



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON... President and Publisher
ROBERT H. LAMPERT... Advertising Director
CIVIL PRINCE... Editor
PERRY MORGAN... Associate Editor
R. L. YOUNG JR... Managing Editor
JAMES McDOWELL... Circulation Manager

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 1958

The Short, Happy Route To Prohibition

THE massive hypocrisy of Alcohol Beverage Control policies is no longer hard news, but the latest example is strangely appealing.

Recognizing that the old "legal limit" rule of one gallon of liquor per purchaser is a dreadful barrier for party-shoppers, Mecklenburg's ABC Board has conjured up a bulk buying system.

The community's Good Time Charles simply apply at the central ABC office for a purchase memorandum. This little document goes to a local store manager so bottles can be packaged and ready when the customer arrives.

However, prospective hosts may receive in hand only a gallon at a time. If it's to be a sizeable blow-out and our own vivacious, say five gallons he must tote the hooch out the door in five separate and distinct trips. ABC officials do not insist that he pretend to be a different customer each time; contrary to local folklore, because they're business tinseltown. After all, business is business and the business of the ABC Board is

selling liquor.

That the purchaser loads all five gallons into the rear of one automobile—in brazen defiance of the law—is his business. Why pry?

Thus, Mecklenburg's long anxious and notably patient buyers for "100-proof" virtue in merchandising booze goes on. The ABC Board would have us believe that it is breaking no law. Possibly not. But it is bending the spirit of the law into the shape of German pretzels.

The next thing we know the board will be installing revolving doors in their stores so bulk purchasers can register the proper number of entrances and exits in advance, in accordance with what is quaintly described as "the law."

The intent of the law is fairly plain. If it is a bad law, the board ought to recommend appropriate changes. If it isn't, the board ought to live within its spirit as well as its letter. By bending it to local folklore, because they're business tinseltown. After all, business is business and the business of the ABC Board is

Desegregation Reaches Crucial Stage

ASSIGNMENT of seven judges to hear the Little Rock school case emphasizes once again the crucial stage now reached in the desegregation process.

Indeed, were there 70 instead of seven judges assigned to the case there could not be much comfort in numbers. The appeal court's decision on an attempt to overturn a district court's permission to postpone desegregation in Little Rock is bound to be controversial. It will inflame either the segregationist or the integrationist camp.

But there is no hope of avoiding controversy. The painful thing for the judges is that they must hope to arrive at a constructive conclusion in a case where there are so few visible signs that such a conclusion is possible—or, at least, so few signs as to what would be a constructive conclusion.

In granting a postponement, Judge Lemley dealt with conditions that now exist in Little Rock. He decided that without a cooling off period there could be no proper education for any student at Little Rock's Central High, white or colored. There was plenty of evidence

before him to sustain that conclusion.

But can the conditions be separated from the provocative actions of Gov. Faubus that helped to create them? The actions of the governor have found no favor in the courts, but the result of the actions have been recognized by the district court as an acceptable reason for reversing the desegregation that occurred.

The court of appeals will have to ponder this point. If it goes along with Judge Lemley in separating the cause and the effects, there is the strong probability that other Little Rocks will occur in the South. But if, on the other hand, it reverses Judge Lemley, there would be a strong possibility that federal troops again would be required to enforce integration. And if that were viewed as winning a battle, it would certainly would be losing the war. For nothing is more certain than that a policy of forced integration would fail.

The court cannot make an easy decision. It will need all its wisdom, and then some, to arrive at a workable decision.

Mr. Sinclair Weeks Goes To Sea

A FLASH flood of his own rhetoric swept Sinclair Weeks far out to sea in his emotional defense of Sherman Adams.

The secretary of commerce said Adams has been "whipped more brutally than any individual in public life in our generation," and has been "cruelly smeared by vindictive hater-mongers." And Weeks rang in again, as so many of Adams' friends are wont to do, "this rugged New England character."

These expressions are imprudent, because they are not so. There is no need to go into chapter and verse about the careless and brutal questioning of other people's loyalty by certain political associates of Mr. Weeks. Richard Nixon reportedly wants to forget what he said about Jerry Voorhis and Helen Gahagan Douglas in California. George C. Marshall's enduring record of service to the nation has pretty well obscured what was said about him by the McGuffey clique. Already forgotten are hundreds of little people who were smeared and cheated of their livelihoods by persons well known to Sinclair Weeks, and for no cause other than political advancement.

So much for refreshing Mr. Weeks' memory.

Without doubt there is a political interest in the investigation of Sherman Adams. There also is a legitimate public interest. But as far as Adams is concerned there has been no "whiplashing" except for the Harris Committee's respectable decision to offer a public forum to John Fox. There has been an entirely proper exposure of Adams' improper use of his office and the maintenance of a double standard of morality in the administration. Even if Adams was an innocent victim of political hater-mongers, he would be fortunate in having his honesty—rather than his loyalty—questioned.

But the most stunning thing about Mr. Weeks' statement is his reference to his friends' "rugged New England character." What in the world is that?

Everybody remembers, of course, that:

Lizzie Borden took an axe
And gave her mother forty whacks;
When she saw what she had done
She gave her father forty-one.

And there's no denying that Lizzie, who lived in Fall River, Mass., was a "rugged New England character." Indeed, yes.

But Sinclair Weeks seems to be asserting that a special virtue embraces all the people indigenous to the considerable acreage lying between Nova Scotia and New York—that there is something in New England's rocks and hills that imparts to all New Englanders a unique and unquestionable integrity. This is bunk.

Sam and Max were always fighting, always calling each other names. Finally they ended up in court. And even in court they were fighting.

"Wait a minute," said the judge. "I think this can be settled out of court. Shake hands and say something for good will."

So Max took Sam's hand and said, "Sam, shake. I wish for you what you wish for me."

"See, Judge?" exclaimed Sam. "He's commencing again." — LAMAR (Mo.) DEMOCRAT.

A statesman is a politician with a high fidelity record.—ELLAVILLE (Ga.) SUN.

Middle Eastern Crisis Must Be Settled By Diplomacy

By WALTER LIPPMANN

WASHINGTON
FOR THE moment, there appears to be a pause with something of the nature of military standstill in the Middle East. It is precarious, and most certainly it is temporary. But it rests, so it would seem, on a recognition in both camps that the status quo cannot now be altered by military means without inordinate and incalculable risk.

The three Western powers have agreed that they will not invade Iraq in order to make a counter-revolution, and that they will not permit Turkey or Jordan to march against Baghdad. On the other hand, it is reasonably clear that Nasser and Khrushchev will not now move their military forces against the American Marines and the British paratroopers.

HOPE OF DECEIT

During this momentary balance of power, it is the task of the statesman and the diplomats to take over.

A cool assessment of our position is the essential basis of a constructive diplomatic policy. What happened in Iraq, the key-stone of the Baghdad Pact and supposedly the one firm and secure ally of the West in the Middle East? Was King Faisal's government the victim of external aggression as were Czechoslovakia and Poland and Hungary? It was not. King Faisal's government was overthrown swiftly and totally by a conspiracy of Iraqi officers.

What is most significant is that the Iraqi army supported the revolution immediately and that this revolution is manifestly popular in the country. So, we would be deluding ourselves if we believed that the friendly government of Iraq was subverted by foreign agents acting contrary to the national sentiment of the country.

REASON FOR RESTRAINT

There is, therefore, no reason to hope that there will be a

counter-revolution which restores the old Iraqi regime. It is plain that no kind of military intervention—for example, by King Hussein of Jordan backed by the British and the Americans—would have any chance of success. It has been said that what restrains us is the fear of Russian intervention in Iraq. That is not the only, or even the best, reason. For even if Russian neutrality were guaranteed, which it is not, no Western military intervention in Iraq could succeed in establishing an independent Arab government in Baghdad. There could be only a puppet government, dependent on the British and American forces, and doomed to destruction if they were ever withdrawn. This is another way of saying that the popular revolutionary movement of the Arabs cannot be overcome by Western arms.

MARINES A LIABILITY

This same fundamental truth applies to our present position in the Lebanon. We cannot successfully entrench ourselves there in hostile opposition to the Arab movement. In fact, we cannot assure the independence of the Lebanon with the forces that are now at Beirut and on the beaches nearby. The independence of the Lebanon can be assured only if the civil war is ended and the new Lebanese state is then guaranteed protection.

Now, it is almost certain true that while the Marines can protect President Chamoun against a palace revolution like that in Baghdad, the Marines are a liability when it comes to making a lasting settlement of the civil war. For any Lebanese government which owes its existence to the Marines is doomed to destruction when the Marines leave. Moreover, the longer the Marines stay on, the greater will be the popular opposition to them in the Lebanon.



The Arena Of Conflict Is Vast And Explosive

This leads me to think that the Lebanese policy, as we have presented it to the U.N., is too thin, is lacking in diplomatic vitality, and may be quite sterile. We have said that the Marines will go on when a U.N. force replaces them. As the chances are not good that the U.N. will set up a force to replace the Marines, we are in danger of having to leave the Marines in the Lebanon for the indefinite future, to leave them there not only without the hope of withdrawal but without the hope of accomplishing anything while they remain.

SETTLEMENT

It seems to me that we should, therefore, come forward soon with a large proposal for the political future of the Lebanon. It would have to begin with the settlement of the civil war, perhaps by the good offices of Mr. Hammarskjöld. The settlement

would be followed by the neutralization of the Lebanon under the guarantee of the U.N., which would include the interested powers.

We must seek, I think, to give Nasser and Nasser a political interest and a juridical reason for allowing the Lebanon to exist as an independent state. There is no other way, short of unconditional and unlimited war, to prevent indirect aggression while a popular feeling is what it is in the Middle East.

GOOD BEGINNING

A neutralized Lebanon would not be the end of the Middle Eastern problem. But it might be an auspicious beginning of a settlement. For it would establish the principle, which is essential to any settlement, that the Soviet Union and the Nasser confederation have interests in the Middle East and that we are pre-

pared to work out an accommodation.

There will be some, perhaps many, who believe that an accommodation of interests is in the post sense of the word, the Munich sense, appeasement. For myself, I do not think that it is appeasement, that Nasser's part in the last revolution is at all like the dismantlement of Czechoslovakia by Hitler.

NASSER ISNT HITLER

Nasser is Nasser, not Hitler, and while he is difficult and unfriendly to the West, he is not the master of a great military machine, and while we deal with him, we can keep our composure. We must not become the victim of our old stereotypes, seeing all our international events in terms of "Munich," or "Yalta," or "Pearl Harbor," and therefore never seeing clearly and freshly the events themselves as in fact they are.

French Fear Soviets Will Land Paratroopers In Syria

By MARQUIS CHILDS

PARIS
DESPITE soothing assurances from Washington, the belief is growing there that the Soviet Union is likely to intervene directly in the Middle East crisis by landing Russian troops in Syria.

This was the conviction of sources with access to both governmental and private intelligence out of the turbulent area where American forces in Lebanon and British troops in Jordan are trying to sustain established order against the rising tide of Arab nationalism backed by communism. The current crisis is expected to come to a climax in the following sequence of events:

In response to "appeals" from Syria to Moscow, to help protect Syrian independence from "aggression" aimed from neighboring Jordan and the "imperialists" now entrenched there, Russia will dispatch troops to the area. During the past two days both the Syrian and Egyptian radio have taken an increasingly violent tone, with charges that the "war-mongering imperialists" intend to launch an attack against Jordan's neighbor. This

is believed to be a buildup preparatory to Soviet action. While this will throw a new fright into the West, the same sources that predict this move also convinced that, having an unforeseen incident, it will not lead to open conflict. Moscow's motive will be to obtain a stronger bargaining position. In the United Nations and in every other forum the Russians are saying, "We came to protect our friends. We will remove our troops from Syria if and when you pull yours out of Lebanon and Jordan."

incident which could touch off a war that in the first phase at least would have a resemblance to the Korean conflict. But they believe that Moscow, despite all the shouting and the demonstrations—these may even be symptomatic of a determination to avoid war while employing a bargaining position of intimidation—is anxious to preserve peace. Considerable prominence has been given in Paris to reports that President Nasser on his secret emergency flight to Moscow stressed to Khrushchev the importance of avoiding any overt-act that would set off a conflict.

CLIMAX TO COME
Russia may, of course, stop short of actual intervention which involves grave risks. But to have troops in the area and particularly on the pretext of responding to the British-American "threat" would give the Soviets a bargaining power they do not now have, or such at any rate is the interpretation of ex-

posed officials and those who must with the problem of the Middle East a greater sense of assurance during the past 24 hours. They do not exclude an

'It's Really More Of A 2-Power Conference, Ain't It?'



Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

The Mess Could Have Been Avoided

JUST one year ago, Dr. Giuseppe Pella, foreign minister of Italy, came to Washington to give John Foster Dulles a plan for the Near East. Dulles said he saw how the new Syria had divided in the Near East since we are in today.

Dr. Pella foresaw that Nasserism would sweep all the Near East, to be followed by communism, if the West did not help conquer the poverty, the filth, the dusty, disease-ridden areas, the contrasts between hovel-dwelling kings and ragged felahs in the Near East.

They Copied Israel

He saw what Nasser had done in dividing up the irrigated land of Egypt, once dominated by only 27 families. He saw how the new Syria had divided up the land from the old aristocracy. Both Syria and Egypt, incidentally, had followed the land reform law of little Israel

which they hate, but which nevertheless helped make Nasser popular with the masses.

So the Italian foreign minister proposed that a fund for the development of underdeveloped areas be created from the Marshall Plan loans which West European nations were then due to repay the U.S. He proposed that the American repayments be matched by payments from European nations, and the money be spent for irrigation, the River Jordan, on the Nile, the Tigris, the Euphrates and elsewhere, to resettle Palestinian refugees and generally improve the economic-social condition of the Near East.

Truman's Plan

This essentially was the plan Harry Truman had been working on when he left the White House. "The solution for the Near East," he once told me, "is not arms, but dams and

more electric power and more wheat. This area used to hold 60 million people in the days of the Greeks and Romans. Now it holds 23 million because the Mongols knocked out the irrigation works and because these people have been too busy fighting against each other.

'It Can Be Done'

"We have got to teach the Arabs that they need Jewish know-how and that they all need other things, like irrigation, patience, leadership and a big public works program it can do."

Acc-In-The-Hole

One political ace-in-the-hole Eisenhower has up his sleeve, if he wants to use him, is Adlai Stevenson, whom fate has put right now in Russia. Stevenson, a skilled negotiator, could be drafted as a troubleshooter to talk to Khrushchev about a summit conference and the Near

People's Platform

Social Security Plan Helps All Americans
Cheraw, S. C.

I FEEL it my duty in behalf of our older people and our disabled children to reply to a letter on Social Security in People's Platform last week from an insurance company's representative.

We are all getting older every day and some of us know the hardships of our old and frequently disabled citizens' lives of high living costs. I can't understand how anyone could be opposed to Social Security payments to these people who need assistance so badly.

I notice that those who pay the tax—the workers and the employers—are not saying very much against the planned increase in these payments. I believe Congress should pass this bill in order to protect the well

being of our citizens who need and deserve help.

Many of our people have had many deals and promises from big insurance corporations. I will call the people's attention to the small print in most policies and the loopholes that the companies have. Why haven't they produced a policy similar to Social Security that would cost any more than the small amount paid for Social Security?

The insurance companies are opposed to Social Security. They have got a better plan at the price the people pay for Social Security. Until they do, they should not criticize Social Security. Regardless of the cost, it is one of the best laws we have. It helps everybody in our country in one way or another. We should all appeal to our congressmen at once to pass the bill increasing Social Security benefits.

—J. A. GRAHAM

People's Platform

Social Security Plan Helps All Americans

Cheraw, S. C.

I FEEL it my duty in behalf of our older people and our disabled children to reply to a letter on Social Security in People's Platform last week from an insurance company's representative.

We are all getting older every day and some of us know the hardships of our old and frequently disabled citizens' lives of high living costs. I can't understand how anyone could be opposed to Social Security payments to these people who need assistance so badly.

'It Can Be Done'

"We have got to teach the Arabs that they need Jewish know-how and that they all need other things, like irrigation, patience, leadership and a big public works program it can do."

Acc-In-The-Hole

One political ace-in-the-hole Eisenhower has up his sleeve, if he wants to use him, is Adlai Stevenson, whom fate has put right now in Russia. Stevenson, a skilled negotiator, could be drafted as a troubleshooter to talk to Khrushchev about a summit conference and the Near

People's Platform

Social Security Plan Helps All Americans

Cheraw, S. C.

I FEEL it my duty in behalf of our older people and our disabled children to reply to a letter on Social Security in People's Platform last week from an insurance company's representative.

We are all getting older every day and some of us know the hardships of our old and frequently disabled citizens' lives of high living costs. I can't understand how anyone could be opposed to Social Security payments to these people who need assistance so badly.

'It Can Be Done'

"We have got to teach the Arabs that they need Jewish know-how and that they all need other things, like irrigation, patience, leadership and a big public works program it can do."

Acc-In-The-Hole

One political ace-in-the-hole Eisenhower has up his sleeve, if he wants to use him, is Adlai Stevenson, whom fate has put right now in Russia. Stevenson, a skilled negotiator, could be drafted as a troubleshooter to talk to Khrushchev about a summit conference and the Near

Able Negotiator

Adlai Stevenson is an able negotiator who served during the war in the State Department. With the country in a serious crisis, a good president uses good men, regardless of politics.

Adlai Stevenson is an able negotiator who served during the war in the State Department. With the country in a serious crisis, a good president uses good men, regardless of politics.