



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON.....President and Publisher
BRODIE S. GRUETT.....General Manager
ROBERT H. LAMPE.....Advertising Director
Cecil Prince.....Editor
PERRY MORGAN.....Associate Editor
R. L. YOUNG JR.....Managing Editor
JAMES McDOWELL.....Circulation Manager

FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 1958

Give A Cheer For Community Progress

THE ideal of a single public education system for Charlotte and Mecklenburg County is a casual conceit of community builders no longer.

Slowly but surely, a vague possibility has become a hard probability. It is clear to us, and we believe, to the entire metropolitan community that both the city and county school boards are conscientiously working toward consolidation now. Commendable progress is being made—not the least of which is the detailed study of legal ramifications released this week by attorneys for the two school systems.

Both administrative units now have a thorough appreciation of the elaborate complications involved in merging two very different educational organizations. The doing will take time and effort. But most of all it will take a willingness to put aside real or imagined differences, to cooperate cheerfully and, occasionally, to compromise.

It is the opinion of attorneys that consolidation ought to be attempted under existing state statutes rather than through passage of a special act of the legislature. The first step would be the adoption of a petition requesting consolidation by the city school board for submission to the county school board. An election on a countywide supplement might follow. First, however, the policies and structure of the pro-

posed single school system ought to be predetermined. There is no better time to begin consultations on these matters than right now.

There are many questions to be answered. How, for instance, will members of a consolidated school board be chosen? What would be the role of local governing bodies—such as the Board of County Commissioners—in connection with the consolidated system's finances? What would happen to the local school committees in the county school districts? What would the administrative structure of the new metropolitan system be like—for instance, would there be one superintendent or two? How would teachers and principals be hired?

Each system now has its own way of doing things and, in all likelihood, prefers its own way. But there must be some friendly give and take on each of these points. A strong, efficient, functional system must be the result of this give and take. It must be so strong, efficient and functional that it will make possible a better education for all our children. That is the whole purpose of consolidation.

We congratulate school officials for what they have already accomplished. We urge them to perform the remaining chores with appropriate speed, thoroughness and determination.

Congress Does Right By Ex-Presidents

NOT without some spiteful exercises in ingratitude, the House has now joined the Senate in approving pensions for ex-presidents of the U.S.

The nation can now be content that its former presidents will not be forced to engage in work that would demean the office they held. Moreover, it is good to have the fact officially recognized that public obligations—burdensome obligations—pursue presidents into retirement. The government may have no further need for their services, but the people do. Herbert Hoover maintains two offices, employs three secretaries and a research assistant and handles roughly 100,000 pieces of mail every year. Harry Truman spends between \$20,000 and \$30,000 annually on his offices and clerical help needed to handle his mail.

Both in the House and Senate measures, pensions of \$20,000 a year would be provided. Widows of presidents would receive \$10,000 a year. The House would agree, the Senate is willing to provide free office space, clerical help and free mailing privileges. All this would have been beyond the wildest dreams of Ulysses S. Grant who was forced to write his memoirs while in debt in order to escape dying as a debtor. But when the burden of necessary correspondence and

travel by ex-presidents is considered, the Senate bill seems more realistic than that of the House.

Either should be acceptable, however, which is more than can be said for the attitude of those House members who objected to pensioning Truman or, when he is eligible, for President Eisenhower. They ought to be ashamed of themselves. The primary thing is to protect the dignity of the office of President, but there certainly is nothing wrong with assuring financial security of former presidents as individuals.

No President—good, bad, or indifferent—can escape bearing terrible burdens of responsibility in the White House. Those members who have voted themselves pensions but who objected to pensions for particular ex-presidents are something less than charitable.

It should not escape notice that a minority report of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee expressed the fear that an ex-president might use a free mailing privilege and clerical help to further a political campaign.

Well, no former President has ever had the opportunity to do this. House members have the opportunity—and some of them have used it rather shamelessly.

Their Lordships' Finest Hour Is Past

AMONG the mossier mossbacks, the consternation was great when the British House of Lords decided to accept women members.

One of Their Lordships, tuning his hearing aid into the debate, took the floor to point out that the female mind was hardly the type to consider matters affecting the public well. "We do not want women in this House," he grouched. But they're coming in, four of them named by Queen Elizabeth. And from this side of the Atlantic it appears the objecting Lords have been something less than gallant about it.

The ladies, after all, are making some sacrifice in undertaking membership. The extent of that sacrifice is very clear when one considers a few of the rules governing debate in the House of Lords. Generally, for example, a member may speak only once to any question. And (or she) may not refer to past de-

bate, nor to debates in the House of Commons.

Without a murmur of protest, the four women members have accepted these rules. Good show, we'd say. Astonishing.

The mossbacks may fear, of course, the ladies will try to change the rules once they're admitted into membership. And there may be something in that possibility to grieve about.

The Ultimate

THOR EXPLODES AFTER TAKEOFF
—Headline

THOSE Air Force scientists mustn't be too downhearted. What they have developed can truly be called the ultimate weapon—a missile that destroys itself.

From The Reporter

STILL LIFE

NOT long ago, LIFE magazine took a full page in the major New York newspapers showing a photo of Marines in Lebanon, the faces of twelve photographers, and under the headline "MIDEAST TIME-BOMB: WHAT NOW, WHAT NEXT?" the following statement: "In today's LIFE the distinguished group of photo-journalists shown above sweep confusion from the trouble-ridden area. mark which makes Mr. Luce's journalists considerably more distinguished than the heads of state."

In the perfunctory style of self-congratulations is the further comment that their illuminating after-photograph was a bewildered view into razor-sharp faces, and in the thumbnail sketches of each depth-reporter, a verb or phrase relating to the urgency of their assignments. One was "rushed," another was "pulled off" for crisis assignment, and another "sped," "flew," "stole a march," "left immediately," were "posted overnight," and "sped without even a toothbrush."

Now few will doubt the mobility of the news staff or the ability of these crisis-assigned gentlemen to report what they see. But not even the most meticulous and timely pictures can make "the

complicated plain and the puzzling primer-clear." This is the fallacy of reliance on sight instead of on insight.

Pictures are interesting and can be valuable. But until they can penetrate the circuits and convolutions of minds like Khrushchev's and Dulles's and Tito's and Nasser's, all they can portray is a static image of the act. The motive from which it springs no lens can capture.

A New Yorker who spent a short vacation in Texas alone returned home bringing his wife several coats, a Cadillac and pockets full of money. "And how were you able to get all these things?" she asked. "Shucks, honey," he replied, "I was in Houston during Halloween and went out playing trick or treat." —FORT MYERS (FLA.) NEWS-PRESS.

By JOSEPH ALSEP

WASHINGTON
THE time has come, once again, to take a very grave step in this space. It is time to say quite bluntly that the Eisenhower administration is guilty of gross untruth concerning the nation's defense of the United States.

The false claims were most succinctly put by the President himself in his last state of the nation message.

"We have now," he told the country, "a broadly based and efficient defensive strength, including a great deterrent power . . . but unless we act wisely and promptly, we could lose (sic) it."

Faubus Win Brews New Race Crisis

By DORIS FLEESON

WASHINGTON
THE Faubus landslide in Kansas as materialized as expected. In the short run, it will further discourage the southern demagogues who have been using it as an effective third force in the war over segregation. It has been one of the saddest aspects of that struggle.

Also, the emotion aroused may spill over into next-door Tennessee and further impair the re-election prospects of Sen. Albert Gore, the able moderate being challenged by former Gov. Prentice Cooper on the segregation issue. Should Gore go down, the segregationist in the new South will feel empowered.

In the long run, all the problems attached to effective enforcement of the Supreme Court ban on segregation in the public schools remain. The latest figures show the extent of Deep South defiance.

SEVEN OF ELEVEN

In seven of the 11 states of the old Confederacy, no schools have been desegregated. In the 17 southern and border states which had some laws enforcing segregation, 77 schools have obeyed the court's decree but all of these except 15 are in border states. The net is that 2,112 schools are still segregated in the South, which has about 5,300 other schools where the problem does not arise.

Gov. Orval E. Faubus' Little Rock returns to the news next week when the entire bench of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals—eight judges—will meet to hear an appeal from a lower federal court decision postponing school integration there.

SPEEDY DECISION

The Supreme Court has pointedly implied that it expects that appeals tribunal to decide the case before school reopens. That will be in only a few short weeks, since most public schools reopen after Labor Day.

Then President Eisenhower can expect he will have to take fresh and painful decisions in the civil rights area. His Civil Rights Commission will be of little help. It is still not in effective operation and its tenure is so short it can do little anything to command the situation.

UNDER HIS NOSE

The President, in addition, will have the problem under his nose. Across the river in Arlington, Va., the public schools are under a direct court order to desegregate this fall, as they are also in Charlottesville, Newport News and Norfolk.

If existing Virginia state laws are then invoked, the nation will witness the first actual closing of public schools in preference to obedience to the federal law.

NEW ISSUE

National moderates are now saying they will seek an order in the state courts to compel reopening of the schools. This would present a new legal issue. Whatever happens, only harsh emotions and hard choices are in prospect.

Aggravating the situation will be the fact that the nation will be in the midst of a hard-fought campaign to determine the complexion of the next Congress. Resent by so many problems, Republican candidates in particular will be tempted to take extreme positions and make stringent charges. In the industrial states notably, where the GOP will continue the recession issue, there will be much allure in exploitation of civil rights.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON
IMMEDIATELY after President Eisenhower made the momentous decision to land American troops in Lebanon, several events took place which led to the present frantic attempts to reverse his position and evacuate our troops.

One was the jitteriness of President Eisenhower. After asking for American aid, he subsequently demanded that U.S. troops keep out of the trouble zone and fire no shots against Lebanese rebels. Later, when U.S. trouble shooter Ambassador Robert Murphy arrived, he found Chamoun jittery, irrational, and at times incoherent. Murphy reported that Chamoun, a cardiac patient, had taken upon himself the advice of his doctors. Murphy has urged Chamoun to leave Lebanon and take asylum in the United States.

Another discouraging development was the refusal of Saudi Arabia to cooperate with the United States. When the American Ambassador in Riyadh, Don Hastin, asked for permission to use the big

capacity to deter attack or defend ourselves? He then outlined the action he proposed to take and he concluded with this promise: "We intend to assure that our vigilance, power and technical excellence keep abreast of any realistic threat that we face."

IFK MISINFORMED

Either the President was consciously misleading the nation, or he is simply decided to break his promise later on, or he has been misinformed about the facts. The third alternative is not only preferable, it is also highly probable. But that does not change the hard facts about which the President has been misinformed. Nothing will change them but a vastly greater national effort to "keep abreast" of the "realistic threat we face."

The time of deadly danger will begin soon during the period the Pentagon calls "the gap" — the years between 1960 through 1963 or 1964. Massive orders for new warware must be placed immediately — indeed they should have been placed last winter. If we are going to make the feeblest pretense of "keeping abreast" during the years of the gap.

The prospective results of the gap. This means, of course, that the balance of manned bomber strength must be weighted in favor of the Soviets; for our manned bombers are now increasingly vulnerable to interception by the more advanced defensive weapons.

MODEST MARGIN

First, we shall retain a modest margin of superiority in manned bombers throughout the years of the gap — unless the Kremlin puts its new, very long-range, supersonic jet bomber into early production, as most of course he expected. It is not expected by the administration, but all the administration's expectations are based on the kind of reading of the grim intelligence that ex-



PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Does He Have The Secret?

rence has repeatedly warned against.

Second, the NATO estimates give the Soviets a strength in air defense that is at least two times, and three or four times greater than our own air defense strength; and this wide margin of superiority will be maintained throughout the years of the gap. This means, of course, that the balance of manned bomber strength must be weighted in favor of the Soviets; for our manned bombers are now increasingly vulnerable to interception by the more advanced defensive weapons.

A FEW MISSILES

Third, we shall be sending a few intermediate-range missiles to our NATO allies in the gap years. Meanwhile the Soviets will acquire between 1,000 and 2,000 ballistic missiles with suitable ranges to neutralize or destroy

all our overseas air bases, on which the striking power of our nuclear bomber force heavily depends. And fourth, the U.S. vs. U.S.S.R. score in operational intercontinental missiles in the gap years will be U.S. 0 ICBMs vs. U.S.S.R. 100 ICBMs in 1959; U.S. 30 ICBMs vs. U.S.S.R. 600 ICBMs in 1960; U.S. 100 ICBMs vs. U.S.S.R. 1000 ICBMs in 1961; U.S. 130 ICBMs (plus a few submarine-borne Polaris, per se) vs. U.S.S.R. 1000 ICBMs in 1962; and U.S. 130 ICBMs (plus more Polaris) vs. U.S.S.R. 2000 ICBMs in 1963.

KEEPING ABRIST?

Furthermore, only a few score more of the Navy's Polaris missiles will alter the balance in 1964. And the still solid-fueled Minuteman missile, on which the Pentagon is gambling the American future, cannot possibly be ready for operational use before the end of 1963 or early 1964. It will probably be later than this.

If this is "keeping abreast," one would like to know how the administration defines "falling behind." The effect of the present policy is indisputable. It will allow the Soviets to gain an overwhelming superiority in overall nuclear striking power. And if anyone wonders what results to expect from this kind of Soviet superiority, it is only necessary to look back a few years, to the last time this reporter took the same grave step of charging official untruth about the national defense.

JOHNSON'S 'FAT'

That was when the egotistical Louis A. Johnson was swearing he was "only cutting fat, not muscle." The Truman-Louis Johnson disarmament policy ended in the Korean War. But at least Truman and Louis Johnson then had

the excuse that the United States still possessed a virtual monopoly of nuclear striking power. Now we are tacitly letting the Soviets gain an overwhelming superiority in this crucial area where we are supposed to have a monopoly. We are doing this moreover, after abandoning superiority to the Soviets in almost all other arms areas. Can any sane man suppose that this folly is not immeasurably more dangerous than the folly of Louis Johnson? Or can any sane man seriously suppose that the end-result will be measurably more terrible? At this instant, the last chance to save ourselves is slipping through our hands.

It's Too Easy To Step Out Of The Draft

By ROBERT C. RUARK

PALAMOS, Spain
MY OLD sparring partner, Lew Hershey, the gent who runs the handicraft - volunteer business - has come up with something more than a germ of a suspicion. General Hershey allows that a lot of our youth, having the military call-up by "playing dumb," since we have placed a stress on simulating mental illness in the military, are passing out of the national defense.

Says the doughty general, who must have more time in grade than John Edgar Hoover has put in the FBI: "Fifty per cent of those called up are listed as unfit for service. I don't understand why 20 per cent of our youth, including the high school graduates, fail to pass fourth grade mental ability tests."

OBSCLETE LAWS

Of course it's true that our draft laws are obsolete, and that nobody in his right mind would want any soldier when there was no war to make the uniform glamorous and the idea of freedom, not to mention privacy, intriguing. A war is a leveler, and they yell at you maybe you ought to drop everything and go.

But from what I read, at the moment, from a recent study, fathers, worthy athletes, deserving cases and dumb jobs can be so easy with the other kids give up good jobs in order to work for Uncle at reduced wages and certainly a lack of freedom, not to mention privacy. This is again mind of the reserve business, when they kept the kids back into the field — men like Gerry Coleman men like Ted Williams, who I think fought three different wars, men like a lot of boys you and I knew who paid and paid and paid for the privilege of offering their lives for grabs in a succession of wars.

NO COMPLAINT

Certainly I have no personal complaint, because I did my time in a blue suit, and on arms and legs alone, I could get quality. I was even a member of the Reserve Division of a Girl Scout troop. No, I don't need this kind even to prepare over the intramural warfare of a marshalling footstep party. But I still would have a certain amount of pride, I might even time into the fray if somebody bothered.

What I do not understand is a young man playing dumb or pleading dependents to beat what is generally a rewarding experience, a couple of years in the armed forces. As a young guy I wouldn't want to hitchhike down life's four-lane highway with the name "draft-dropper" laid on me. Apart from pride, it's a real stupidity.

DAMAGING TERM

In a small community, the term "draft dropper" can literally ruin a boy for the rest of his life. Whether he's up for a job in a bank or bucking for the Kiwanis Club, or even a big city, a record of intentional cowardice can be brutally harmful. Most companies ask for a record of an applicant's military service.

What do you write on the blank? I was too stupid to be a GI? There goes the job. I was a coward? Out the window. I was a bunch, blind in one eye, had three legs? There goes the job. Young lady says: What did you do in the military? I was a draft-dropper, and you say, I ducked it. She went thataway.

King Hussein repeatedly asked for American troops, repeatedly expressed a desire to take the offensive against that of his kingdom which had deserted — Iraq.

'I Can Lick Any Other Peace-Lover In The House'



People's Platform

Kick Russians Out Of United Nations

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

I CAN'T understand why the United Nations doesn't kick Russia out. Russia is no business being a member of it. Russia has vetoed about everything the United Nations has proposed. Russia is a God-damned, Christianity-hating, freedom-hating nation, and our President and Congress ought

to know that they will never reach any mutual agreement with Russia, and no one can trust the word of an infidel. If we are going to have a United Nations, it should be composed only of free-loving nations, and the freedom of religion, the right to worship God as free people. Most South American countries also are opposed to freedom of religious worship.

It is impossible to build up any organization, if the Devil is in it. The Christian religion sets men

free; it does not persecute Christians, and the Bible commands that Christian people come out from among them and be a separated people. The United States government ought to teach these murderers to have respect for American citizens when they go abroad, and not to molest them. You can do business with the Devil, so why try it? It is time for all members of Congress in Washington to show themselves to be men, and not mice. Let's have a United Nations of God-fearing free-loving people.

—PARKS A. YANDEL

Crisis Wrecked Chamoun's Composure

American air base at Dhahran for U.S. military planes, he just did get an answer. Crown Prince Faisal, now real ruler of Saudi Arabia, reported that he had tried to secure landing rights from the Saudi Cabinet, but they had asked too many questions for him to answer. Prince Faisal complained that he had not been given enough information by the United States to satisfy the questions of his ministers.

Folded Fails

This was just an Arab stall. Saudi Arabia is a monarchy where one man's word is law. Prince Faisal could have given that word himself. The Eisenhower administration evaded all kinds of fiasco and royal chivalry to enter into the Saudi deal. The deal was renewed, but current military use was denied. As these developments were called

back to President Eisenhower in Washington, a highly important secret meeting took place in Moscow. President Nasser of Egypt, though supposedly en route to Syria from a conference with Tito in Yugoslavia, suddenly turned up in Moscow. Just how he got there still remains a mystery. His yacht was under observation all the way from the Adriatic to Syria and it was thought he was aboard. But he was not. Possibly a dummy substituted for him aboard the yacht. At any rate his sudden arrival in Moscow was a complete surprise.

His talks with Khrushchev kept Washington on tenterhooks. At first it was thought that Nasser would give Russian support for possible military intervention against the United States. Sketchy reports now received indicate that he advised Khrushchev just the opposite, namely, to stay out of the Near East except as a last resort in case of a British-American attack on Iraq. Meanwhile the new Iraqi government

was making diplomatic overtures to the West to save off any western plans for attack. It sent word first through the West German Embassy, later direct through the American Embassy in Baghdad, that it would continue to flow. It even sent a work crew to the GO HOME posters plastered on the Baghdad walls during the revolt. Ambassador Gallman reported that the new government seemed to be popular with the Iraqi people.

False Front?

Offsetting this, Eisenhower received vigorous representations both from the Turks and King Hussein of Jordan that the new Iraqi government was practicing a false front, aimed at lulling the West into a false sense of security.

King Hussein repeatedly asked for American troops, repeatedly expressed a desire to take the offensive against that of his kingdom which had deserted — Iraq.