THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

Brodie S. Griffith ..... Editor and General Manager
Cecil Prince ..... Associate Editor
R. L. Young Jr. ..... Managing Editor

FRIDAY, JULY 31, 1959

What's The Score On Consolidation?

The long summer's nap that followed Mecklenburg's approval of a consolidated city-county school system ended abruptly yesterday.

It was about time.

Less than a year remains to combine North Carolina's two largest units of public education into a single working organism.

It is a tremendous task, requiring literally thousands of sensitive adjustments, numerous administrative decisions and a whole new table of organization.

Intimately affected by the operation will be approximately 56,000 school children, 2,100 teachers and more than 1,000 additional employes. All want to know — and deserve to know — what is going to happen to them and when.

Furthermore, public school administrators throughout the region are watching Mecklenburg with enormous interest, and curiosity. The step this metropolitan community has taken is a bold and imaginative one. It may very well set the pattern for large city and county school systems all over the South. This makes it even more important for Mecklenburg to plot its progress prudently and to give consolidation every conceivable opportunity to live up to its promise.

None of this can be accomplished until the two school boards and their administrative staff begin working closely, albeit informally, as a team long before the merger becomes official. The appropriate time to start is right now.

The City School Board properly made a move in this direction yesterday. It would be well for the County School Board to respond immediately to the challenge and for the ground rules of a working partnership to be established before another school year begins.

Certainly the problem of public relations and information ought to be one of the first concerns of the two bodies. We have discovered widespread misunderstanding of the timetable of consolidation and of its significance as far as individual students are concerned.

In general, consolidation will eliminate the boundaries between the two school systems and will allow most children to attend schools nearest their homes. But consolidation will **not** become effective when the new school year begins in September, nor when the city limits are extended on Jan. 1. The effective date is next July 1, coinciding with the beginning of the next fiscal year.

In the months that remain between now and that date a whole new educational apparatus must be fashioned. There is not a moment to lose.

For Two Governing Democrats, 1960 Spells Symington

By JOSEPH ALSOP

HARRISBURG, Pa.

Along with Louisiana delegates, if Gov. Earl Long still has anything to say about them, Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri can pretty well count on the massive Pennsylvania delegation, if Gov. David Lawrence has anything to say about it. And Gov. Lawrence will have almost everything to say about it.

Such is the inescapable conclusion here, although Gov. Lawrence is one of the really professional veiled prophets of American politics. Hence he is very far from solidly committing himself at this stage in the Democratic presidential contest.

In a technical sense, Gov. Long's commitment, which is unqualified, gives the unavowed Symington candidacy an ornament that none of the horde of other Democratic candidates can boast. Symington is the first to have got the clear promise of a fairly big state delegation by the state's governor.

PROMISE

The promise was given over the weekend, after the ailing Louisiana governor wildly bustled off to see Sen. Symington's real backer, former President Harry S. Truman. Very likely, Gov. Long "only did it to annoy because he knew it teased" his nephew, Sen. Russell Long, who is backing the even more unavowed candidacy of Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas. Moreover, it is at least doubtful whether Gov. Long will be there to keep his promise at convention time.



Lawrence, Symington, Long: A modest Little Bandwagon

In a practical sense, therefore, the favorable inclination of Gov. Lawrence is much more important to Sen. Symington than the promise of Gov. Long. The reasoning behind the inclination is both interesting and revealing.

ELIMINATION

In brief, Gov. Lawrence arrives at Symington by a kind of elimination contest — by a system of reduction to Symington after finding fatal flaws in all Symington's rivals. As he has said in public, the governor believes that Adlai E. Stevenson is "the best man the Democratic Party has." But he considers that Stevenson's vote-getting record as a two-time loser just about scratches him from the list.

After Stevenson, Gov. Lawrence makes no bones about considering Senate Majority Leader Johnson his party's "biggest figure." But the Negro vote, so important in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, is said to be hopelessly hostile to Johnson. The Democratic Party organization is also said to be hostile, which this reporter can testify to be true.

Hence Johnson is crossed off, unless the senator can overcome this double hostility. This would require the kind of action in the field of civil rights that Johnson is hardly able to take.

RULED OUT

Having ruled out the two men considered to be much the ablest potential candidates, Gov. Lawrence is then left with the junior senatorial trio, Stuart Symington, Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, and John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts. Neither Gov. Lawrence nor any other Pennsylvania Democratic leader feels any visible enthusiasm for the Humphrey candidacy. That leaves Symington and Kennedy.

If the choice were left to the majority of the Pennsylvania organization, it is pretty clear that Kennedy would get the nod. But the governor, Symington undoubtedly has other important friends here. Most important among them is the somewhat tarnished Philadelphia boss, William Green, who organized the big dinner that introduced Symington to the Pennsylvania Democracy. But most of the lesser organization people lean to Kennedy, because they feel he has strong mass support.

OBJECTION TO KENNEDY

Gov. Lawrence's objection to Kennedy, which appears to be decisive, is simply his Catholicism. The objection is highly unlikely to be overcome. The governor's old friend, Joseph P. Kennedy, has tried and failed to overcome it — which is the only known political intervention of the father on the son's behalf. The objection is founded on Gov. Lawrence's own experience in the last election, when he feels that he, as a Catholic, lost great numbers of Protestant votes.

On the face of the record, the governor's view cannot be proven. He ran about 200,000 votes ahead of the Democratic senatorial candidate, former Gov. George Leader, who was defeated. While Leader led Lawrence in some rural counties, Lawrence himself admits that in other, more urban areas, he gained extra votes because of his Catholicism. The unpopularity of the previous Democratic state administration ought to be enough to explain Lawrence's relatively narrow margin of victory.

MUCH CHARM

But the governor has made his own investigation and is convinced his Catholicism was largely responsible for his winning by less than 100,000 votes, whereas he expected to win by 300,000. So Kennedy too is ruled out; and this leaves only Symington, to whom "there is no objection"

Sen. Symington is an able man of much charm, who has courageously dealt with the great issue of national defense. But in this dangerous year of doubtful grace, it seems a bit odd to pick a presidential candidate because "there is no objection" to him. It is a fair prediction that more positive reasons will eventually have to be found if Gov. Lawrence is going to ride a Symington bandwagon to victory.

Adlai's Still There — Grin And All

Like a cat immune to the ninth mortal blow, Adlai Stevenson continues against all odds to slink onto the scene wherever Democrats talk about a candidate for 1960.

The late example of this feline durability (totally involuntary on his part) loomed this week when Rep. Charles O. Porter (D-Ore) announced he will enter Adlai's name in the Oregon primary next May. Sen. Richard Neuberger of that state was quick to announce his joyful support of the idea. And although Adlai himself, in Florence, Italy, requested that the Oregonians not "embarrass" him with the move, they seem set on putting his name on the list anyway. Rep. Porter's straw poll showed the governor still leading the field. It appears that only an affadavit would keep Stevenson out of the poll; and those who have interviewed him recently have the impression he wouldn't exactly go out of his way to file it. He is reported to have told a close friend, recently, "I want to let nature take its course."

On the whole, it is King Poll that keeps Adlai slinking around. The most recent Gallup Poll showed a Stevenson-Kennedy ticket leading a Nixon-Rockefeller ticket by no less than 13 per cent. The same polls have showed other Democrats, with the exception of Kennedy, lagging far behind the Illinoisan. To those who wish to pretend that everything Stevensonian has vanished but the grin, like the Cheshire cat of legend, the latest Gallup poll is taken as a pure Kennedy triumph. Perhaps it was. But who can be sure?

The really comic aspect of Stevenson's durability is that Sens. Kennedy, Symington, and Humphrey, who make no secret of their hope for the nomination, are powerless either to remove the Stevenson haunt or finish it off. Everywhere they turn, there are Stevenson's eyes glowing in the dark. Kennedy, who has announced his intent to enter the Oregon primary, can only do so with trepidation if Stevenson's name is also entered. A defeat would lead to only one verdict and would be rather disastrous. Humphrey, always a possible Stevenson man at heart, hasn't yet managed to effect the transfer of affection from the old Stevenson camp which alone can give him headway. Gov. Brown of California, whose name is mentioned often, remains a Stevenson partisan by his own admission — as do a host of nostalgic senators, governors, and high party officials.

Wherever "Happy Days Are Here Again" is cautiously whistled in the dark, Democrats have a dilemma and a half. The Stevenson cat can't be finished off and no one is powerful enough to bell it.

Have It Your Own Way

Economy-minded taxpayers who are keeping a score card on the frills in the new Senate Office Building in Washington may wish to record that the tables in the hearing rooms are fitted with drawer knobs — but no drawers.

This can be taken two ways. Either the "savers" are economizing on drawers or the "spenders" are squandering our money on knobs.

Take your choice.

Let The Middle Aged Give It A Whirl

The week's prize for massive silliness goes to the Communist-sponsored World Youth Festival in Vienna.

Leave it to the young people to promote international understanding and thereby solve the world's "basic ill," said the advance billing. On the first full day of the festival, Vienna police reported 13 street fights.

At last report, a hand-picked Chicago group of young capitalists was holding a hollering match with a hand-picked Moscow group of young Reds. The score was 0 to 0 and the game appeared to be destined for extra innings.

We propose a moratorium on acknowledged young squirts for a spell and a more scientific examination of the yearnings of the middle-aged. Between the inanities of the elderly at Geneva and the screeches of the young at Vienna there is really very little to choose. The disease of youth is delusion; the heritage of old age is despair. We would put both groups on ice for a year and ask them to remain completely silent the while. Then we would hand the world's problems to people who have lived long enough to be on speaking terms with reality and not long enough to be consumed by mopishness. If, at the end of the test, it is not clearly demonstrated that there is virtue in ideas based upon both experience and expectation, let Geneva take up where it left off and a new world youth festival can open in Peiping. After 12 months of earnest thought we would probably be ready for a little comic relief anyway.

Chicago Or Warsaw?

Nixon's Poland

By DORIS FLEESON

WASHINGTON

The spectacle of Vice President Richard Nixon campaigning for the presidency in a Soviet satellite state, more especially Poland, which is the most delicate area of American diplomacy today, is one which Secretary of State John Foster Dulles adamantly refused to countenance in his lifetime.

A mistake made here will be paid for by the Poles, not by Nixon nor by the United States. And what their Soviet masters are capable of in the way of reprisals has been written in blood in East Germany and Hungary.

FAN THE FLAME

American diplomacy has undertaken in Poland to fan the flame of independence while avoiding any move which would instigate acts by the Poles which, in turn, would incite the Soviets to harsh retaliation. It is into this situation of precarious balance that Nixon proposes to interject himself and his enormous entourage for purposes of self-aggrandizement.

This government and the Gomulka regime of Poland accepted the risks of their present association because the ties between the two countries are long and deeply felt. The Polish struggles for freedom have vibrated a responsive chord in American hearts for generations. Among the Soviet satellites, it alone now receives American credits.



Gomulka: Accepted Risks

INCREASING TENSION

Why this has been overlooked by the Soviet Union is unclear, but presumably the Soviets wish to avoid another Hungary. It is never wise, however, to assume that Soviet policy in such areas cannot instantly shift, and it so happens that the Nixon visit coincides with a period of increasing East-West tension.

The State Department refuses to accept responsibility for the Nixon trip to Poland. Secretary Christian Herter is in Geneva.

Nixon's own reasons are starkly simple. There are more people of Polish descent in Chicago than in Warsaw. There are similar concentrations in Detroit, Buffalo and like industrial centers. In every case, they form a largely homogeneous voting bloc of whose susceptibilities all politicians are notoriously tender.

The Nixon trip to Russia is a vastly different cup of tea. There is every reason to believe that the Kremlin, despite Nikita Khrushchev's brief show of truculence, welcomed a visit from the man they think might be the next President. This falls within the realm of the realities they are quick to grasp, power being one of the few things they understand and respect.

Nixon, in turn, had certain great advantages. He cannot negotiate and produce any substantive settlement of East-West difficulties. But, in view of the present dismal outlook, any glimmer of hope he brought back would be regarded as a triumph.

In the event that the Russians denied him even this small change, he could do what he has been doing, which is present himself in a brave light as a man "standing up to the Russians." The quality of the dialogue between Nixon and Khrushchev, read in cold type, is far below the casual exchanges of a dull day in the United States Senate.

'Who? Me!'



People's Platform

McCarthyism Does Die Awfully Hard

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

In People's Platform of July 23 Mrs. Jaunita F. Moore (in a critical comment on Jean McCarthy's letter to The News about her dead husband) states, "McCarthyism certainly dies hard."

I concur fully with Mrs. Moore. McCarthyism does indeed die hard, and may it always be so! The late Joe McCarthy himself defined the "ism" connected with his name as, "The Fight For America."

It is little wonder, then, that patriotic Americans, presumably like Mrs. Moore, would suggest that McCarthyism dies hard. But let's not just say, "die hard," Mrs. Moore. Let's say, "die rigor mortis hard!"

— J. R. CHERRY JR.

Emphasis Is On A Four Letter Word

Charotte

Editors, The News:

The papers speak of "southern hospitality" at the North Carolina Tobacco Festival. Naturally the emphasis will be on the word of four letters just after the "Ho" in that hospitality!

Let's clean up.

—S. EED OGBURN

From The Richmond News Leader

NOT VERY FUNNY, DAILY MAIL

Many an American who travels by air will find nothing very funny in a bizarre contest being waged by the London Daily Mail. The Mail is offering a $14,000 top prize to the contestant who can travel fastest from the center of London to the center of Paris, provided only that the Channel itself is crossed by air. The object is to show how much time is lost by air travelers in getting to and from commercial airfields.

Why rub it in? This drawback to air travel is a familiar irritation, not likely to be corrected by any account of the horrors of traffic in London and Paris. Those of us on this side of the pond, to coin a phrase, can match the worst our British cousins can describe.

Have the exasperated editors of the Daily Mail flown into O'Hare Field, Chicago? Do they know where O'Hare Field is? It is in Siberia; this is where O'Hare Field is. Or have they been put down in Newark with a destination in uptown New York? Or flown recently to St. Louis? Or to Pittsburgh? Or fought rush-hour traffic from Love Field to Ft. Worth? It takes longer to get from Philadelphia's airport to, say, Independence Square than it takes to fly from Philadelphia to Baltimore. When Washington gets its new airport at Chantilly, flying time from D. C. to New York will be fixed at two hours: One hour to get to Chantilly, one hour to fly to New York.

And while we're brooding on these injustices: Delays in surface travel to and from airports are only one of the inconveniences that airline management needs to concern itself with. An impression develops, all too frequently, that the airlines are determined to adopt all of the rude and inconsiderate practices that once drove thousands of offended passengers from the railways.

Time was when the rail passenger used to find his train halted for no apparent reason on the Kansas prairies; inquiry to train personnel produced nothing more responsive than an uncommunicative grunt. The conductor's attitude was that delay was none of a passenger's business. Now the airlines will keep a plane idle on the ramp for long periods, for no apparent reason, while passengers miss connections and everyone's time is lost, and no one bothers to explain anything.

Maybe the Daily Mail's sarcastic contest will goad the cross-channel airlines into Taking Steps, and maybe the reaction will spread across the Ocean. If not, the day of the Interstate Highway is not far ahead, and a lot of Captain Eddie's old customers may decide to fly to Manhattan — by car.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Russian Defenses Leave U. S. Puffing

WASHINGTON

There was irony in the fact that Nikita Khrushchev's unprecedented and on-the-whole healthy public debate at the American Exposition in Moscow was staged with the man who has consistently urged more American concentration on missiles.

When Khrushchev threw in Vice President Nixon's face the warning "we have means at our disposal which can have very bad consequences" and again when he said, obviously referring to missiles, "but ours are better if you want to compete"—Nixon knew Khrushchev was telling the truth.

Urged Frankness

It was Nixon who urged a franker policy in telling the American people how far behind Russia we were when the first Russian sputnik was launched on Oct. 4, 1957. He was overruled by the White House. In the approximately two years since then, we have lagged even farther behind. And the real reason Foreign Minister Gromyko has been so tough at Geneva is because Russia is now ahead of the United States in every military department except sea power.

Here is the box score on Soviet vs. American military strength, which both Nixon and Khrushchev had in mind when they debated in Moscow:

Intercontinental missiles: Russia suddenly resumed testing intercontinental missiles in March after a long lapse. From this, Secretary of Defense McElroy hopefully concluded that the lapse meant the Russians, like us, were having trouble with their long-distance missile. Other experts believe Russia stopped firing the big missiles simply because she was busy producing them.

No Mistake

In any event, there can be no mistaking the fact Russia has been blasting off about four missiles a month since March from her great test center northeast of the Caspian Sea. Our powerful radar eyes in Turkey have spotted the missiles takeoff; another radar station in the Aleutians has followed the warheads as they plunged back to earth. Only two of the big missiles have been hurled a full 5,000 miles. The remaining 18 which we were able to track went 3,500 to 4,500 miles. Whether these were test models or production models, however, remains a question mark.

Minor Malfunctions

Our own ICBM firings have been plagued by minor malfunctions. It is no military secret that we have tested 26 Atlas ICBMs, of which eleven have been successful, six partially successful, and nine complete failures. In contrast, our monitor shows that 75 per cent of the Russian ICBM tests have been successful. They have operated with alarming reliability. The first of our 5,500-mile Atlas missiles were supposed to be combat-ready in July. But five misfires in a row have delayed the operational date until September or October. It is doubtful that we will have the 10 operational Atlases that Secretary McElroy promised by the end of the year. Russia ought to have ten times that number.

Intermediate missiles: Russia is known to have 750 medium-range missiles ready to launch against our overseas bases. They include both T-4s, which can shoot 1,000 miles and T-2s, which can hit targets up to 1,800 miles away.

Our first squadron of 1,200-mile Thor missiles was delivered to England last winter and was supposed to be ready for combat by January. It didn't become operational until June.

This now gives us 15 intermediate missiles against Russia's 750. We should whip another 15-missile squadron into shape before the summer is over. Altogether, we will set up four squadrons in England. We also hope to locate four squadrons in Italy, perhaps four more in Turkey. But we haven't even selected the launching sites.

Our present schedule also calls for halting production altogether after we have built about 200 intermediate missiles.

Homing Devices

Underwater Missiles: We have taken actual photographs of Soviet submarines equipped with vertical launching tubes. These are capable of firing stub-nosed Comet missiles from underwater hiding places at targets 700 miles inland. Russia has also stepped up its submarine activity in American waters during the past three years. Apparently the Reds have even planted secret transmitters along the ocean bottom near our shores. These serve as homing devices to guide other submarines.