THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

Thomas L. Robinson ---- President and Publisher
Brodie S. Griffith ---- General Manager
Robert H. Lampee ---- Advertising Director
Cecil Prince ---- Associate Editor
R. L. Young Jr. ---- Managing Editor
Huey Stinson ---- Circulation Manager

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1956

The Middle East: A Two-Part Tragedy

THE world today is like a carnival crazy house, except that the distortions and preposterous appearance of things is not funny.

Four days ago the world was buoyant on a tide of optimism loosed by the satellite uprisings against Soviet imperialism. There were whisperings of trouble in the Middle East, to be sure, but Americans had been assured the threat of war there had dwindled. They could perceive that the enslaved people of Central Europe had stripped from Russia power equivalent to what she had gained through support of an Arab confederation in the Middle East. Events seemed to have struck a balance favorable to peace.

But that perception was based on the mistaken impression that the Western alliance still existed, that the U. S., Britain and France, despite disagreements, still were acting in concert to preserve peace.

Indications are that the U. S. government was deceived just as thoroughly as its citizens. U. S. diplomats, chief among them Mr. Dulles, seemed completely befuddled by Israel's strike into Egypt to the apparently planned accompaniment of a British-French assault.

Conceding the desperate position forced upon Israel, Britain and France by Russian arms for the Arabs, their action is dangerous folly. Whatever strategic advantages they may regain they actively threaten the peace of the world and thereby lose its sympathy for their cause. Their action smacks too much of a Kremlin-type coup at a time when even Russia seems fearful of the disadvantages of the use of naked force to seal up a shattering satellite empire.

But the tragedy has two parts, the second of which is the stark failure of U. S. foreign policy in the Middle East, a failure both of not knowing and not doing. Mr. Dulles had a responsibility to know what was afoot, to head it off and to make the Western alliance hang together under U. S. leadership. The alliance has now been split severely, and U. S. leadership has been openly and stingingly repudiated.

Mr. Dulles is left in the dubious position of cooperating with the Soviet in the U. N., and in pledging to defend victims of aggression in the Middle East. But who is the victim and who is the aggressor, and is the U. S. to take up arms against Britain, France and Israel to the direct benefit of Soviet expansionism?

These are hard, bitter choices made necessary by Mr. Dulles' failure to hold the allegiance of Britain and France during the Suez crisis or, failing that, to realize that he had lost that allegiance.

With that loss went U. S leadership and some of the world's brightest hopes for peace.

With Just One Week Left, Let's Go!

THE apathy that is said to infect Mecklenburg's voting population must not be permitted to dull the community's civic senses. The United Appeal needs everybody's active help.

Only a week remains to power this year's campaign to a successful conclusion. The final report meeting is scheduled for Nov. 8.

In all, 35 vitally needed agencies are dependent upon the massive demonstration of generosity citizens of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County are being asked to summon up during the days immediately ahead.

The goal of $990,493 must be met.

To fall short would be to let our neighbors down. It would represent a betrayal of our own personal interests as well.

Money, great amounts of it, is needed to repair social damage in the community. It is also needed to provide health and recreational services useful to all our citizens.

It might be argued that we should give for purely selfish reasons. Decay in a neighborhood affects everybody on the block. Our metropolitan neighborhood is countywide in size and scope. The essential oneness of our community offers perhaps the sturdiest reason of all why we should strive to give it uniform strength. What affects one of our citizens affects us all.

If you have not already made a pledge or a contribution, don't put it off. Everybody should participate in this crusade.

Who Are The 'Independent' Voters?

IN THESE final days of dubious grace before the election, the caterwauling of the professional politician is beginning to border on the outrageous.

His fondest theme of late is that everything is in the hands of the "independent voter." In fact, dependence upon this vague and misty personage has almost become a conditioned reflex when serious students of U. S. public opinion attempt to get down to cases about either the presidential election or various local contests.

Heinz Eulau, professor of government at Antioch College, shrewdly punctured the myth of the independent voter this week when he declared flatly that "most of what the politicians say about the 'independents' is sheer nonsense."

Who are the independents, anyway?

Pollsters leave the matter to the individual. Anyone who says he is an independent is accepted as one.

But Mr. Eulau dares to suggest that there are no genuine independents.

We would agree that most statements about independent voters are shot through with unexamined value assumptions, false premises, confused definitions and irrelevant inferences.

As the educator maintains, people belong to groups—family groups, business groups, religious groups, social groups and so on. To a rather large extent, people vote with their groups and there is no reason to believe that independents behave differently from partisans. "In their political conduct," he argues, "even people in a hostile environment refer themselves to groups they perceive as friendly."

Most split ticket voters—those who may vote Republican in national election and Democratic in local elections—are not true independents. Their ticket-splitting is a regular form of behavior.

As Mr. Eulau points out, there is a vast difference between most ticket-splitters and the rational ticket-splitter who makes up his mind, presumably, after having thoroughly explored party programs and candidates.

We do not believe that there is no such thing as an independent voter. We do believe that independent intelligence in political matters is a rarity and the "independence" of most citizens who refer to themselves piously as independent voters is vaporous indeed.

"Independence" may be a way station from one party to another. It may be a position that is considered fashionable, useful or naked opportunism. Furthermore, the bonds that unite a person to some people and separate him from others are usually emotional rather than intellectual.

The "independent" vote may be important in this election. But a good deal more research will have to be done into the nature of political independence before we will know *how* important.

From The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

BASEBALL PLAYERS OR GYPSIES?

NOW that the Senators have decided to stay in Washington for another year—and maybe forever—let there be no punning questions about what Washington would be like without the Senators. The matter is not so frivolous. Since baseball writers agree to a man—at least part of the time—that baseball is the national pastime, what would the game be if it repudiated the national capital, or vice versa?

Yet such was the threat in Washington as it is in some other big-league cities. Paid attendance had declined so much that the Senators' management was all but convinced the turnstiles would wear out much faster elsewhere—say, in Los Angeles. Had they and their team gone West with their bats and gloves as the Boston Braves went to Milwaukee, the Philadelphia Athletics to Kansas City and the St. Louis Browns, in reverse direction, to Baltimore, would they not have contributed to the growing opinion that henceforth the big-league teams will be moving to a new home as soon as they feel a touch of coolness in the old?

If that were to come to pass, the big-leaguers would be but gypsies, and the make-up of a league would change before a boy who had picked a favorite among its members could grow up to pay his own way to a game. Why, baseball players might become like tennis pros or like the Dodgers in Japan, moving from town to town just behind the press agents and the poster-pasters. Consider what that has done to the circus business.

But the Senators have decided that Washington is the place for Senators. And if the non-playing Senators will bring their families to a few more games, the national capital should be safe for the national pastime.

A bank president, extremely sensitive about his baldness, wore his hat much of the time inside and out. One day while the porter, an employe of long standing, was sweeping out his office the president asked jokingly, "Sam, why is it after all these years you don't have an account with us?" "Because, Boss, you always look like you're about to go somewhere!"—LAMAR (MO.) DEMOCRAT.

An Arizona professor has found three pine trees 4,000 years old. They must not have many subdivision developers out there.—FORT MYERS (FLA.) NEWS-PRESS.

Dulles' Policy Was A 'Dismal And Desperate' Failure

By JOSEPH AND STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

AS this is written, it is not yet clear whether Israel's invasion of Egypt will lead to a full-scale war in the Middle East, which could become a much bigger war. What is crystal clear is that American policy in the Middle Eastern crisis has been a dismal and desperate failure.

It has been a failure because it has been based on a simple miscalculation. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles obviously concluded, after Egypt's Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser seized the Suez Canal Co., that anything, including a major triumph for the violently anti-Western Col. Nasser, would be better than a shooting war in the Middle East.

UNSEEN ELEMENT

He further reasoned that war could be prevented if only the British and French could be held back from using force against Egypt. He therefore bent all his efforts to that end. But in so doing, he overlooked another and vital element in the equation.

For Nasser is, of course, even more violently anti-Israel than he is anti-Western. He has never made any bones about the fact that his ambition is, first, to become the leader of a re-armed Arab bloc, and then, at the propitious moment, to destroy Israel.

PREVENTIVE WAR

Even before the Suez Canal crisis, and after the Soviet arms deal with Egypt, the "activist" group in Israel most seriously considered "preventive action" against the Nasser regime. Israel's Prime Minister David Ben Gurion's government was only dissuaded from taking such action by strong pressure from the American government, the promise of an American loan, and the persuasions of then Foreign Minister Moshe Sharrett and Israel's ambassador to Washington Abba Eban.

But Nasser's seizure of the canal again basically altered the situation in Israeli eyes. For Nasser's action was a direct and open challenge to the great powers of the West. If Nasser were permitted to get away with his challenge, the Israeli reasoned, then nothing could stop him from achieving his stated ambition to destroy Israel—nothing, that is, except prior action by Israel.

This is not hindsight on the part of these reporters. Immediately after Nasser's seizure of the canal, we wrote: "The Israeli count Nasser their most formidable enemy. If Nasser now triumphantly defies the power of Britain and America, they will conclude that Israel is next on the list. The Israeli may then take 'preventive action' which could spark a Middle Eastern or even a general war."

JOHN FOSTER DULLES
Time Ran Out

Yet this clear danger was generally disregarded in the Dulles' State Dept. Instead, Secretary Dulles devoted all his very considerable powers of persuasion and maneuver to preventing the British and French from taking forceful action against Nasser.

DELAYING ACTIONS

It was a brilliant operation in its way. The British and French, especially the British, desperately wanted American support in any move to cut Nasser down to size. Nor were they eager for bloodshed. In this situation, Dulles adopted a series of delaying actions, seeming to promise effective American support for strong action, and then drawing back.

Thus, the British and French were repeatedly pulled back, when they had almost reached the decision to use force or the threat of force against Nasser. From the beginning force or the threat of force constituted the only effective sanction in negotiating with the Egyptian dictator. So by last week it was already clear to all, including the Israeli, that Nasser would succeed in defying the power of the West.

It was in this situation that Ben Gurion, no doubt with an eye on the American elections, and quite possibly with some secret encouragement from the French and the British, decided to strike. Late last week, hard intelligence of Ben Gurion's decision was obtained by the intelligence services, and conveyed to Dulles and the State Dept., where it caused consternation. A summary of the report was hastily conveyed to President Eisenhower at Walter Reed Hospital, and he issued his statement warning the Israeli against aggression. Strong pressure was also brought on Ben Gurion on the spot, but to no avail.

COMPLETE FAILURE

Thus the shooting in the Middle East which Dulles maneuvered so hard to avoid has started. It has started, moreover, under the worst conceivable conditions. Thanks to the Dulles delaying tactics, there has never been a time since the war when this country's relations with its two major allies, Britain and France, were nearer the breaking point. Altogether, the failure of our Middle Eastern policy is about as complete as it is possible to imagine.

People's Platform — Readers Plunge Wet Pens Into Politicos' Hides

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

IT is evident that Mr. Nixon and Mr. Eisenhower have, during Mr. Eisenhower's sojourn in the White House, been very much associated. Could it be that Mr. Eisenhower has imparted to Mr. Nixon a sensibility for the things of honor and resulting by a respect for those who differ or, amazingly, could it be that Mr. Eisenhower finds an element of congeniality in association with a man who, according to press reports, finds that the past 20 years of national administration prior to Eisenhower's administration and Mr. Eisenhower have. Such fits in with McCarthy. But McCarthy's personality has been put before the people and there are none of fair mind to do him reverence. The paradox is presented: how can Eisenhower repudiate McCarthy and take to his bosom Nixon.

But maybe there has been method in the chimera of Eisenhower made in the minds of the people by the steady iteration of the cliche, "I like Ike" by the big office holders, big money publications, and the activities of the national Republican organization and, resultingly, maybe there has been a sort of doped or mesmeric quality impressed upon the mass mind. And maybe when reality is approached it will be found that this great man, this imagined heroic and almost sanctified personality is a mental picture—a painted image.

So far disappointment has been my only reward for fond expectation of noble, broad sentiment and logic in furtherance in this campaign of Republican principle and administration, but the Republican effort has been contained so far almost wholly in the cliche, "I like Ike." I liked Ike but when he went forth and made his public speech (or read it) he, according to AP reports, used in reference to Democratic speeches, as descriptive, the expression, "wicked nonsense," etc. Now, that is not argument, or logic, in fact. It remains for a higher power than Ike to say a thing is wicked which means sinful, criminal, heinous. Nonsense means silly, absurd. He has a peculiar moral concept who thinks a thing that is wicked, heinous is also at the same time only absurd or silly.

I don't think Truman in his effort to "give 'em hell," or Nixon's low expressions went so far. Maybe Eisenhower in his inability to traverse the high road has found it congenial with his concepts and habit of thought to project such ideas, or, maybe he had the wrong man write his speech, or, as there are meanings not always superficially apparent maybe such explains the result of Eisenhower's intimacy with Nixon.

—HOYT EAVES

Jonas' Record Has GOP Blood-Line

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

FOR several weeks now Mr. Eury of Lincolnton has acclaimed himself challenger to my challenge for anyone to justify the official voting record of Charles Raper Jonas. To date, an attempt to justify only two of the numerous issues I have brought forth has been made.

To date, my challenger's best, and almost only, argument has been "Mr. Jonas voted with a majority of the other congressmen from N. C." Does this make Mr. Jonas' record go down any easier? I say it only proves a candidate's record should be brought to show foremost in any locality. It would make a great difference in many, many cases if this became a habit everywhere in every election.

Since my challenger seems to need many issues before finding one to sound off on, let us give him a good choice of the key issues.

1 — Mr. Jonas opposed the recently enacted $1 minimum wage law. He thought it was excessive and unreasonable. Yet when it came out on the floor with passage assured and a vote to be recorded for the folks back home to see, Mr. Jonas voted for it.

2 — He voted against increases in unemployment compensations. All unemployed folks of Hoskins, Kendall, Huntersville, Cornelius and Davidson, who had the mills close on you, take note of this.

3 — He fought hard to end all public housing.

4 — He voted to reduce funds for hospital construction.

5 — He worked and voted against school consiruction legislation.

6 — He fought hard to prevent working people getting badly needed tax reductions.

7 — He voted for the billion dollar atomic give-away that even Mr. Eisenhower vetoed because of rottenness.

8 — He voted for the billion dollar tidelands give-away — the tidelands that every taxpayer pays to patrol and protect.

9 — He voted for legislation that would have greatly harmed Civil Service employes.

I could go on and on and prove every word I have written by the official records. However, I will just say to all of the registered Democrats who vote "for the man," that in this case the man's record is a full-blooded, old-time Republican record that is made up of endless votes against the wage earner and plain citizen.

—J. C. JAMES

Citizen Surprised By Legislative Rule

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

LAST week I carried a relative of mine to Chapel Hill for a psychiatric examination on the advice of her doctor for study and treatment, if needed.

Imagine my surprise when the social case worker informed me that she could be examined there but could not be treated there, as our legislature had ruled about one year ago that no Negroes could be treated. I understand that before last year, Negroes were treated. I was asked if I had a relative in the North where perhaps she could go and be treated.

I am sure that the doctor who advised taking her to Chapel Hill did not know of this ruling. My relative is a native of North Carolina and has worked for the state all her life. Why should she have to go far away from her relatives and friends to secure the help she needs?

I am not writing this to stir up strife as, goodness knows, there is too much of this already. Neither am I representing any political faction or group. I do not have any criticism to make of the University because everyone was most helpful and kind. I am writing to give the facts to the fair-minded white people and my people.

—MRS. D. H. SANSOM

Ballot Law Arouses Jonas Supporters

Rt. 4, Morganton

Editors, The News:

ELECTION day is near at hand. The voters will continue to be bombarded by our governor and others to vote a straight Democrat ticket. They hope that with this plea, aided by the change in marking ballots brought about by the "Get Jonas Bill," to defeat the will of the people and beat our congressman, Charles Raper Jonas.

In my humble judgment, they are mistaken. They have aroused the people. We will not be dictated to as to how we vote, neither will we be fooled by the tricky ballot.

—MARY GASH RODGERS

'Well, Are We North, South, East Or West Of Suez?'

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Witnesses Say Ike Exhausted On Trip

WASHINGTON

IT IS never pleasant to tangle with the White House. I have tangled with a good many more Democrats in the White House than Republicans, and none of these occasions are pleasant. But denials don't necessarily make a news story wrong, as for instance Jim Hagerty's denial on Aug. 4, 1953 of my statement that President Eisenhower had high blood pressure, the first symptom of a heart condition.

Scratch A Hole

The easiest way to deny a story is to scratch a hole in a couple of details, which is what shread Jim Hagerty tried to do. So let's take a look at some of the details.

Quote

1. Hagerty started off by quoting me as saying the "relapse was the reason for the week-end medical examination." Eisenhower announced early in August he would undergo a pre-election check-up, said Hagerty.

One Reason

But I did not say this. Hagerty twisted my words to suit his denial. What I said was: "This was ONE reason for the head-to-toe examination. Such an examination had been promised, but was made all the more necessary by the incidents of his West Coast trip."

2. My description of Ike's trouble was qualified, namely "an apparent mild relapse" which could have been "campaign exhaustion." Hagerty admitted that the President was suffering from campaign fatigue.

Partial Error

3. Hagerty disputed Ike's sudden departure from the Minneapolis airport, said he had stopped to shake hands with local dignitaries. I said he hadn't. In this I was in partial error. He did shake hands with a few. As described by Al Wienberg, candidate for Congress from the 6th District, a vigorous Republican, "At the airport, the President shook hands with just a couple of people and got on the plane in accordance with the Secret Service regulations."

Heavy Makeup?

4. Hagerty says the President's car did not pull out of line and speed toward the airport. This is disputed by various people. The evidence points to the fact that it did leave the line of march at Lake and Bloomington Streets, and, with about three other cars, headed for the airport.

5. Hagerty claimed Ike was in good health though admitting campaign weariness.

Mayor Eric Hoyer of Minneapolis, who was close to him, stated: "He appeared flushed or heavily made up. His face was too ruddy for the condition of his voice. His voice was weak, and it was my impression they had used make-up or a lamp treatment on him for months."

Stumble

Two witnesses, close by when the President got into his car in front of the New York Life Building, saw him stumble. Archer Nelsen, candidate for governor, beside him in the car, had to steady him. One witness standing five feet away said the President looked nervous and exhausted.

Others, standing along the route saw a genial figure smiling and holding up his arms. He maintained that gesture of greeting for almost two hours that day — too much for the politicians to ask of any 66-year-old candidate.

Others Reports

6. Hagerty made a point that other newsmen with the Presidential party did not report anything of a similar nature.

On the contrary, Doris Fleeson wrote: "Riding among the great and friendly crowds (at Minneapolis), he was superb —arms uplifted, the Eisenhower smile radiant. When he finally spoke he seemed pale and weary . . . At Seattle: "The Presidents' delivery was much too wooden. He threw away lines, he stumbled . . . At such points, reporters lifted their eyes from the written script to the President. Physically, he was tiring, it seemed."

Reported Tom Stokes: "He had five hours of rest in the flight to Seattle . . . He remained in his hotel all the next day until his speech that night and thereafter until he went to nearby Tacoma."

Life With Hagerty

Stokes and Miss Fleeson are columnists who don't have to travel every day with Hagerty. Newsmen regularly attached to the White House have to live with Hagerty. Life with a hostile Hagerty can be difficult. For instance, only one newsman, Andy Tully of the Scripps-Howard papers, reported an amazing incident last winter when the President, given the wrong golf club by his caddy, threw it in a burst of anger across the side of his golfmobile.

Only Man

The incident happened in front of all newsmen and was extremely significant regarding anyone recovering from a heart condition, because they have to watch excitement and temper. When I asked Tully why he was the only man who reported the incident, he didn't know. When I asked other newsmen, they indicated that they didn't want to get in wrong with Hagerty. Tully was already in wrong.