



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1956

Rescue Lawyers' Plan From File 13

PROSPECTS for more elbow room at City Hall and the County Courthouse are promising. But the proposed removal of city-county school administration offices to a separate building is nothing more than a palliative action.

The basic problem remains: So much to do and so little space. The county's case of governmental cramps is particularly severe. A cure was prescribed almost four months ago by the 26th Judicial Bar Association. It came in the form of a thoughtful, comprehensive plan for the erection of a new office building "to house the activities of Mecklenburg County and other related municipal or state governmental functions."

Since the proposal was made—in early January—nothing has been heard of it at all. Heads nodded briefly in agreement—and then turned to fresher, if more ephemeral, issues.

Meanwhile the clutter builds up. The taxpayer's money is being wasted by the reduced efficiency of inadequate, outdated facilities. The present courthouse was erected

some 30 years ago when Mecklenburg's governmental operations were still in the rural county courthouse era. Since that time there has been a swift, steady expansion of governmental functions at all levels. There is every reason to believe that the expansion will continue.

A more modern county office building—should be designed not only to serve today's needs but for the needs of tomorrow as well—with thought given to the possible consolidation of city and county government in the not too distant future.

The present courthouse naturally would not be abandoned. It could still be used for traditional county functions, such as offices for the clerk of court, register of deeds, tax officials, sheriff's department and county police. The new office building—a modern, functional structure apart from the old courthouse—would house a vast array of governmental machinery.

The bar association's plan is still worthy of the county's earnest consideration. It should be rescued from obscurity.

'Nuclear Stalemate' Gives Disarmament Talks Urgency

By WALTER LIPPMAN

NEW YORK
MR. Stassen and Mr. Gromyko, who are in London exchanging proposals about the race of armaments, are no doubt a long way from an actual treaty which could be signed and ratified. And there is something new in the temper, if not in the substance, of what they are proposing. We may describe it, if seems to me, by saying that each government, while defending its own strategic interests, is now very anxious to prove that it is not the obstacle to an agreement and that it is trying genuinely to negotiate.

The London meeting is interesting, not only for what might conceivably come out of it in the end, but because it is reflecting the objective military situation in the world today. Both the USA and the USSR have taken a new look at the situation. They are now reacting each in its own way to the same basic fact—namely that there exists, precariously, a stalemate in nuclear weapons.

TIME LAG

There is almost always a lag in human affairs between an actual change in a situation and the official appreciation of the change. We are like people on the back platform of a railroad car who see the country through which the train has already passed. It is fair to say, I think, that not until the past few months have the governments taken seriously into account the strategic revolution which began in 1949 when the Soviet Union broke the American monopoly of nuclear weapons.



GROMYKO
Something New . . .

The failure to take this revolution into account is a reason, perhaps the reason, why for so many years disarmament has been such a fruitless and boring subject.

The summit meeting at Geneva last July was the first great reflection of the military stalemate. The Geneva meeting acknowledged that the stalemate exists. This meeting in London, and the correspondence between Bulganin and Eisenhower which preceded it, are concerned with

the stalemate, with how to prove it, with how to benefit by it, with its effects on the two alliances and on the uncommitted nations.

TWO VIEWPOINTS

We can best understand what is going on in London if we look at the proposals from two points of view—first, as they reflect the vital interests of the two nuclear powers themselves, and second, how these proposals are addressed to the other nations which do not have nuclear weapons.

Both Moscow and Washington have acknowledged publicly that in the stalemate they are mutually deterred from going to war. They have been asking themselves under what conditions, the deterrents might not work. Obviously, the deterrents would cease to work if one or the other of the two lost the race of armaments—that is to say fell seriously behind the other in airplanes and missiles. But, assuming that the race remains equal, the stalemate might well be broken if one or the other achieved a tactical surprise or some decisive strategic advantage.

SNEAK ATTACKS

Here lies the key to what Washington and Moscow are proposing. For us, the greatest danger is that the Soviet Union, relying on the fact that it is a closed and censored and secretive society, could achieve tactical surprise and deliver a knock-out blow by a sneak attack. Our policy is for this reason primarily directed not to reducing armaments but against the sneak attack. What we want is inspection



STASSEN
... In The Temper

from the air and on the ground to provide an early warning system.

The Soviet Union is not worried about a sneak attack, knowing quite well that in our open society it would be morally and technically impossible to mount an attack and to strike without warning. What the Soviet Union worries about is the circle of American Air Force bases from which so many different attacks could be launched. That is why the central purpose

of Soviet policy is to dislocate and liquidate the alliances on which the encircling air bases depend.

These are such big differences that it is hard to see how agreement can be reached. Perhaps, we should say, it is hard to see how an agreement can be reached. But in the long run it may well be that our bases will become obsolete and that the Soviet system of secrecy will become unworkable.

TALKS MUST GO ON

Both the USA and the USSR have become deeply conscious that they are the only two nuclear powers in a world which is for nuclear warfare unarmed. Great Britain is a partial exception in that it has some nuclear weapons. But the British Isles are too small to be able to absorb and deter a nuclear attack.

Moscow and Washington are, therefore, armed powers dealing with an unarmed world. Naturally, Great Britain is a partial exception in that it has some nuclear weapons. But the British Isles are too small to be able to absorb and deter a nuclear attack. Moscow and Washington are, therefore, armed powers dealing with an unarmed world. Naturally, Great Britain is a partial exception in that it has some nuclear weapons. But the British Isles are too small to be able to absorb and deter a nuclear attack.

Alcoholism: The Voices And The Hands

CHARLOTTE is an island of sobriety. An eye weaned on gigawatt puzzles bogged at the report. But the statistics were concise. Not only was Charlotte tied with Austin, Tex., for the lowest population percentage of far-gone alcoholics, but this largest urban area of the Carolinas occupies the soberest section in all Tar Heels.

The report was as mystifying as it was welcome. The reasons why Charlotte has such a fortunate distinction are hidden in a mountain of sociological factors. And it is going to take some tedious sifting to bring out the significance of the statistics.

The report ran counter to popular notions of the causes of alcoholism all across the board. Lost weekenders proportionately are more numerous in Wilmington, Del., and Sacramento, Calif., than in New York and Detroit where skidrows are prominent features of the metropolitan terrain.

Density of population and complex social structures, the report suggests, are not unfailing pass keys to the alcohol problem. A citizen is more apt to tipple too much in South Bend, Ind., than in Washington, D. C.

Leaving the precise lessons of the report to those trained to find them, Charlotteans will cite their churches and community organizations, active chapters of Alcoholics Anonymous and a generally stable social structure as reasons for relative freedom from the problem. They cannot be wrong in that. They will be right in giving even greater support to the churches, Scouts, Ys, social agencies and all other such groups so that no citizen will be beyond the reach of a helping hand or the sound of an understanding voice. For whatever the myriad causes of alcoholism it can be said that it flourishes best where no hands touch or voices speak.

Vandalism: A Late Inning Rally

CHARLOTTE may yet score in its campaign against juvenile vandalism. If it cannot reform the culprits it will at least be easier to catch them in the act.

The City Council yesterday gave approval to the issuance of a "special officer's" permit to Harry Holmes, employed by the Park & Recreation Commission to keep a close watch on hard-hit public property. He will operate with a radio-equipped automobile, providing quick communication with police patrol cars.

He cannot, of course, be everywhere at once. But he will be thoroughly familiar with potential target areas, know exactly what to watch for, and operate immediately when something is not quite right.

As always, society is quick to devise methods of detection of crime and law

to do anything about preventing it. Certainly the presence of a watchman of sorts may have some preventive value. But it doesn't help the attitude of the potential vandal. He can always go somewhere else to commit his destructive act—and often does.

The heart of the problem is out of the reach of "special officers." It is in the homes and families of the growing child. Here and here alone is the cradle of his sentiments, attitudes, tensions and other emotional distortions. It is a good bet that many children with aggressive behavior problem are more neurotic than delinquent. If such children could get attention early enough we could save lives, careers, lives, hearthstones, and a great deal of money—including the salaries of "special officers."

Here is the real challenge for society's ingenuity.

'Pardon Me, But I think That's My Hat'



HERB BLOCK
GIVES THE WASHINGTON POST

British To Use Naked Force If Middle East Catches Fire

By JOSEPH ALSOP

LONDON
THE absence of any clear lead from Washington, the present British government has decided what to do if worst comes to worst in the Middle East. The resolve is to fight it head on, and against heavy odds.

As already reported, for example, the situation in Jordan is regarded here as immediately dangerous. In Jordan, King Hussein's abrupt dismissal of Gen. Sir John Bagot Glubb has opened the way to a pro-Egyptian anti-Western coup which would depose King Hussein in favor of a young officer's junta like the one that now rules Egypt.

Faced with this possibility, the British cabinet has sought to keep the situation in hand by continuing their subsidy to Jordan despite the humiliation of Gen. Glubb's dismissal. None the less, the odds are thought here to be rather heavy that a coup in Jordan will be attempted soon.

Circumstances certainly are favorable, in view of the leanings of the present Jordanian cabinet, for the changes in command in the Arab Legion since Gen. Glubb's enforced departure, and the degree of Communist underground penetration.

Intervention
Faced with this likelihood of a coup in Jordan, the British government has tentatively decided to intervene. They will join the Jordanian civil war if it is realigned by a civil war. Everything will depend on whether the existing order has enough remaining support in the Arab Legion and elsewhere so that there is a serious likelihood of action which the British can assist.

If there is such a faction to assist, the British mean to assist with two or three regiments of British troops stationed in Jordan. In the final pinch they may also send the parachute brigade which has been moved for the purpose to Cyprus.

DESPERATE RESOLVE
In addition, but somewhat desperate resolve has been taken about the danger in Jordan because of the British estimate of the situation in Iraq. King Faisal II of Iraq is the cousin of King Hussein of Jordan. King Faisal's Prime Minister, the brilliant and aging Nuri es-Said, is strongly pro-Western.

Yet once again the existing order is strongly threatened by an ill-Western, pro-Egyptian forces, which are working beneath the surface with active Communist assistance. The danger in Iraq will be enormously increased if the danger next door in Jordan is not successfully averted. Protecting the position in Iraq is the real motive of the conditional British resolve to intervene in Jordan. It is also the real motive of the otherwise puzzling British insis-

tance on stronger American support for the Baghdad Pact. The idea is to strengthen Nuri es-Said's King Faisal.

Finally, the protection of the Middle Eastern oil source is the real motive of the British desire to protect the position in Iraq at almost any cost. Iraq itself is a major oil producer. A defeat in Iraq would produce immediate disaster in the Arab world, such as Iran, which was so narrowly saved from the Communist Tudeh Party only a few years ago.

What is chiefly learned in London, in short, is the stage by stage loss of the oil sources which are the true lifeblood of these states. The gravity of the British view is clearly suggested by another conditional resolve that has been taken here. If, ever so slightly, the position in Iraq changes, the British government means to hold the Sheikdom of Kuwait as a bargaining chip, if need be.

PRACTICAL POLICY
This last ditch policy is practical, though unattractive. The population of Kuwait is not large enough to resist effectively. Kuwait alone has enough oil, if the tap is turned on a little harder, to meet the needs of Britain and Western Europe for a good many years to come. Even so, there might be very great difficulties for the Egyptians sought to retaliate by closing the Suez Canal to oil tankers from Kuwait. This is entirely imaginable. Again, it can be quite possibly stated that the Soviet ambassadors in Egypt and Syria have expressed Soviet interest in intervention in the Middle East if any Western power intervenes there, either in the manner outlined above or in order to bring about a renewal of the Arab-Israeli fighting. And the Soviets may mean what they are saying.

UGLY OUTLOOK
Altogether the outlook is not pretty. The simple fact that such plans are even being prepared in London proves the acute peril to the Western Alliance of the state of affairs that prevails in Washington. If the Eisenhower administration dislikes the policy, that is being liberally worked out here—and would certainly be understandable—then the Eisenhower administration has a reasonable duty to come forward with a positive practical Middle Eastern policy of its own, which will probably be greeted with sighs of relief by the British.

John Steinbeck In Saturday Review

MADISON AVENUE AND THE ELECT. N

THE Republican and Democratic National Committees have announced that advertising agencies will again design their presidential campaigns in 1956. This gives rise to some speculation on the virtues and the dangers of such a cause.

The last presidential campaign was also handled by major agencies, and the methods successfully employed then will doubtless be used again. Chief among the tactics then used was the trapping of captive television viewers. It works this way. Let us say there is a fat comedian who is so admired that when his show goes on X millions of television screens welcome him. His admirers gather by families, by clans. Bars with TV are jammed. So funny is this man that people laugh before he speaks because they know how funny he is going to be. They feel close to him and also they feel indebted to him to the extent of rushing out to buy the product he endorses. This is the purpose of his being on television at all. Now, in addition to being amused his audience is also half-hypnotized. Television does this to people. Their eyes glaze, their mouths go slack, and they move only with great effort. They are truly a captive audience. The time following such a program is very valuable for here you save X millions of people in a wild, helpless state, unable to resist any suggestion offered—even that of breakfast food. This then is the time when the Republican or Democratic National Committee, through the advertising company, steps in with a sharp message. Sometimes it is a sweet thought of the good to come. At other times the virtues of the candidate are dangled before the hypnotized viewers. Laborers, housewives, common, simple people are shown joyfully announcing

their intentions of voting the proper ticket. It is hoped that the captive audience when it regains the power of locomotion will be so overcome that it will be drawn with zombie inevitability to the Republicans or the Democrats' side of the ballot. If they will buy the things they are told to buy, and they do, then they will vote the way they are told to vote. Q. E. D.

There is only one difficulty in all of this and don't think the National Committees are not aware of it. The captive audience has been conditioned to buy Squeakies—the body-building bran dust. Then suddenly the message changes and they are told to vote for Elmer Flegandale for senator.

Now the responses of the captive audience are slow and slightly confused, which is what the great advertising companies want them to be. There is a great danger that they may be confused and vote for a cereal. It was no accident that a cleansing powder won three public offices last year and that the sovereign people of the State of South Tiggs elected a two-ton convertible to the governorship. The danger does not stop here. If in our country there should be candidates capable of good natured chicanery, and if they should enter into partnership with advertising agencies, the possibilities are frightening. Could a captive TV audience resist a chocolate-candidate or one with sugar and cream in his hair? Why the electorate might even insist on tasting candidates before voting.

The fellow who brings an open mind and an impartial, objective approach to any discussion finds that when it's all over he can't catch a ride home with anybody on either side.—FLORINA TIMES-UNION.

Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the editors. The News reserves the right to condense.

Will Dulles Fiddle While Israel Burns?

Editors: The News: Charlotte

For five months Israel has vainly appealed for arms to keep the peace in the Middle East; for five months the Arab nations are openly and flagrantly buying the tools of war to destroy Israel and endanger the peace of the world.

Mr. Dulles has turned deaf ears to the pleas of Israel, other great powers and the petition of its congressmen representing 50 million Americans. Mr. Dulles is gambling with the security of the United States. Mr. Dulles' great gamble on the brink of a world war is based purely on hope and wishful thinking, that through weakness and throwing Israel to the mercy of the hostile

Arab nations, the aggressors would become friendly and peace-loving. Is that sane? Is that a policy to command the respect of the world? Mr. Dulles' "Policy of Friendly Impartiality" Is it friendly or impartial to withhold arms from a small nation whose life hangs by a bare thread? Is it friendly or impartial to say to the world that Israel cannot be defended? Is it friendly or impartial to see before our eyes the army of hostile war camps beating the war drums and remain impassive and undisturbed? Is it friendly or impartial to abandon Israel to its fate? Is it friendly or impartial to allow hostile nations to arm and invade attack upon Israel because of this country's refusal to sell arms to Israel?

Our responsibility as a great

world power to aid all freedom-loving nations and to take decisive action for peace is found wanting by Mr. Dulles' policy, which is endangering the security of the United States and endangering the life of Israel as a nation, risking access to the oil fields of the Middle East and losing influence and prestige before the world. Mr. Dulles states, "Solution means other than an arms race." That the solution lies elsewhere than giving arms to Israel, does it help world peace to let the Arab world grow stronger and bolder?

Israel eight minutes from death and destruction, the peace of the world imperiled, subject to the whims and fits of the Arab war leaders, and the Israelis cannot make up his mind. —SAUL ASHKENAZIE

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

SOME of the big Democratic bosses backing Adlai Stevenson got together in Pittsburgh shortly after Adlai's defeat in Minnesota to try to figure out what they should do.

Arvey Absent

The meeting was held at the invitation of Mayor David Lawrence of Pittsburgh, one of the staunchest Stevenson backers. Col. Jake Arvey of Chicago was invited, also Carmine De Sippo, head of Tammany Hall, though neither could make it.

Bitter Enders

However, Jim Finnegan, former leader of the Democrats in Philadelphia, together with other Stevenson leaders, attended.

Stevensonites Determined To Do Or Die

Its net result was a decision to back Stevenson to the bitter end and knock Kefauver off at any cost. The leaders were confident they could deal Kefauver out of the nomination at any cost, no matter how many primaries he wins.

Use Rayburn

Their attitude was one of let the public go hang. They talked of controlling the convention through Speaker Sam Rayburn, appointment of the nomination at the well-known bitterness against Kefauver. As for Stevenson's chances in November, the bosses told each other that almost any Democrat can win as long as Nixon stays on the GOP ticket.

Strange Alliance

The secret congressional buddies over the farm bill have been cold, difficult,

and technical. However, one interesting night stands out. They had developed an alliance between Sen. Aiken of rock-ribbed Republican Vermont, and Dixie-riding Democrat Sen. Eastland of Mississippi, joining them most of the

For The Farmers

All the five members of the House, whether Republican or Democrat, have voted for the farmers in the joint conference between House and Senate. We have Democratic Sen. Ellender of Louisiana, Johnston of South Carolina, and Young, Republican of North Dakota.

No Arguments

But Young, Aiken and Florida's Holland have stuck right together in upholding Benson and Eisenhower for flexible price supports. Aiken and Holland

only automatically. No arguments, not much debate. Only one Aiken got a bit excited when Eastland introduced a complex amendment on pricing cotton—which would have had the effect of reducing the price of cotton. Other conferees got the impression Aiken had made a deal with Eastland to support the amendment. Anyway, the only vote for it went Aiken's and his Dixie ally, Holland.

Personal Interest

Aiken introduced another complex amendment to benefit dairy farmers and sheepmen. He did not speak for the administration this time. Dairy farming, of course, is important to Vermont. That's how the farm bill is being rewritten by ten men in secret sessions.

Human Affairs

THE SIGHT of human affairs stirs desires admiration and pity. And he is not invariable who pays them the undramatic tribute of a sigh which is not a grin.—Joseph Conrad in "A Personal Record."