



Thomas L. Robinson... President and Publisher
Brodie S. Griffith... General Manager
Cecil Prince... Associate Editor
R. L. Young Jr... Managing Editor
Huey Stinson... Circulation Manager

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1956

Public Education At The Crossroads: A Time For Wisdom, Faith And Hope

FROM the mountains to the coast, the mood of North Carolina today is a strange complex of ancient fears, present problems and future hopes, of apathy and vigor, of fatalism and determination, of permanence and change.

THE constitutional amendment implementing it—proponents argue that it is a measure to save the public schools. It permits schools to be suspended only in the face of "intolerable situations" which may exist in a particular locality and permits the payment of state tuition grants of approximately \$135 a year to children who would prefer to attend a private school rather than a racially mixed public school.

It is viewed, then, as a moderate and constitutional solution to the school problem. It is hoped that such a solution will prevent outbreaks of violence stirred by community sentiment against desegregation for it would give outraged citizens a legal and theoretically effective "safety valve."

It is argued that the state structure of education would be preserved and that the voters in local communities will be given freedom of choice to cope with the problem.

Proponents warn, too, that if the Pearsall Plan is not approved extremists in the next General Assembly will surely draft a program which is more drastic in its effect than the one in North Carolina.

North Carolina, even in the midst of an era of social and economic change, stands as it always has—virtually inviolate, insistent upon its individuality, stubborn in its differentness, proud of its progress, firm in its prejudices.

It is indicative of this mood that the great mass of the population has refused to get excited about the Pearsall Plan and Saturday's special election. There is something a little frightening about this lag in interest—this is the most important decision in the decade of North Carolina have had to make since the beginning of the century.

WE DO NOT intend to tell Tar Heels how they must change, nor the public school amendment Saturday. We do not presume to have any editorial monopoly on wisdom, virtue or judgment. We believe—very deeply believe—that this is a matter for the individual conscience of each citizen.

Our stand on the issue, as it developed, should be well known. We have no intention of revising or diluting it now. Following the July special session we expressed the opinion that the General Assembly had erred in combining the two most important elements of the Pearsall Plan in a single constitutional amendment. It erred in approving a local option "safety valve" of questionable safety—one which would endanger the constitutional mandate for a uniform system of free, state-supported public schools. It erred in scheduling a statewide vote Sept. 6 rather than Nov. 6 when a larger expression of public sentiment might have been obtained.

BUT IT IS too late for tears over what the General Assembly did or did not do. That is history. The question now is whether the people of North Carolina will accept what is frankly recognized by all sides as a somewhat less than perfect legislative package in the absence of anything better.

It is important therefore that the people should know precisely what is at stake. They should also have the benefit of some of the legitimate arguments on both sides.

We have discussed the Pearsall Plan in detail ever since it was first conceived. At the risk of oversimplification, we will attempt to present at this time in capsule form certain viewpoints on both sides of the issue.

In support of the Pearsall Plan—and

IN OPPOSITION to the Pearsall Plan and to the constitutional amendment, it can be argued that the best way to "save the schools" is to keep them open.

Any weakening of the constitutional mandate guaranteeing a universal system of free, state-supported public education is a backward step which North Carolina ought not to take, opponents argue. They see the state's public school system as its most valuable institution.

It is feared that the rights of a minority—white or Negro—could be trampled by the will of the majority if "local option" becomes law.

As to tuition grants, it is argued that \$135 per year per child would not pay for an education in a private school in North Carolina. Furthermore, there are no private schools to speak of in the state. Also, it is felt that a diversion of public money into private channels might not be constitutional.

Finally, it is argued that Tar Heels will have to resist the threat of drastic legislation action whether the Pearsall Plan passes or not.

THERE can be no question about the sincerity of leading figures on both sides of this enormously important issue. All believe they have the best interests of the state and its people at heart.

The decision now rests in the collective conscience of the voters of North Carolina.

We urge you to vote on Saturday. We urge further that the decision you make be rooted in intelligence, understanding and moral conviction.

The effect of what is done will live with us through history.

Cornfields, Gum Trees & Patriotism

IS PATRIOTISM dead in the U. S. A.? This is the season for politicians to make fist-thumping disclosure of the quality burning so intensely within their own breasts, while implying their opponents have forgotten patriotism or think it is out of date.

It's always open season for article writers to deplore the failure of schools to "teach" patriotism. The decline of the flag-draped bandbox exuding martial airs on summer evenings is lamented, and notice is taken that people are negligent about hanging out the flag on holidays.

They say that patriotism can be taught in the classroom or instilled from the platform. They imply that the country is proved by signing loyalty oaths, or painting mail boxes red, white and blue. In sum, they say that something ought to be done.

As a matter of fact, something is being done. People are having vacations every summer, they are moving about the broad land and they are looking at it. Maybe patriotism can be pounded into

mind and heart by orators and teachers. It comes unspoken through the eye that looks on the endless sweep and configurations of the face of the nation. Each year more eyes behold that face, and more hearts feel the quiet pride of knowing that this land belongs to them, and they belong to this land. It is a case of mutual possession.

The cornfields that march off out of sight belong to an Ohio farmer. Some Tennessee has a claim on the mountainside where a single gum tree has made an early surrender to autumn. The sheep that mill at a meadow gate in Virginia are the property of some other man who plants their pasture and shears their wool.

But to the vacationer the corn, the tree, the sheep, the mountain also belong to him in a special way.

He cannot explain the wonder that he feels, but it is like love, and he knows that no one else can explain it either.

He thinks the orators and the article writers ought to get out and look at the land, and be reassured.

From The Washington Post & Times-Herald

WHAT PRICE THE CITY?

IN A DESPERATE effort to restore a little human comfort to the business of living in New York City, the authorities are experimenting with air-conditioning on the subway shuttles between Times Square and the Grand Central Terminal. The initial results may give Frank Lloyd Wright, who long has regarded the big city as totally inhumane and outmoded, occasion for a highly satisfying chuckle. It seems that the one-minute run between the Square and the Terminal was not long enough for the air-conditioners to overcome the hot air taken in during the one-to-two-minute stops at each end of the shuttle. The tightly sealed cars were thus more oppressive than the old leaky ones.

The difficulty doubtless can be overcome with air conditioner of higher capacity. But this little example of the extravagant economics and absurd ex-

traneous of high-density living points up again the growing realization among our best planners that the modern city's basic ailment is its incompatibility with the basic amenities of life. Architect Amancio Williams of Argentina, perhaps this hemisphere's outstanding exponent of this idea, and Richard J. Neutra of California, are among those who believe that a radically new approach to urban design, rooted in human needs, is necessary. We think there is more merit than whimsy in Dr. Neutra's recent suggestion that the biologist and the physiologist should be chairmen in meetings for reshaping the human environment.

Sign on back of trailer-truck: "Don't Sit Here, Nag Your Husband." —ATLANTA CONSTITUTION.

Ike's Changing Image: From Father To Party Leader

By JOSEPH ALSOP

THE campaign problem that President Eisenhower out here in the Northwest can be rather simply summed up. For the great bloc of the working-class voters, at least, Eisenhower has lost his father-status as a President above party. He is now thought of as a Republican President. And a large majority of this great voting bloc does not like or trust the Republican Party.

A previous report described the rather massive switch of urban Northwestern voters from Stevenson to Eisenhower. This was revealed by arduous polling in the company of a professional, Lou Harris.

As nearly as we could judge, Portland and Seattle and their surrounding counties now show about the same majority for Stevenson that these key voting areas gave to Eisenhower in 1952. If there are also farm defections from Eisenhower, the switching in the big cities could conceivably put Oregon and Washington into the Democratic column in November.

SMALL SAMPLE

Our sample was too small to measure the switch precisely. But our results were so dramatically consistent, in both cities, in all working class precincts, and even from city block to city block that I have no doubt at all about the reality of the switch. The nature of the switch was rather clearly revealed by one of the dramatic consistencies that we discovered.

In brief, Eisenhower carried Washington by a wide margin in 1952, while the youthful Democrat, "Scoop" Jackson, beat the Republican, Harry Cain, by a wide margin in the Senate race. Again, Eisenhower carried Oregon by a

wide margin; but two years later the Democratic, Richard Neuberger, nosed out the old-line Republican, Guy Gordon, in the 1954 Senate race.

NO PARTY

We found no one who had voted for Cain or Gordon who was switching from Eisenhower to Stevenson. When you asked them their party affiliation, they would rarely say they were Republicans. They would almost invariably say, "We vote for the man, not the party"; for being a Republican is not a matter of pride among the neighbors in a working-class district. But the Cain and Gordon voters were genuine Republicans, none the less, and were loyal to their party.

On the other hand, if you ran into an Oregonian who had voted for Eisenhower and then for Neuberger, or a Washingtonian who had split the ticket to vote "Scoop" Jackson, you generally found a switcher to Stevenson. "Time for a change," discontent with the Korean war, the warmth of the President's personality, had won these people to Eisenhower in 1952. But they had recorded their real party preference in their votes in the Senate races. And although they still "like Ike," they now regard him as a Republican, and their party preference leads them to choose Adlai Stevenson, who is "a fine man too." Stevenson was not doing quite so well as Jackson did in Washington, but he seemed to be running in Oregon just about as Neuberger ran.

LEADS TICKET

By the same token—and here is another big surprise—Stevenson was leading the Democratic ticket in both states. The experts have been predicting heavy ticket-split-



PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER The Switch Voters Are Leaving Him

ting in favor of the Northwestern Democratic Senate candidates, Wayne Morse in Oregon and Warren Magnuson in Washington. We found a lot of ticket-splitting, but it was going both ways, because of the popularity among Washington voters of the Republican Senate candidate, Gov. Arthur Langlie, and because Morse is far from universally popular in Oregon. In both states, therefore, Stevenson was just a hair ahead of the Democratic ticket.

What, then, is one to make of this significant Democratic resurgence in the key urban areas

of the Northwest? It is a real thing, I have no doubt, but as of now it is a fragile thing. In most cases, the switchers had made their decisions without passion or violent conviction. Their decisions, one could guess, might be changed later on. A lot can depend on the campaign that is now opening.

SITUATION FLUID

But the fact that the situation is still relatively fluid is by no means sure to benefit the Republicans. They are vulnerable to further losses in the urban areas, because the urban working class voters are

themselves very vulnerable to any economic squeeze. I have ventured to use the phrase "working class" to describe these voters because it is the way they think of themselves. In discussing their politics, they freely said they were working people, and naturally we always have to remember that. Yet this phrase, in its old-fashioned ring, hardly conjured up the physical reality that Lou Harris and I saw.

NO MISERY

There are no pockets of misery in Seattle or Portland. I could not see the slightest difference, in fact, between the solidly pro-Eisenhower Seattle precinct inhabited by junior executives and embryonic professional men, and the strongly pro-Stevenson working class precinct inhabited by Boeing aircraft foremen and workers and others who made their living by their hands. There were the same nice but small houses, the same cars and television sets and parlor furniture and pretty gardens (although the working people had the edge as gardeners).

PRICE RISE

But there was, no doubt, a small difference in family incomes between the two precincts. Furthermore, having found their final place in life, the people in the working class precinct were older, and their families were bigger. Thus the high living standard they had achieved was fairly hard to maintain. One could not guess that the price rises of the last months had a lot to do with making up the switches' minds. And I would say further that any additional rises in the cost of living will hurt the Republicans badly, not just as an additional drop in farm prices will hurt them badly in the farm areas.

'Adlai Is Sure Popularizing That Hole-In-The Shoe'



Serious Faults Developing In Court's Desegregation Policy

By WALTER LIPPMANN

WE ARE now at the beginning of the third year since the Supreme Court held that segregation in the public schools, as it has prevailed in seventeen states and the District of Columbia, is unlawful.

Eight southern states, extending from Virginia to Louisiana, have taken legal action to nullify the law as applied to primary and secondary schools, and five of them—all but Virginia, Mississippi and Alabama—maintain segregation in their colleges and universities. Only the District of Columbia, which is under federal government, has abolished segregation entirely. In most but not all of the remaining nine states—which include all the border states—there are some mixed schools. But they are largely confined to communities where white and colored children, such as white Negroes are a small minority of the population.

SHORT TIME

Two years are a very short time in a matter of such gravity and difficulty. But they have been long enough, it seems to me, to raise questions which deserve the most careful study and discussion. These questions revolve around the policy—as laid down by the Supreme Court—for putting the law into effect. This policy we can now see, is suitable and effective in communities, as for example the District of Columbia, where the public authority and a preponderant public opinion are in favor of observance and compliance. But in the resistant states or communities, in the hard core of the South, the policy is most unwise. It is, in fact, either ineffective—which discredits the law—or dangerous to peace and order.

THE ESSENTIAL POLICY, which I am talking about, is this: Having declared that segregation in public schools is unlawful, the Supreme Court invited citizens in communities which do not comply voluntarily to come into the District Court for a redress of their grievance. This means in practice that in segregated communities Negro families who are willing to fight for their children's rights must get a lawyer, supplied usually by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and must ask the judge to order the local officials to do what these local officials do not want to do.

A BETTER WAY

Is this a good way to go about putting the southern states to comply with a law which they must live with? There must be a better way than to initiate the process of compliance by a legal fight in which a Negro fam-

ily calls on the federal government to override the will of its own community, and subjects Negro children to the kind of ordeal that they are suffering now in Clinton, Tenn.

These two years have shown, it seems to me, that the great project of integrating the public schools of the United States is more than a matter of laying down the law and then demanding that every one comply with it. Where there are two school systems, one white and one Negro, integration requires a program which looks ahead for a generation, and faces up to the practical problems of integration, such as the financial cost, such as the difference in educational opportunity and of living standards, such as the care of colored children, such as white and colored adolescents it will be wise to combine co-education with integration.

CONSENSUS NEEDED

The problem is one for statesmen and for district judges, and it cannot be solved by scattered law suits. What we very much need is to arrive at a national consensus of enlightened opinion as to how—at the hard core of the problem in the South—we should go about effecting compliance.

My own view is that at the hard core the wisest policy is to proceed by stages, beginning as soon as possible with integration in the universities. In the graduate schools of law, medicine, education, engineering, theology—and, in fact, in all the professions—causing social convulsions, in the bigger colleges. The object of this is to bring about a new generation of white and colored men and women who will be the leaders in their communities.

HARD CORE

Until they exist, there is little prospect that at the hard core there will be a disposition by whites and Negroes to work together on the complex and sensitive problem of integrating at the primary and secondary levels. At the hard core, a state which complies with the law at the university level should for some years not be deemed to be acting in good faith. We would be deceiving ourselves if we thought that at the hard core it is possible to tackle the whole problem at once, and to move any faster.

Until the elections are over nothing useful can be done about forming a new policy and arriving at a consensus to support it. But it will be on the agenda, and not too far from the top, of the president-elect.

People's Platform

Remember Sabbath And Keep It Holy

Charlotte. I ENJOYED the letter Mr. Mitchell had in The News about the Sunday laws and I am sure that Dr. Warren and other ministers who are in favor of keeping the Sabbath holy will not have to pay for breaking it. God's word said remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy and all the money on earth won't pay anyone out of hell.

All we have belongs to God. Fathers and mothers who fail to teach their boys and girls to go to church and live for Christ will one day pay for it with tears. A

house that doesn't have Christ as its leader is not a home and will one day fall. Those of us who are on God's side will not have to worry about breaking the Sabbath day.

Charlotte. I THINK your paper owes Gov. Timmerman of South Carolina an apology for the headline, "Byrnes, Timmerman Back Independents," which appeared in your first edition today (Aug. 3).

Editors: Nat Woolsey, who owed and offered. The erroneous reference to Gov. Timmerman was detected and deleted in most copies of the first edition.

Editors: Nat Woolsey, who owed and offered. The erroneous reference to Gov. Timmerman was detected and deleted in most copies of the first edition.

Editors: Nat Woolsey, who owed and offered. The erroneous reference to Gov. Timmerman was detected and deleted in most copies of the first edition.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go Round

Editors: Note: Drew Pearson is touring the Middle East. During his absence, the Washington Merry-Go-Round will be written by his junior partner, Jack Anderson.

WASHINGTON. In a memo suppressed by Atomic Energy Chairman Lewis Strauss, atomic engineers have warned sternly that the "fast breeder" power reactor be approved for construction outside Detroit may "risk the health and safety of the public."

Hot Heap

Last November, a similar but smaller experimental reactor at Arco, Idaho, melted down into a hot radioactive heap that couldn't be touched for six months. Puzzled scientists still haven't found the cause.

staff in our country against the law of the country."

—MRS. J. D. BIGGERS

Timmerman Tabbed Wrongly In Paper

Myrtle Beach, S. C. I THINK your paper owes Gov. Timmerman of South Carolina an apology for the headline, "Byrnes, Timmerman Back Independents," which appeared in your first edition today (Aug. 3).

Editors: Nat Woolsey, who owed and offered. The erroneous reference to Gov. Timmerman was detected and deleted in most copies of the first edition.

Proposed Atom Plant Might Explode

Yet Strauss, ignoring the urgent advice of his own safety experts, obeyed construction of the same design atomic power plant in Detroit's populous back yard. The \$10,000,000 plant will be built by the Power Reactor Development Co., which, like the Dixon-Yates combine, was formed by several private companies.

No Secret

Though there isn't a secret in it, Strauss has guarded the embarrassing memo as if it were a blueprint of the H-bomb. He carefully stamped it "top secret" before showing it, as required by law, to the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee. Chairman Flint Anderson (D-MI) angrily returned it with a demand that the security classification be removed. But Strauss agreed only to change the stamp from "top se-

cret" to "administratively confidential." Similarly, he has turned down a demand by Michigan Gov. Mennen "Scoop" Williams to make the document public. The governor argued fully that the proposed reactor might endanger citizens of his state.

Despite Strauss' precautions, this memo has obtained a copy of the hush hush. Here are some of the more explosive passages. "The committee believes," wrote the AEC's scientists, "there is insufficient information available at this time to give assurance that the PRDC reactor can be operated at this site without public hazard."

Not Sure

The scientists acknowledged, however, that they could not say for sure the

reactor would be unsafe. Strauss had claimed to assure the license that new research would guarantee safe operation by the time the reactor is completed in 1960. But the scientists disputed this.

"It appears doubtful," they wrote, "that sufficient experimental information will be available in time to give assurance of safe operation of this reactor unless the present (research) program of the AEC is amplified and accelerated."

Risk Of Explosion

Even an accelerated program, they added, might not give sufficient information to permit safe operation of this reactor at the Lagoona Beach site on the time schedule presently proposed.