

Thomas L. Robinson President and Publisher  
Brodie S. Griffith General Manager  
Cecil Prince Associate Editor  
Thomas G. Fesperman Managing Editor  
W. W. Sirmon Circulation Manager

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1956

## Semper Fidelis Carried Too Far

IN THE Caribbean, there is a story they still whisper about Henri Christophe, 19th century king of Haiti. To test the devotion of his troops, he sometimes marched them off the highest parapet of a mountain fortress. "Discipline," he explained, "is everything."

Discipline is apparently everything to the U. S. Marine Corps, too, and the Semper Fidelis tradition is indeed glorious. But the Parris Island death march was an appalling distortion of the disciplinary requirements of a civilized society.

No amount of fearful regrets or irrelevant discussions of Marine Corps history can explain away the death of the six young recruits.

Training for war is a grim and occasionally dangerous business. Sometimes there are accidents. Injuries and even deaths occur. But the military establishment is obligated to take every reasonable precaution to protect the lives and limbs of youngsters entrusted to its care.

Every reasonable precaution was clearly not taken Sunday night at Parris Island.

It was not necessary to run the risk

of drowning recruits to teach them discipline.

Not can the responsibility for the incident be borne solely by S. Sgt. Matthew C. McKeon. It must be shared by his superiors, by the entire Marine Corps, by the system which permits such nonsense in the name of "disciplinary training." It is the solemn duty of the board of inquiry investigating the drownings to consider all of these matters.

The question might be asked too why news of the tragedy was withheld for so long if Parris Island authorities indeed "have nothing to hide," as Gen. Randolph Pate, Marine Corps commandant, insisted yesterday.

Certainly such incidents defeat the government's efforts to create more "attractive" recruits, as outlined to Congress yesterday by President Eisenhower. In fact, the Parris Island tragedy gave grim and unintended emphasis to one sentence in the presidential message—"The loss of trained personnel continues to be the most expensive and extravagantly disruptive obstacle to the strengthening of our armed forces to-day." He was referring, of course, to the failure of trained military personnel to reenlist.

## The Schools: Years Of Uncertainty—II

SUMMER, 1956, will be a lawyer's delight in North Carolina.

The reason is that the state legislature in special session is going to try to match wits with the Supreme Court. It has been advised by the Advisory Committee on Education neither to obey nor to defy the court's desegregation ruling, but to try to get around it. That will demand some skillful legal acrobatics.

Can it be done? Nobody knows. The Supreme Court will decide whenever a plan adopted by the state is brought before it.

What is the plan? To try to maintain segregation in the public schools by pupil assignment and—if that fails—to permit closing of the public schools with the state system "tuition grants" to private schools.

What does the "tuition grant" system mean? The committee didn't say. Apparently it means private schools having no connection with the state, schools the state would neither organize nor support. The more the state has to do with schools, the more likely the court is to declare them public and thereby subject to the desegregation ruling. The legal success of the "tuition grant" system lies in making it the state system of private schools are in reality public schools.

But if the state is to have nothing to do with them—other than paying out tuition money—where are these schools coming from? And who is going to operate them? Presumably that is a bridge to be crossed when it is reached.

If it is reached, it will be a very hard bridge to cross.

Following the court's 1954 decision the Institute of Government at Chapel Hill explored the theory of the "tuition grant" system.

James C. N. Paul, assistant director, concluded the "tuition grant" idea is far superior—legally—to the state system of private schools. But he also found

the idea tangled with unanswerable questions.

The idea he considered was this: To convince the court that these private schools really were private, the state would pass no legislation authorizing creation of private schools. Nor would it authorize lease of public school property to private educational organizations. Each community would be left entirely on its own. If a community that voted to close its public schools could organize a school without benefit of state law or funds, the state would pay a fixed sum as tuition in that school.

To further divorce itself from the schools, the state might repeal the compulsory attendance law. All strings would be severed. The schools would be on their own.

Paul concluded such a setup might get by the court's raising.

But it also would raise a host of questions. These are a few.

Could the state be sure it would get anything like its money's worth out of the schooling provided in private schools?

Would the schools meet academic standards sufficient to enable children attending to go to college and professional institutions?

Who will organize and run the schools?

How could classroom facilities be provided?

The state could not provide the answer. That would be the responsibility of the communities which voted to abolish their public schools to avoid desegregation.

Obviously, the Advisory Committee hopes no community will ever face these questions. It hopes pupil assignment and voluntary segregation will keep the schools both segregated and public. The "tuition grant" plan is proposed as an "escape hatch" if those measures don't work.

(Tomorrow: The Assignment Plan).

## More Of Eisenhower's Time Needed

THE timing of President Eisenhower's latest going holiday in Augusta was unfortunate and, at best, politically clumsy.

No time in the past six months has more problems been heaped on the chief executive's desk. At no time during his term has there been so much confusion over such a wide variety of critical issues.

Earlier in this week, James Reston observed in the New York Times that Mr. Eisenhower is the "most popular politician since Franklin D. Roosevelt and can speak to the American people with more authority and persuasiveness than any other man alive."

Furthermore, Mr. Eisenhower plainly regards the presidency as the greatest podium and educational forum in the nation.

When there is a great and compelling need for presidential influence and guidance on such issues as segregation, farm policy, the Middle East crisis, foreign aid, highway construction, health legislation and social security, Mr. Eisenhower goes golfing.

To note these things is not to be disrespectful. On the contrary, it emphasizes how much we depend upon the President for leadership.

When things have come badly in the past it has usually been because Mr. Eisenhower has been away from his desk and unable to run the show directly. As often as not when the trouble was foreign in nature, Mr. Dulles was also away.

It is no secret that this government's morale in Washington and its influence abroad have seriously declined since the President was stricken with a heart attack last year and the long absences began.

Of course, the President can and does work in Augusta but it is not quite the same. He is, in effect, directing the executive branch by remote control.

The political implications of the long absences should be obvious. He is already facing "full-time-president" bars from the Democrats.

We are concerned, however, with the more practical implications of the need for steady, aggressive leadership in an age of widespread indecision.

## Letting A Question Answered At A White House Press Conference

WHILE HOUSE press conferences are becoming somewhat like getting recognized on the floor of the House of Representatives. You sometimes have to let the Speaker in advance that you want to speak, and even so he will deliberately not recognize someone he figures is going to cause trouble.

So also at the White House.

Last week, the President showed signs of becoming extremely selective in answering questions. Less so for some time, correspondents made repeated attempts to obtain recognition, but out of the 18 correspondents recognized, four were New York Times, two from the New York Herald Tribune, two from the Chicago Daily News. Other correspondents recognized were AP, UP, CBS, NBC, Gannett News Service, Washington Post, Newsweek, Cowles Publications, Reuters, and Sarah McLendon of the El Paso Times, Sherman Democrat, San Antonio Light, Austin America, and Longview News-Journal, all in Texas.

Not so at the White House.

Out of the press conference transcript of 22 press column inches, correspondents devoted to questions from the New York Times, the same newspaper which graduated Press Secretary Jim Hagerty into government service.

Yet it was the question asked by a small town reporter, Miss McLendon, that got the big headlines next day. She was also the only small town reporter who managed to get an answer from the President and she had quite a hard time getting it.

From the start of the press conference Miss McLendon kept bobbing up. But the President did not choose to see her. When she did address him, "Mr. President," he abruptly turned to N. Y. Times reporter James Reston who sat off in a corner and was not noticeably making an effort to obtain recognition.

The president Miss McLendon, who never gets discouraged at having her ears pinched back, persevered. And toward the end of the press conference she managed to get this important question, which the President seemed almost intuitively to be answering:

"Would you order those Marines that were sent over to the Mediterranean and over in that area," she asked, "would you order them to war without asking the Congress first?"

The official transcript of the press conference as released to the public by James Hagerty bore a notation at this point: "Laughter." However, newsmen attending the conference remember no laughter, and some suspect the word was inserted as an attempt to belittle Miss McLendon. Certainly it was a most serious question, and the President's reply indicated that he considered it so.

"I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood. "I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood.

**No Laughing Matter**

At this point there was definite laughter, though the conference transcript did not so indicate. It quickly stopped, however, as newsmen noted how serious and irritated the President was.

# People's Platform The North And Segregation

**Charlottesville, Va.**  
Enclosed is a letter sent to Herbert Brownell Jr., attorney general of the United States.

—RALPH CONNELLY

Dear Mr. Brownell:  
More than 18 months during World War II I lived in or near your home city of Lincoln, Nebraska, while I worked for the Burlington railroad.

At first I worked at Havelock, a suburb town of Lincoln, at a big car stacking shop there, where the population was entirely white. The war was on and labor was hard to get, so the railroad recruited a few Negroes in Lincoln and sent them out to Havelock to work.

As a southerner I had expected to see your people of Nebraska treat these Negroes with full equality—but to my surprise I found the people of Havelock decidedly against them and more hostile than I have ever known southern people to be toward Negroes.

The railroad restaurant management all but refused to let these Negroes eat, serving them last in an unkindly manner, and such a racial question of high policy which will have to be answered in London and Washington is the question of whether and how they will recognize the fact that the Soviet Union is now present as a great power in the international affairs of the Middle East.

This question is as painful and difficult as is the somewhat similar question in the Far East, that of the recognition of Red China. Both in China and in the Middle East the question is how policy is to come to terms with the hard and unpleasant fact that an unkindly great power is now present in the neighborhood, and how they will recognize the fact that the Soviet Union is now present as a great power in the international affairs of the Middle East.

Later when I went to work at the Burlington roundhouse at the end of West O. Street in Lincoln, I found two Negroes employed, cleaning out track pits and wiping engines at the roundhouse. Not once did one of these Negroes enter the all-white railroad restaurant to eat. That was how strong the spirit of racial segregation was in your hometown of Lincoln, Neb., 11 years ago.

One evening coming from work one of the Negroes crowded one of the white men and they nearly had an affray over it.

"The white man later told me: 'Don't care how high a Negro gets just so he doesn't get too close.'"

And so with all of the pro-segregation spirit I found in Lincoln, I cannot help but wonder if you honestly want to see racial segregation ended, Mr. Brownell. It's true that you argued before the Supreme Court for the ending of school segregation. And this being election year, you will no doubt ask for the ending of every form of racial segregation. But I ask you, do you and the people of Lincoln, Neb., really want to integrate the races? I do not believe you do. But what Negro vote is important in some key northern states, so playing

politics with the race issue is a good way to get the Negro vote for the GOP. Just like FDR got it for the Democrats for your 12 years. I can't help but believe that you do not want to see segregation end, you just want to make a vote-getting issue of it.

My grandfather, a soldier then born, was a Union soldier during the Civil War and fought to free the Negroes from slavery. If he were alive today in Nebraska, he did not believe in associating with them.

And so, Mr. Brownell, how can the pot throw up black to like integration in Nebraska, how do you expect us to like it any better in the South? But after all, this is election year and it's a good time to play politics for the Negro vote, and I can hardly blame you for it, for I kept FDR in office a long, long time and it's "good political thunder" for either party to use.

I am not knowing you people in Nebraska as I did 11 years ago. I can hardly believe that they of you want to mix the races unless you have had a complete change of mind since then. So what I read about what you have to say about civil rights and segregation always makes me remember how strong the pro-segregation spirit was in your hometown of Lincoln, Neb., during World War II.

—Ralph Connelly

aware of this information without taking my word for it. Bend an ear to the private statements of some of our electives, listen to the national committee members that Lyndon Johnson did not sign with his brethren.

But why should the incumbents not issue this manifesto? After all, we can see even now that the Democrats are trying to obtain their first public offices are fishing for votes with cries that they are bigger and better segregationists than the men presently in office. Watch the fur fly in Georgia when Herman Talmadge runs against Walter George for his seat in the Senate!

How can you believe that the Manifesto is firm, statesmanlike or a powerful asset is beyond me. It is weak, political and an affront to our intelligence. I am no Nostradamus, but this I can safely predict: The manifesto will soon be forgotten — it has already been graciously ignored by the nation — and it shall never have the slightest effect on the court's decision of May 17, 1954.

As for our friend's laudatory cheers for the General Assembly of Virginia, Georgia, South Carolina and Mississippi, I say that he must cast his eyes to the state which is to see much good in this world. Frankly, if the men in the legislatures of these states would just recognize the character displayed by those with whom they are allied, it seems that they might stop their screaming for a bit and then take steps to lead their states along more worthy paths, along paths better lighted and less hazy.

I do not have a very good opinion of Mississippi — they have stained their escutcheon with too many unpunished lynchings and murders of helpless men. I regard darkly anything that the legislators in Mississippi might do. All that is present in our ranks does the southern cause no justice.

I note that the letter in question threw in a few words regarding the mongrelization of the races. Here, again, we have that tired old worn-out theme which deliberately calculates to stir emotions and to close the door on reason. There is not one of us who is not now a mongrel. If mongrelization means a mixing together of types of people and we all know that these "races" have mixed together to the extent that there are but one or two unmixed races left in the world, these being only relatively unmixed now, when I mention the remaining races, which are relatively unmixed, I do not have in mind "Anglo-Saxons" or any other figments of man's imagination, because I actually refer to certain natives of Australia and to the few remaining Bushmen of Africa.

— J. J. JUSTICE

## Reds Job Key To Peace In Mid East

By WALTER LIPPMAN

NEW YORK — "What has gotten better, if it is, I think, becoming clearer, what is the fundamental question of high policy which will have to be answered in London and Washington is the question of whether and how they will recognize the fact that the Soviet Union is now present as a great power in the international affairs of the Middle East."

## Southern Manifesto Will Be Forgotten

Charlottesville, Va.

Editors, The News: Enclosed is a letter on which I would like to comment. Statement No. 1 "In the opinion of many of the Southern Manifesto is the firmest, most statesmanlike and positively the most powerful assault yet made on the madness of the time made on the United States Supreme Court."

If the statement has any merits at all, it is merely through its insulting but heady admission that there has been no telling blows struck against size B. And so, the intended meaning of the quoted statement, I say that many people can have foolish notions, certainly; but I doubt that many southerners are deluded about the fate of the manifesto. Has our friend not read the newspapers since the manifesto was issued — does he not know that this six document was written for southern consumption (the politicians still rely on the gullibility of the masses)? The obvious purpose of it being to further the careers of the men who wrote it? My arching back, our fine representatives and senators have lately admitted to as much as I say here. You can become

more than 18 months during World War II I lived in or near your home city of Lincoln, Nebraska, while I worked for the Burlington railroad.

At first I worked at Havelock, a suburb town of Lincoln, at a big car stacking shop there, where the population was entirely white. The war was on and labor was hard to get, so the railroad recruited a few Negroes in Lincoln and sent them out to Havelock to work.

As a southerner I had expected to see your people of Nebraska treat these Negroes with full equality—but to my surprise I found the people of Havelock decidedly against them and more hostile than I have ever known southern people to be toward Negroes.

The railroad restaurant management all but refused to let these Negroes eat, serving them last in an unkindly manner, and such a racial question of high policy which will have to be answered in London and Washington is the question of whether and how they will recognize the fact that the Soviet Union is now present as a great power in the international affairs of the Middle East.

Later when I went to work at the Burlington roundhouse at the end of West O. Street in Lincoln, I found two Negroes employed, cleaning out track pits and wiping engines at the roundhouse. Not once did one of these Negroes enter the all-white railroad restaurant to eat. That was how strong the spirit of racial segregation was in your hometown of Lincoln, Neb., 11 years ago.

One evening coming from work one of the Negroes crowded one of the white men and they nearly had an affray over it.

"The white man later told me: 'Don't care how high a Negro gets just so he doesn't get too close.'"

And so with all of the pro-segregation spirit I found in Lincoln, I cannot help but wonder if you honestly want to see racial segregation ended, Mr. Brownell. It's true that you argued before the Supreme Court for the ending of school segregation. And this being election year, you will no doubt ask for the ending of every form of racial segregation. But I ask you, do you and the people of Lincoln, Neb., really want to integrate the races? I do not believe you do. But what Negro vote is important in some key northern states, so playing

politics with the race issue is a good way to get the Negro vote for the GOP. Just like FDR got it for the Democrats for your 12 years. I can't help but believe that you do not want to see segregation end, you just want to make a vote-getting issue of it.

My grandfather, a soldier then born, was a Union soldier during the Civil War and fought to free the Negroes from slavery. If he were alive today in Nebraska, he did not believe in associating with them.

And so, Mr. Brownell, how can the pot throw up black to like integration in Nebraska, how do you expect us to like it any better in the South? But after all, this is election year and it's a good time to play politics for the Negro vote, and I can hardly blame you for it, for I kept FDR in office a long, long time and it's "good political thunder" for either party to use.

I am not knowing you people in Nebraska as I did 11 years ago. I can hardly believe that they of you want to mix the races unless you have had a complete change of mind since then. So what I read about what you have to say about civil rights and segregation always makes me remember how strong the pro-segregation spirit was in your hometown of Lincoln, Neb., during World War II.

—Ralph Connelly

aware of this information without taking my word for it. Bend an ear to the private statements of some of our electives, listen to the national committee members that Lyndon Johnson did not sign with his brethren.

But why should the incumbents not issue this manifesto? After all, we can see even now that the Democrats are trying to obtain their first public offices are fishing for votes with cries that they are bigger and better segregationists than the men presently in office. Watch the fur fly in Georgia when Herman Talmadge runs against Walter George for his seat in the Senate!

How can you believe that the Manifesto is firm, statesmanlike or a powerful asset is beyond me. It is weak, political and an affront to our intelligence. I am no Nostradamus, but this I can safely predict: The manifesto will soon be forgotten — it has already been graciously ignored by the nation — and it shall never have the slightest effect on the court's decision of May 17, 1954.

As for our friend's laudatory cheers for the General Assembly of Virginia, Georgia, South Carolina and Mississippi, I say that he must cast his eyes to the state which is to see much good in this world. Frankly, if the men in the legislatures of these states would just recognize the character displayed by those with whom they are allied, it seems that they might stop their screaming for a bit and then take steps to lead their states along more worthy paths, along paths better lighted and less hazy.

I do not have a very good opinion of Mississippi — they have stained their escutcheon with too many unpunished lynchings and murders of helpless men. I regard darkly anything that the legislators in Mississippi might do. All that is present in our ranks does the southern cause no justice.

I note that the letter in question threw in a few words regarding the mongrelization of the races. Here, again, we have that tired old worn-out theme which deliberately calculates to stir emotions and to close the door on reason. There is not one of us who is not now a mongrel. If mongrelization means a mixing together of types of people and we all know that these "races" have mixed together to the extent that there are but one or two unmixed races left in the world, these being only relatively unmixed now, when I mention the remaining races, which are relatively unmixed, I do not have in mind "Anglo-Saxons" or any other figments of man's imagination, because I actually refer to certain natives of Australia and to the few remaining Bushmen of Africa.

— J. J. JUSTICE

## Well, What Did You Unlearn Today?

Editors, The News: Enclosed is a letter on which I would like to comment. Statement No. 1 "In the opinion of many of the Southern Manifesto is the firmest, most statesmanlike and positively the most powerful assault yet made on the madness of the time made on the United States Supreme Court."

If the statement has any merits at all, it is merely through its insulting but heady admission that there has been no telling blows struck against size B. And so, the intended meaning of the quoted statement, I say that many people can have foolish notions, certainly; but I doubt that many southerners are deluded about the fate of the manifesto. Has our friend not read the newspapers since the manifesto was issued — does he not know that this six document was written for southern consumption (the politicians still rely on the gullibility of the masses)? The obvious purpose of it being to further the careers of the men who wrote it? My arching back, our fine representatives and senators have lately admitted to as much as I say here. You can become



## Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON — Letting a question answer at a White House press conference are becoming somewhat like getting recognized on the floor of the House of Representatives. You sometimes have to let the Speaker in advance that you want to speak, and even so he will deliberately not recognize someone he figures is going to cause trouble.

So also at the White House.

Last week, the President showed signs of becoming extremely selective in answering questions. Less so for some time, correspondents made repeated attempts to obtain recognition, but out of the 18 correspondents recognized, four were New York Times, two from the New York Herald Tribune, two from the Chicago Daily News. Other correspondents recognized were AP, UP, CBS, NBC, Gannett News Service, Washington Post, Newsweek, Cowles Publications, Reuters, and Sarah McLendon of the El Paso Times, Sherman Democrat, San Antonio Light, Austin America, and Longview News-Journal, all in Texas.

Not so at the White House.

Out of the press conference transcript of 22 press column inches, correspondents devoted to questions from the New York Times, the same newspaper which graduated Press Secretary Jim Hagerty into government service.

Yet it was the question asked by a small town reporter, Miss McLendon, that got the big headlines next day. She was also the only small town reporter who managed to get an answer from the President and she had quite a hard time getting it.

From the start of the press conference Miss McLendon kept bobbing up. But the President did not choose to see her. When she did address him, "Mr. President," he abruptly turned to N. Y. Times reporter James Reston who sat off in a corner and was not noticeably making an effort to obtain recognition.

The president Miss McLendon, who never gets discouraged at having her ears pinched back, persevered. And toward the end of the press conference she managed to get this important question, which the President seemed almost intuitively to be answering:

"Would you order those Marines that were sent over to the Mediterranean and over in that area," she asked, "would you order them to war without asking the Congress first?"

The official transcript of the press conference as released to the public by James Hagerty bore a notation at this point: "Laughter." However, newsmen attending the conference remember no laughter, and some suspect the word was inserted as an attempt to belittle Miss McLendon. Certainly it was a most serious question, and the President's reply indicated that he considered it so.

"I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood. "I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood.

**No Laughing Matter**

At this point there was definite laughter, though the conference transcript did not so indicate. It quickly stopped, however, as newsmen noted how serious and irritated the President was.

## Ike Choose About Answering Newsmen

WASHINGTON — Letting a question answer at a White House press conference are becoming somewhat like getting recognized on the floor of the House of Representatives. You sometimes have to let the Speaker in advance that you want to speak, and even so he will deliberately not recognize someone he figures is going to cause trouble.

So also at the White House.

Last week, the President showed signs of becoming extremely selective in answering questions. Less so for some time, correspondents made repeated attempts to obtain recognition, but out of the 18 correspondents recognized, four were New York Times, two from the New York Herald Tribune, two from the Chicago Daily News. Other correspondents recognized were AP, UP, CBS, NBC, Gannett News Service, Washington Post, Newsweek, Cowles Publications, Reuters, and Sarah McLendon of the El Paso Times, Sherman Democrat, San Antonio Light, Austin America, and Longview News-Journal, all in Texas.

Not so at the White House.

Out of the press conference transcript of 22 press column inches, correspondents devoted to questions from the New York Times, the same newspaper which graduated Press Secretary Jim Hagerty into government service.

Yet it was the question asked by a small town reporter, Miss McLendon, that got the big headlines next day. She was also the only small town reporter who managed to get an answer from the President and she had quite a hard time getting it.

From the start of the press conference Miss McLendon kept bobbing up. But the President did not choose to see her. When she did address him, "Mr. President," he abruptly turned to N. Y. Times reporter James Reston who sat off in a corner and was not noticeably making an effort to obtain recognition.

The president Miss McLendon, who never gets discouraged at having her ears pinched back, persevered. And toward the end of the press conference she managed to get this important question, which the President seemed almost intuitively to be answering:

"Would you order those Marines that were sent over to the Mediterranean and over in that area," she asked, "would you order them to war without asking the Congress first?"

The official transcript of the press conference as released to the public by James Hagerty bore a notation at this point: "Laughter." However, newsmen attending the conference remember no laughter, and some suspect the word was inserted as an attempt to belittle Miss McLendon. Certainly it was a most serious question, and the President's reply indicated that he considered it so.

"I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood. "I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood.

**No Laughing Matter**

At this point there was definite laughter, though the conference transcript did not so indicate. It quickly stopped, however, as newsmen noted how serious and irritated the President was.

## REP. MARTIN LOST HIS SEAT

WASHINGTON — Letting a question answer at a White House press conference are becoming somewhat like getting recognized on the floor of the House of Representatives. You sometimes have to let the Speaker in advance that you want to speak, and even so he will deliberately not recognize someone he figures is going to cause trouble.

So also at the White House.

Last week, the President showed signs of becoming extremely selective in answering questions. Less so for some time, correspondents made repeated attempts to obtain recognition, but out of the 18 correspondents recognized, four were New York Times, two from the New York Herald Tribune, two from the Chicago Daily News. Other correspondents recognized were AP, UP, CBS, NBC, Gannett News Service, Washington Post, Newsweek, Cowles Publications, Reuters, and Sarah McLendon of the El Paso Times, Sherman Democrat, San Antonio Light, Austin America, and Longview News-Journal, all in Texas.

Not so at the White House.

Out of the press conference transcript of 22 press column inches, correspondents devoted to questions from the New York Times, the same newspaper which graduated Press Secretary Jim Hagerty into government service.

Yet it was the question asked by a small town reporter, Miss McLendon, that got the big headlines next day. She was also the only small town reporter who managed to get an answer from the President and she had quite a hard time getting it.

From the start of the press conference Miss McLendon kept bobbing up. But the President did not choose to see her. When she did address him, "Mr. President," he abruptly turned to N. Y. Times reporter James Reston who sat off in a corner and was not noticeably making an effort to obtain recognition.

The president Miss McLendon, who never gets discouraged at having her ears pinched back, persevered. And toward the end of the press conference she managed to get this important question, which the President seemed almost intuitively to be answering:

"Would you order those Marines that were sent over to the Mediterranean and over in that area," she asked, "would you order them to war without asking the Congress first?"

The official transcript of the press conference as released to the public by James Hagerty bore a notation at this point: "Laughter." However, newsmen attending the conference remember no laughter, and some suspect the word was inserted as an attempt to belittle Miss McLendon. Certainly it was a most serious question, and the President's reply indicated that he considered it so.

"I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood. "I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood.

**No Laughing Matter**

At this point there was definite laughter, though the conference transcript did not so indicate. It quickly stopped, however, as newsmen noted how serious and irritated the President was.

## GOP Faces Bad Odds On Congress

WASHINGTON — Letting a question answer at a White House press conference are becoming somewhat like getting recognized on the floor of the House of Representatives. You sometimes have to let the Speaker in advance that you want to speak, and even so he will deliberately not recognize someone he figures is going to cause trouble.

So also at the White House.

Last week, the President showed signs of becoming extremely selective in answering questions. Less so for some time, correspondents made repeated attempts to obtain recognition, but out of the 18 correspondents recognized, four were New York Times, two from the New York Herald Tribune, two from the Chicago Daily News. Other correspondents recognized were AP, UP, CBS, NBC, Gannett News Service, Washington Post, Newsweek, Cowles Publications, Reuters, and Sarah McLendon of the El Paso Times, Sherman Democrat, San Antonio Light, Austin America, and Longview News-Journal, all in Texas.

Not so at the White House.

Out of the press conference transcript of 22 press column inches, correspondents devoted to questions from the New York Times, the same newspaper which graduated Press Secretary Jim Hagerty into government service.

Yet it was the question asked by a small town reporter, Miss McLendon, that got the big headlines next day. She was also the only small town reporter who managed to get an answer from the President and she had quite a hard time getting it.

From the start of the press conference Miss McLendon kept bobbing up. But the President did not choose to see her. When she did address him, "Mr. President," he abruptly turned to N. Y. Times reporter James Reston who sat off in a corner and was not noticeably making an effort to obtain recognition.

The president Miss McLendon, who never gets discouraged at having her ears pinched back, persevered. And toward the end of the press conference she managed to get this important question, which the President seemed almost intuitively to be answering:

"Would you order those Marines that were sent over to the Mediterranean and over in that area," she asked, "would you order them to war without asking the Congress first?"

The official transcript of the press conference as released to the public by James Hagerty bore a notation at this point: "Laughter." However, newsmen attending the conference remember no laughter, and some suspect the word was inserted as an attempt to belittle Miss McLendon. Certainly it was a most serious question, and the President's reply indicated that he considered it so.

"I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood. "I get discouraged sometimes here," he said, obviously trying to lighten the mood.

**No Laughing Matter**

At this point there was definite laughter, though the conference transcript did not so indicate. It quickly stopped, however, as newsmen noted how serious and irritated the President was.