

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

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1956

Schools Cannot Be Taken For Granted

SUDDENLY all ears were tuned to school bells in Charlotte. The massive red doors swung open and interested gazes followed the steady, frolicking stream of youthful humanity inside.

The newspapers took pictures and the reporters wrote their stories of a huge educational system awakening fitfully. For thousands of children and parents and just plain, ordinary people as important as the most important news item, nothing was as fascinating as the importance of as vital to the progress of the community.

The tenderest, most compelling vision of all was the sight of mothers and fathers leading saucer-eyed youngsters into the big, wide, wonderful world of the classroom.

Not even the violence in Tennessee or the ringing arguments over the Pearsall Plan in North Carolina, with their dominant racial theories, or the national politics or the tightness of the National League race could steal and hold the public's attention so well.

All at once, the school just around the corner was the most remarkable, the most stirring, the most important news item in the world. And a city stopped and stared and was interested.

Then, just as suddenly, everything was normal again. The September miracle was completed.

Normalcy, in this case, is an un-bashed taking-for-granted of the school system and all it represents. Parents and non-parents alike are guilty of the same lazy custom, the same forgetfulness and unconsciousness.

The schools cannot be taken for granted. Nor can their problems be left

to "them" to solve—"them" being the mythical and non-existent receiver of the buck passed by an apathetic public. The over-crowding, the building deficiencies, the teacher shortages, the decline in educational standards are important enough to catch and hold the public's continuing attention and interest.

We are not speaking of the chronic critics, those whose supercilious is "Stop Doing What You're Doing But Don't Ask Me What To Do." Their sentimental and destructive interest is neither required nor wanted.

We want to see more sincere and constructive concern. The schools do not get "magical" and intended in a democratic society. They need the general public's goodwill and assistance and enthusiastic backing. They also need the public's money to buy the kind of education our children deserve.

Recently, Henry Steele Commager, the famed historian, wrote:

For a century and a half American schools have strengthened and strengthened the commonwealth. They provided a citizenry as enlightened as any on earth. They justified and vindicated democracy's promise. If society clearly defines the new duties it wishes our schools to fulfill and if it steadfastly insists that not only with their money but also with their faith, they will surely justify that faith in the future as they have in the past.

With this kind of year-round dedication to the meaning and the challenge of the public school, the "corner," the "most stirring, the most important news item" to itself and its children.

Give Three Amendments A Quick Okay

AS PEARSCALL PLAN debate dwindles, passing attention should be paid three other constitutional amendments on the Saturday ballot.

Happily they are rather uncomplicated. They make sense. And citizens can vote for them without any of the soul searching with which sincere citizens have contemplated the school amendment.

Taking the simplest first, Amendment No. 2 would change the date for convening the General Assembly from January to February. The reason is that the filing deadline for income tax returns has been extended from March 15 to April 15, thereby delaying for a month the estimates of anticipated revenues legislators have to have before considering appropriations bills. This amendment will cause less frittering of time and taxpayers' money, and should be passed.

Amendment 1 will cost money, but also deserves approval because members of the General Assembly who will receive it have been short-changed long enough by the state for which they labor.

The amendment will increase from 90 to 120 regular session days for which legislators may be paid. It also will authorize law to provide a seven-and-a-half month travel and \$8-a-day subsistence

allowance for General Assembly members while engaged in legislative duties.

Effect of these changes would be to permit the General Assembly to convene on the Saturday following the election. The new sum would hardly represent wild generosity by taxpayers. Service in Raleigh now means serious financial losses for many legislators, on the basis of their actual earnings and income by their being away from their farms, businesses or professions.

Amendment 3 is good for the pride of women, and expeditious of legal affairs and business transactions.

It simply makes it possible for a married woman to execute a power of attorney conferred by her husband. With written authorization from him, she could sign his name to deeds of land belonging to her, and also to land owned by them jointly or by the husband alone. The amendment is designed to put an end to court battles over whether a wife, even with her husband's written consent, could convey her own property without his written consent in each instance. The amendment would merely constitutionalize a common business practice.

The need for Amendments 1, 2, 3 is as simple as their numbers, and they should be passed.

Two Silly Reasons For A Silly Question

SILLY questions don't always draw silly answers.

The reporter's question was: Will Adlai Stevenson need security clearance before receiving secret intelligence reports from the administration during the presidential campaign?

The eminently correct reply from Press Secretary James C. Hagerty was: "Absolutely not." A little display of temper on his part would have been out of keeping with the question.

The exchange between the two was not without value, however. It was a clear illustration of how insecure a nation can be after making security a fetish, how suspicion breeds when suspicion has been made fashionable and, in some notable cases, politically profitable.

Assuming the reporter had better sense than to think his question sensible, two other reasons for asking it suggests themselves. Either he thought the administration might stoop to such a patently political tactic as having the FBI run a check on the Democratic candidate for the nation's highest office, or

he thought some of his readers might be worried about Mr. Stevenson's loyalty.

The root of either reason is a virulent sense of insecurity flourishing after years of operation of a security program that often has violated the individual rights it was designed to protect.

One paradox leads to another. This one is that the administration actually has no qualms about giving top secrets to Stevenson while he is in the vice presidential candidate was suggesting darkly that Stevenson tolerated and defended communism in high places.

Happily, politicians can act more sensibly than they talk.

Mr. Stevenson will have the information he needs to shape his campaign utterances so as to avoid remarks prejudicial to good conduct of U. S. foreign affairs, as did Tom Dewey and Dwight Eisenhower before him.

From The Louisville Times

WHO'S OUT FRONT?

WE ARE NOT going to get into the argument between Democratic Chairman Butler and Dr. George Gallup on the validity of political polls. But we couldn't help being fascinated by Dr. Gallup's report that Mr. Butler's complaint about the current surveys.

Quoth Dr. Gallup the other day: "Interestingly, it is always the party that is behind which claims that our figures fail to reveal its true strength."

Interestingly, Harry Truman claimed in the 1948 campaign that the Gallup figures failed to reveal the Democratic Party's true strength. Interestingly, Dr. Gallup replied: "Mr. Truman would love us if we could show him out in front. Nobody wants to be shown behind."

Interestingly, Mr. Truman rebutted on October 29, 1948: "He will be more

red-faced pollsters on November 3 than there were in 1936, when they had to fold up THE LITERARY DIGEST. You can throw the Gallup poll right into the ashcan."

Interestingly, when November 3 came, Mr. Truman was right.

An Internal Revenue Service agent in Denver, according to the Associated Press, informed of a tardy income tax form filed by Mr. Truman was helping "Occupation" Tavern keeper "Joint return?" "No—I got a first-class place." —CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER.

An old fogey is anybody who likes music that makes you tap your foot instead of the kind that makes you jump up and down.—COLUMBIA (S. C.) STATE.

People's Platform

Editors, The News: Charlotte

A LITTLE PROOF has been given of how little the average person has knowledge of the crisis in the preservation of our public school system.

It is amazing to learn just how little the majority of people are acquainted with the issue so vital to every North Carolinian. Perhaps there will be votes cast from about 50 per cent of qualified voters—the other 50 per cent will probably say to themselves "Well, well, well, I am sure I will be the first to get excited if North Carolina is faced with problems now facing her sister states.

The time to present such situations is now to cast your vote on Sept. 8. At least there in the amendments one can see a beginning to aid our people to prevent bursts of outrage, etc., if so faced with similar situations. Remember, if these aren't passed, no miracle can be made overnight.

It is the duty of every parent and qualified voter to weigh carefully the issue and at least give backing to qualified men and women who spend their labor and love, I'm sure, in efforts to arrive at the best of their ability at a plan to help all school ages, and preserve our public education system.

Let's face the issue with depth. Let's try to understand it to get some constructive knowledge before you make your decision.

It is up to you. Get out and vote.

—MRS. GUY BRADFORD JR.

Three Counts Against Pearsall Proposals

Editors, The News: Wagram

I should like to express my views on the Pearsall Plan, not with any hope of influencing any vote, but because it is the only way I can manage to keep peace with a very annoying conscience—and I hope some day grandchildren as a responsible parent, I am against the Pearsall Plan for the following reasons:

First, it is a moral issue which is of course, a matter entirely between an individual and his conscience. The bill is admittedly unconstitutional in direct opposition to the constitution of our state but to that of our country.

How can we, as responsible teachers and parents, teach our children by endorsing such a bill that we must obey the law as long as it suits us to do so but when it goes against the grain, then we must find some means to circumvent them? As our good Democrats said in the platform adopted two weeks ago, "We are a country of laws, not men; in a country of such vast population (around 170 million) of all races and nationalities it would be impossible for every law to be acceptable to every group, but I must teach my children to respect the law. I feel I can do that best by example, regardless of how distasteful a law might be to me personally...."

Second, I am against the Pearsall bill because it is unrealistic. You say you do not expect to use it, that you are stalling for time. The Supreme Court has held that land has already recognized our need for time and accepted the fact that traditions of a lifetime cannot be set aside overnight. The, have not even set a limit on that time, the only requisite being that all states who that they are acting in good faith.

Surely, North Carolina is showing that faith as we accept Negroes in our state universities, two already in the UNC and two young women accepted this month for the fall term at Women's College in Greensboro. I agree that integration is the only way now is unobtainable, but it could be started in our larger cities in western or central parts of the state with very little delay.

I should like to see the state echo the question of the state executive board of the North Carolina Association of Parents and Teachers: "Just what does constitute an intolerable situation? One Negro student, two or three Negro students, or the entire 70 per cent Negro school population of our county has any desire to attend the white schools."

Third, I am against the Pearsall Plan because I think it will have exactly the opposite effect from which it is intended. Our Negro schools in this county are something to be proud of, their physical plants are excellent,

Some Pros And Cons On The Pearsall Plan

their teachers and principals of superior training. I predict that Gov. Hodges' voluntary plan will work in Scotland County and we do not pass this bill. However, it is human nature to think of our pastures greener and when we are told "you dare not," we usually take that, dare, especially when the law is on our side. I think the Pearsall Plan is asking for trouble where at present there is none.

I recognize the problem confronting our public schools is serious one; I would not minimize it in any way. We must have time and the Supreme Court has granted us that time.

I feel that, left alone, it will be years before we face an acute problem here in Scotland County and that at that time perhaps it will seem less acute. I find the prospect of integration as distasteful as any of you; I would not hasten it through such a bill as this. I do not pretend to know the answer. I do not think it has been found in the Pearsall Plan.

As a responsible member of both the local and state Parent-Teacher Association, I feel duty bound to add a plea for our public schools, as their life is threatened for the first time in our lifetime if our schools close, not only will it be an immediate

economic loss to each community but will have far-reaching effects in the future, for the masses of the people simply will not be educated.

—MRS. JOHN BUIE

After Years Of Talk, Issue Still Confused

Pittsboro

Editors, The News: INTEGRATION is predicted by Mr. Pearsall if the plan being his name is rejected. I will go him one better and say that integration is certain irrespective of what becomes of his plan.

We have now been toying with this school dilemma posed by the U. S. Supreme Court for more than two years, and have not yet stated the issue or the basis upon which the court rule. Until this is done we are just running around each other and getting just nowhere. We are not saving the schools, but the white race. We can rebuild our schools, but we can't deal with the white race. The racial barriers have been removed across race of approximate numerical parity amalgamation has resulted.

We can't defy the U. S. Supreme Court and get away with it. We have got to get out of the area of the jurisdiction of the U. S. Supreme Court, and we can do that only by withholding public money for the support of integrated schools, voluntary or otherwise. Some schools would be closed. However, I do not believe the Negro will deny his children the privilege of an education. He would rather see outsiders' dislike of the South and her institutions. Even though a substantial number of our schools are or would be closed, however, we become so soft and irresolute that we will not make a substantial sacrifice for our convictions?

So I ask what difference does it make as to what the Pearsall Plan means to Hodges. Even though we were dealing with a normal U. S. Supreme Court, no sound thinking lawyer would contend that schools could be voted out upon the arrival of intolerable conditions. Some normal standard must be set up and spelled out at to what will constitute intolerable conditions.

However, I will not ask for more space to discuss such abstract matters as circumventing the U. S. Court's desegregation fiat on legal grounds. Since we have set out on a futile and abortive method of or service segregated schools and since, further we are not likely to have any other chance on the part of the people to express themselves on the subject, I suggest that we turn down the Pearsall Plan and integrate under the present Carper-Baggett-Scallaway constitutional mandate, which was originally designed or intended to provide for education in mixed public schools. Such would certainly be most fitting.

—JOHN W. HESTER

'Not That I Really Need To Wash—'



Stevenson Strategy Unfolds

The South Must Be Solid

By MARQUIS CHILDS

STEVENS ON'S strategy in this presidential campaign is broad indeed. The high level oratory of the 1952 campaign will be at a minimum and the Democratic candidate will again and again aim at what he and his strategy board believe are the holes in the Eisenhower record. The geographic outlines of the Stevenson campaign will be broadly agreed upon by the strategy board. As now planned, the candidate fairly early in the campaign will concentrate in the South with the major speech in Texas, probably at Dallas, a speech in New Orleans and in Florida, either at Jacksonville or Miami, with stops elsewhere in the South. From there on out Stevenson will concentrate in the states where it is believed a margin of victory can be won on the basis of the Solid South, by cutting the role of the two parties and the two candidates will be strikingly reversed from four years ago.



WALTER REUTHER Down With Defeatism

record of failure on issues affecting both workers and farmers. As one of these close to the candidate put it, "What we are going to try to do is to push through the fog of generalizations and platitudes from the President to show what actually happened during the past four years."

The candidate made a beginning at the Labor Day rally by proposing a switch of Michigan delegates at the critical moment, thereby eliminating any doubt that the nomination would go to Stevenson. And it is Reuther, with his great intensity and drive, who believes as strongly as any Stevenson partisan that the Democratic candidate can break through the defeatism spread by his fellow Democrats at the convention and before and win in November.

GOOD SETTING Stevenson could not have chosen a better setting to launch his campaign of specific attack. The Detroit area four years ago gave him a majority of close to 70 per cent.

It is claimed here that this was his best showing anywhere.

He had the United Auto Workers and Walter Reuther to thank for the size of his majority. At the Democratic convention in Chicago it was Reuther who engineered a switch of Michigan delegates at the critical moment, thereby eliminating any doubt that the nomination would go to Stevenson. And it is Reuther, with his great intensity and drive, who believes as strongly as any Stevenson partisan that the Democratic candidate can break through the defeatism spread by his fellow Democrats at the convention and before and win in November.

On the foreign policy side, he sharply attacked Secretary of State Dulles at Pontiac, where there is a large Polish-American population, for promising "liber-

Inferior Men Sneer At Superior Women

Charlotte

Editors, The News: SINCE women are a proven class themselves safer drivers than men, why do men drivers look at them with a 13-and-a-half look and a sneering grin on their faces when a woman makes any kind of a mistake while driving.

If she doesn't pull out on a highway in front of oncoming cars, and risk her life and others, they start howling their horns.

If her car stalls, due to a faulty carburetor or just anything that might happen and does every day to all drivers, the men think that happened because it was a woman driver.

A man can make the same mistake in driving that women do and they think nothing of it. Or could it be they are afraid to say anything or laugh at a man?

—MRS. LOUISE WHITE

Timmer, Hodg & Ery: Southern Politics

Rock Hill, S. C.

Editors, The News: DESPITE the loud cries of the Democratic Party, there appears to be little truth in the claim that the Republican Party is ethnologically all wet.

The shortening of Democracy to Democrat is simply in tune with the times. The economic development is clearly seen in the use of the language by the teenagers, i. e.: real game, square, hey, fly right, etc.

This development of unnecessary economy of the printed and spoken word may result in parsimonious publishers in the future referring to candidates and politicians as Eisenhower, Hodg, or even Ery and Thurmo to say nothing of Sco and Stevens.

—D. EMIS

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go Round

WASHINGTON

CONGRESSMAN Edgar Hiestand (R-Ga.) is a stern, dignified, retired Sears-Robinson executive, rigid in his bearing and his Republicanism. He is impatient with government red tape, which has led him to take short cuts with his congressional payroll.

Helping Out

For "convenience sake," Hiestand has required employes to help pay office expenses out of their government payrolls. It is against the law to submit false payrolls to the government. It is also illegal to accept kickbacks or political contributions from government employes.

A Puzzle

Whether Hiestand's payroll practices technically violate the law is up to the Justice Department to puzzle out. He

How A Congressman Pares A Payroll

WASHINGTON

pocketed no kickback money himself. This column has established that two Hiestand employes, Virginia Timmons and Brooke Gilbertson, have written checks to pay his office expenses. The checks were drawn on Washington's National Capital Bank.

Admit Payments

His explanation: He deposited \$1,000 in their names. The money, contributed by the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, went to pay political bills. He let the girls sign the checks, instead of doing so himself, for convenience.

However, an employe, Mary Anne Davis, admitted to this column that she had paid for part-time help out of her congressional salary. She wrote a personal check dated May 20, 1955, to Margaret Whitney for \$50, another dated April 29, 1955, to Brooke Gilbertson for \$22.85. Miss Davis claimed she was

never reimbursed for paying the two girls who worked in Hiestand's office.

No Pressure

Another employe, Mary Hornbeck, acknowledged writing a \$312.25 check, dated January 29, 1955, to pay congressional salaries for a helping out. However, she had hired and paid the Reynolds girl on her own responsibility without pressure from Hiestand.

She could not explain another \$21 check dated March 7, 1954, made out to Brooke Gilbertson. But she insisted she "must have been" reimbursed for this payment.

Congressman Explains

Confronted with these facts, Congressman Hiestand acknowledged that he had asked his employes occasionally to pay part-time workers who might be called on for staff envelopes for a couple of

evenings. It took too much red tape, he explained, to put someone on the congressional payroll for a couple of days' work.

Hiestand argued that he did not keep kickbacks from his employes but often dipped in his own pocket to pay his congressional expenses. He showed this column a book of check stubs which showed he had paid office expenses, including part-time workers, out of his personal bank account.

Relative Paid

The California congressman also keeps his son-in-law, Norman Watt, on the public payroll for \$208 a month, though he works full time for the Los Angeles Ad Advertising Club. Hiestand claimed his son-in-law handles congressional homework in his spare time. This column discussed the story with the Justice Department and offered to turn over its findings.