

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

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 1957

Can A Hole In The Dike Be Plugged?

FOR weeks, rumors of a political coup d'etat in Syria spread over the Middle East like a brushfire. Officials in both Jordan and Israel confided, with undisguised merriment, that all the West had to do was wait. "You'll see," said one highly placed Jordanian. "In a matter of weeks Syria will be aflame with anti-Nasser, anti-Soviet sentiment."

Turkey holds the Dardanelles and some of the strategic mountain barriers which protect the Middle East against land invasions. It realizes that it cannot afford to have a Communist power to the south as well as to the north.

But the United States is the chief guarantor of Western interests in the Middle East. Can we, then, invoke the Eisenhower Doctrine and put an end to the whole unpleasant affair? Hardly. As it has been explained heretofore, the Eisenhower Doctrine provides only for the United States aid to the victims of aggression from a Communist-controlled country. It does not provide for intervention to prevent Communists from taking over by subversion or other internal means.

The United States, however, cannot surrender the initiative to the Soviet Union in the Middle East. It owes it to its own best interests to do everything possible to keep Syria out of the Soviet orbit. Syria could well become the hole in the dike—and if Soviet influence ever prevails to any significant degree in the Middle East it will certainly represent a victory for the Kremlin comparable to the communication of China.

Given the Syrian shock treatment, the United States should awaken to the fact that all its problems in the Middle East were not solved by the Eisenhower Doctrine. It should awaken to the need for a reappraisal of where it has been and where it is going in the Middle East. It should recognize its responsibility for much of the mess the Middle East now finds itself in—namely, its responsibility for stirring and then not supporting the Baghdad Pact which gave the Soviets their pretext for penetration, for quibbling on guarantees against aggression by Egypt or Israel, and for failing to confront Russia at the 1955 summit conference with the deal to send arms to the Arab States. The Arab pact cannot be mended. But the future can be protected against similar calamities. The time to start protecting is now.

Anyone waiting for some Syrian version of Jordan's King Hussein to pluck the fat from the fire must necessarily wait in vain. There is no such figure in Damascus. There is even a rumor that President al-Kuwatli will be toppled now, making nothing but a bad joke of Syria's professed neutrality between East and West.

The seriousness of the situation should not be underestimated. Despite the nationalistic murmurings from Damascus, the crisis cracks the door for the Soviets. What it could mean in the future is all too clear in Washington: Satellite status for Syria in the Soviet orbit.

Looking ahead, Communist bases in Syria would tend to neutralize Britain's remaining power in the neighborhood, would make the eastern Mediterranean an extremely perilous place for the United States Sixth Fleet and would outflank Turkey—and thus NATO. Turkey has already hinted on several occasions in the past that she might move into Syria if a Communist or Soviet-controlled government took over in Damascus. These hints were dropped during Israel's Sinai campaign last fall and were repeated last April. The Arab pact it seemed possible that the Syrian Army would rush to the support of anti-Western elements in Jordan.

Put American Beauty Before Billboards

The country was built on economics, not beauty.

HIS statement before the Senate Public Works Committee was one of Scott Lucas' lesser contributions to the annals of congressional debate. When the old New Dealer was a powerful member of the Senate, it's doubtful he ever would have made it.

Surely, as a senator, Scott Lucas cast his share of votes for federally-financed parks, playgrounds and slum clearance projects in his home state of Illinois and others. But now, as a powerful member of the Senate, it's doubtful he ever would have made it.

It is easy to say that one phase of America—professional lobbying, for example—was built on economics, not beauty. But stated inclusively, the theory pictures America as her enemies paint her.

The questing spirit of the pioneers was concerned with matters beyond the stimulus of money, and one of these matters was a desire to discover and behold the virgin beauty of primeval forests and prairies. Much of the adventuring that pushed the American frontier back to the Pacific was too dangerous to be done for money. Economics followed the wagon tracks and newly-found rivers to be sure, but the beauty of America antedates by some centuries the clink of the first continental.

To say that beauty was here before the billboard lobby is really irrelevant, though, because beauty needs no defense. Beauty is so inherently valuable

to modern man that instruments of economics such as great industries are spending millions on architecture and landscaping in order to surround their factories and employes with trees, flowers, grass and pleasing physical designs. Beauty, if Scott Lucas pleases, is business, too. Modern industry has decided it around factories.

Americans, in connection with their new highway system, have a lesser problem. The problem is neither to preserve nor to recreate natural beauty, but to see it. The billboard lobby, in quite legitimate service of its own interests, wants to conceal 45,000 miles of American scenery from the taxpayers whose dollars will build the roads and bring that scenery into view.

The billboard interests would pay for rights to put up their signs, of course, but in the bargain they also would gain a captive audience. To this certainly no one would dissent if America was built on the Lucas theory—all money and no beauty.

The theory is out of tune, however, with one of the most beloved songs of the nation. The first verse goes:

O beautiful for spacious skies,
For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties
Above thy fruited plain...

When Americans have built their vast new highway system, they ought to be able to ride along it and see the amber waves of grain, the purple mountain majesties and the fruited plain. It is best in building anything to know and love the land you're building on.

By ROBERT F. CAMPBELL

Editors' Note: State and federal laws already guard the voting rights of Tar Heel citizens. Newsman Robert F. Campbell, writing in the Winston-Salem Journal-Sentinel, tells how.

SUPPOSE someone tried to interfere with YOUR right to vote here in North Carolina.

If the civil rights bill now before Congress becomes law, new avenues would be opened to protect your rights in casting your vote for federal officers. But even without the proposed new law, your voting rights are safeguarded by state and federal law. When these laws are fairly applied, a citizen has little cause to fear denial or abridgment of his right to vote on account of "race, color or previous condition of servitude," as forbidden in the U. S. Constitution.

Ordinarily when attempts are made to infringe on the right to vote they occur in connection with registration. For instance, a registrar might reject your request to register on the ground that you could not be placed in a section of the state Constitution.

PROMPT HEARING

If that happened, you would have the right to appeal to the county board of elections by giving the registrar written notice of appeal on the day of the denial or by 3 p. m. the following day. That notice entitles you to a "prompt and fair hearing" on the



Charlotte Voters Exercising Their Franchise During 1956 Presidential Election

merits of your qualifications to register. You would be notified within 10 days of the hearing whether the board had ordered you registered or had denied your appeal.

If the board decided against you, the next step open would be an appeal to the Superior Court of your home county. The court could then order you registered or deny your appeal. If you are still

denied the right to vote, you can appeal to the State Supreme Court.

What new protection would you receive, then, from the civil rights bill in the form passed by the Senate?

1. The U. S. attorney general would be authorized to bring civil actions in behalf of a prospective voter who was deprived or about to be deprived of his right to vote in an election of federal officers. Such a suit could be brought with or without your consent. In such an action, the United States would be the plaintiff. Suits could be filed for injunctions and would be tried before a judge alone, without a jury.

If a registrar defied a final court decree, the government could move to have him cited for contempt. If the object of the contempt sentence were to force his compliance with the decree, the contempt would be civil and would be heard before a judge alone. If the object were to punish a failure to obey the court order, the contempt would be criminal and would be heard before a jury.

SOUTHERN JURIES

These added provisions of law are needed, says Attorney General Brownell, "to lodge power in the Department of Justice for bringing suits in which the product can often be solved in advance of the election, and without the necessity of imposing upon any official the stigma of criminal prosecution by a jury."

The alleged reluctance of southern juries to convict those who deny voting rights to Negroes also is a major reason for the original civil rights bill. It is still a factor, although it is somewhat less important in the light of the amendments adopted by the Senate. The quinquennial trials in criminal contempt cases.

—BERNARD SILVER.

Greener Pastures

The Collapse Of The Farm Bloc

By DORIS FLEESON

ONE OF the extraordinary political phenomena of the Eisenhower administration is the complete and utter collapse of the once-powerful farm bloc. Its dissolution is so complete, it does not even put on an interesting struggle these days.

This is the logical result of population shifts so widespread and so striking many Americans have yet to grasp them.

REGIONAL PATTERN

To take one example, Sen. Ralph Yarborough of Texas surprised himself when he made a study of population trends in his state for campaign purposes last year. He found that in 1940 about 45 per cent of Texans were on farms and ranches, but that in 1955 only 32 1/2 per cent had remained there. Furthermore, the trend is continuing.

Not all states show so dramatic a swing away from the old pat-

tern — naturally — but all regions do. The flight from the farm and to the city has been so accelerated since the war it has actually tended to outpace the old regional differences.

The broad political reflection of this fact is the tendency of the two parties to stand closer together on nearly all issues. It is the real secret of that "moderation" which both the Republican President and the Senate Democratic leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, claim for their trademark.

GREENER PASTURES

It is the reason the ambitious vice president, Richard M. Nixon, has looked to greener pastures than the old "Republican heartland, the farm belt," which was for so long the base of GOP voting strength.

One astute politician who has served in both the Senate and the executive branch comments: "It

sounds brutal to say it, but there are only about five million farmers anymore and there are 10 million Negroes. That is why there's no farm legislation before us and we are struggling so hard with civil rights."

DEFLECTION

The same veteran estimated that when he arrived here during the New Deal about 300 of the 431 members of the House had to pay very marked attention to farm needs and complaints. He would put that figure at about 100 today.

The breakup of the old farm bloc happened with surprising suddenness because the population shifts took place all at once. The South, which so long made common cause with the Middle and Far West, has been emphasizing changes there by receding from the old internationalism dictated by its need to sell cotton on the world market.

Push-Butt on Defense



People's Platform

These Two Evils Need Correcting

Roanoke, Va. Editors, The News:

In our country we have two very serious evils which need correction.

One, the tremendous loss of life and property by automobile accidents, we could have a remarkable reduction of this tragic highway slaughter. As soon as it hurts one's pocketbook, the picture will change.

This may also apply to farmers who very often fail to check and repair their farm implements.

The second evil is our big loss by forest fires. As a frequent traveler on interstate buses, I have observed many riders who open the window, throw their lighted cigarettes out on open fields, especially at night and in the evenings.

May I suggest that on every interstate bus there should be installed an ash tray in front of every two seats, and on the start of every journey, the driver should urge his passengers to use these ash trays.

—BERNARD SILVER.

Imposition

LINCOLN's saying in his Pro-

ria speech of Oct. 16, 1834, "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent" sounds virtuous, but it is actually nonsense. Nearly half the American people at any given time have refused their consent to the current government.

To be sure, they have to endure it, but that is something quite different from consenting to it. The plain fact is that government is always an imposition. — H. L. Meechen.

Brownell's Breast-Beating Is 'Ironic'

Bill, thereby keeping civil rights an issue in the 1958 congressional election.

Sen. Tom Hennings, Missouri Democrat, whose grandfather was one of the biggest slave-holders in Georgia, developed some of the facts regarding the resignation of Brownell last year.

"You have come up with no program during your four years, until April 1, I believe," Sen. Hennings challenged.

Brownell replied that he had worked on such civil rights as restaurant segregation, discrimination in the armed forces, and kindred measures.

Brownell's Admission

"You know these were initiated in the preceding administration," Hennings was quick to point out.

"A great many of them, yes," Brownell admitted.

"We welcome your suggestion that there be a commission on civil rights in the Department of Justice," Hennings continued. "At my request on March 22, 1955, this letter was addressed to you."

He then read Brownell a letter one year old asking for his views on legislation proposing a civil rights commission.

No Reply

"There was no reply from you whatsoever over a year ago relating to the establishment of a commission or a division," Hennings pressed.

The attorney general squirmed and spat. He could give no adequate explanation. The fact is that while civil rights was being pushed for four years by Hennings and Congressman Heller in the House, they got no help from Brownell or from his Justice Dept. or from the Eisenhower administration.

Making An Issue

Irony No. 4—For four years the Justice Department dragged its feet on civil rights, thereby making it an issue in the 1956 presidential election. Today the Justice Department is opposing the Senate

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON

HERE are some ironies about the breast-beating of the Justice Department for a tough civil rights bill. A bill even tougher than that now urged by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Irony No. 1—Atty. Gen. Brownell and the Justice Dept. have played ball for four years with Sen. Jim Eastland of Mississippi, bitterest opponent of civil rights. No judges, U.S. attorneys or U.S. marshals have been appointed in Mississippi without his okay.

Negro Committee

Irony No. 2—Atty. Gen. Brownell gave private backstage encouragement last year to the move to oust the one Negro who is a member of the Republican National Committee, Perry Howard of Mississippi. Howard has been a national committee member longer than anyone in his

Making An Issue

Irony No. 4—For four years the Justice Department dragged its feet on civil rights, thereby making it an issue in the 1956 presidential election. Today the Justice Department is opposing the Senate

Irony No. 3—Brownell has been working to build up the Republican Party in the South through E. O. Spencer, owner of the Walthall Hotel in Jackson, Miss., in which the Mississippi White Citizens Council was first organized. The council has had an office in room 203 of the hotel. Brownell usually entertains Spencer in his home when the Mississippi comes to Washington.

Building The GOP

Irony No. 3—Brownell has been working to build up the Republican Party in the South through E. O. Spencer, owner of the Walthall Hotel in Jackson, Miss., in which the Mississippi White Citizens Council was first organized. The council has had an office in room 203 of the hotel. Brownell usually entertains Spencer in his home when the Mississippi comes to Washington.

Irony No. 2—Atty. Gen. Brownell gave private backstage encouragement last year to the move to oust the one Negro who is a member of the Republican National Committee, Perry Howard of Mississippi. Howard has been a national committee member longer than anyone in his

Irony No. 1—Atty. Gen. Brownell and the Justice Dept. have played ball for four years with Sen. Jim Eastland of Mississippi, bitterest opponent of civil rights. No judges, U.S. attorneys or U.S. marshals have been appointed in Mississippi without his okay.

Negro Committee

Irony No. 2—Atty. Gen. Brownell gave private backstage encouragement last year to the move to oust the one Negro who is a member of the Republican National Committee, Perry Howard of Mississippi. Howard has been a national committee member longer than anyone in his

Irony No. 3—Brownell has been working to build up the Republican Party in the South through E. O. Spencer, owner of the Walthall Hotel in Jackson, Miss., in which the Mississippi White Citizens Council was first organized. The council has had an office in room 203 of the hotel. Brownell usually entertains Spencer in his home when the Mississippi comes to Washington.

Irony No. 4—For four years the Justice Department dragged its feet on civil rights, thereby making it an issue in the 1956 presidential election. Today the Justice Department is opposing the Senate

Making An Issue

Irony No. 4—For four years the Justice Department dragged its feet on civil rights, thereby making it an issue in the 1956 presidential election. Today the Justice Department is opposing the Senate

Irony No. 3—Brownell has been working to build up the Republican Party in the South through E. O. Spencer, owner of the Walthall Hotel in Jackson, Miss., in which the Mississippi White Citizens Council was first organized. The council has had an office in room 203 of the hotel. Brownell usually entertains Spencer in his home when the Mississippi comes to Washington.

Irony No. 2—Atty. Gen. Brownell gave private backstage encouragement last year to the move to oust the one Negro who is a member of the Republican National Committee, Perry Howard of Mississippi. Howard has been a national committee member longer than anyone in his

Irony No. 1—Atty. Gen. Brownell and the Justice Dept. have played ball for four years with Sen. Jim Eastland of Mississippi, bitterest opponent of civil rights. No judges, U.S. attorneys or U.S. marshals have been appointed in Mississippi without his okay.

Negro Committee

Irony No. 2—Atty. Gen. Brownell gave private backstage encouragement last year to the move to oust the one Negro who is a member of the Republican National Committee, Perry Howard of Mississippi. Howard has been a national committee member longer than anyone in his

Irony No. 3—Brownell has been working to build up the Republican Party in the South through E. O. Spencer, owner of the Walthall Hotel in Jackson, Miss., in which the Mississippi White Citizens Council was first organized. The council has had an office in room 203 of the hotel. Brownell usually entertains Spencer in his home when the Mississippi comes to Washington.

Irony No. 4—For four years the Justice Department dragged its feet on civil rights, thereby making it an issue in the 1956 presidential election. Today the Justice Department is opposing the Senate

From The Kansas City Star

CHEESECAKE VS. TRACTORS

THE editors of USSR, the Russian propaganda magazine for the United States, seem to be learning fast.

The first issue of USSR had Ike and Bulganin (at Geneva) on its cover. Inside were an essay on Lenin, an article on demobilization and the usual pictures of strapping Russian workers swarming over tractors.

By issue No. 4 there had been a subtle transformation in presentation. An article on the Leningrad tension system and an account of the disbanding of a Soviet air division. But back on page 54 were an interview and color pictures of Alla Larionova, a Russian movie actress.

Question: "What age... is most suitable for love?"

Answer: "Twenty-three"

Question: "Why 23?"

Answer: "That's how old I am."

Issue No. 7 shows further progress. On the back cover is a full color photograph of the young ballerina, Sofia Vologodova. She is a pretty girl, fetchingly clad in a blue swimming suit, bright red shoes, dangling earrings and lipstick. She could easily have come from the line of the Latin Quartet.

USSR has advanced to the point of putting children on its front cover instead of the Gorky hydroelectric station

or wheat fields in Kazakhstan. The next step is to put both pretty girls and children on the front cover, preferably at the beach and holding cute dogs.

What will happen when promising politicians are unable to find anybody else who can use government help?—LAUREL (MISS.) LEADER-CALL.

Comes a report from Washington that congressmen soon may ride from their office buildings to the Capitol on a conveyor belt. A lot of people would like to give some of them a different kind of belt.—TALLAHASSEE DEMOCRAT.

And so, say the youngsters, what this country needs is a good five-cent candy bar.—ORLANDO (FLA.) SENTINEL.

A child reluctant to say who broke the reading lamp feels compulsion to tell the unvarnished truth when neighbors inquire about the rest of the family.—ELLAVILLE (GA.) SUN.

"Hubb" said little Bill, "I bet you didn't have a good time at the party yesterday." "I bet I did," answered little Eddie. "Then why ain't you sick today?"—LOS ANGELES EXAMINER.