONARY OF MUSIC AND MUSICIANS. Alternatively you can screw the set to the ceiling, screen downwards, and lie on your back on the hearth rug. Slim viewers might manage by placing the set on a tripod on the floor, and lying above it, face downwards, on the table. The only disadvantage of the latter position is that while the diaphragm is unusually well supported, the eyeballs are not only dangerous but positively unsightly.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON

HERE are the events which took place behind the scenes in the White House and in the Pentagon immediately after the momentous decision was made to send American Marines into strife-torn Lebanon.

Yes, President Nixon did not participate in the decision. This is considered significant. He was briefed by the Joint Chiefs at 7:45 the next morning at breakfast, but did not participate in the high-level meeting Monday between Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, Gen. Nathan Twining, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Acting Secretary of Defense Donald Quarles, who made the final decision after the congressional delegation had left the White House.

World Opinion

The President, the morning after the decision was made, showed considerable nervousness about getting American troops committed too far in the Near

'Baghdad On The Subway'

new Premier Iyad Bak. Gen. Abdul Karim al-Kassas, is not pro-Communist and does not want to give the United States indirect assurances from him that it would continue to flow and that he wanted to be a neutral.



Regarding the first, the decision has been in the affirmative. Turkish troops are ready to be used.

Regarding the second question—Russian volunteers—the Joint Chiefs have been in favor of shooting them down if they try to reach Iraq. The only way they can reach Iraq is by plane. U.S. military leaders advised, though their decision is not final, that U.S. forces should make cer-

neutral embassies in Baghdad that the new Premier Iyad Bak. Gen. Abdul Karim al-Kassas, is not pro-Communist and does not want to give the United States indirect assurances from him that it would continue to flow and that he wanted to be a neutral.

Regarding the first, the decision has been in the affirmative. Turkish troops are ready to be used.

Regarding the second question—Russian volunteers—the Joint Chiefs have been in favor of shooting them down if they try to reach Iraq. The only way they can reach Iraq is by plane. U.S. military leaders advised, though their decision is not final, that U.S. forces should make cer-

neutral embassies in Baghdad that the new Premier Iyad Bak. Gen. Abdul Karim al-Kassas, is not pro-Communist and does not want to give the United States indirect assurances from him that it would continue to flow and that he wanted to be a neutral.

Regarding the first, the decision has been in the affirmative. Turkish troops are ready to be used.

Regarding the second question—Russian volunteers—the Joint Chiefs have been in favor of shooting them down if they try to reach Iraq. The only way they can reach Iraq is by plane. U.S. military leaders advised, though their decision is not final, that U.S. forces should make cer-

From The Manchester Guardian

TELEVIEWING CAN BE PERILOUS

IN the past twelve months I have seen no fewer than five patients," writes a correspondent in the current BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, "who had collapsed with substernal pain and shock while they were watching television. In the first, now 'substernal' apart, one can understand the pain and shock. We have known the old twinge ourselves. But apparently the good doctor's patients were suffering from no ordinary sort of angst or revolution. He goes on to elaborate clinically.

"The link between these cases," he writes, "was that each was a man who had eaten a heavy meal shortly before the attack commenced, and had then sat down in a low chair to watch the program. (Which program is carefully left unspecified.) Moreover, one of the patients, found to be suffering from hiatus hernia, had inordinately consumed two bottles of a popular fizzy drink in quick succession shortly before he was taken ill."

Now to the diagnosis. "The viewer has a tendency to select a 'comfortable' armchair which is low and deep from front to back, and the next to him he sits, slopes backwards so that the buttocks are below the level of the knees. This position is mechanically unsound, for it is bound to lead to upward pressure on the diaphragm, particularly when the stomach is overfull." And so to the prescription. "The old-fashioned straight-backed chair with a firm seat is far



UNDERGROUND INTRIGUES

Regarding the first, the decision has been in the affirmative. Turkish troops are ready to be used.

Regarding the second question—Russian volunteers—the Joint Chiefs have been in favor of shooting them down if they try to reach Iraq. The only way they can reach Iraq is by plane. U.S. military leaders advised, though their decision is not final, that U.S. forces should make cer-

neutral embassies in Baghdad that the new Premier Iyad Bak. Gen. Abdul Karim al-Kassas, is not pro-Communist and does not want to give the United States indirect assurances from him that it would continue to flow and that he wanted to be a neutral.

Regarding the first, the decision has been in the affirmative. Turkish troops are ready to be used.

Regarding the second question—Russian volunteers—the Joint Chiefs have been in favor of shooting them down if they try to reach Iraq. The only way they can reach Iraq is by plane. U.S. military leaders advised, though their decision is not final, that U.S. forces should make cer-