

# THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

FRIDAY, AUGUST 23, 1957

## A Mirror For The Peevish Councilmen

There is an element of mystery in the increasingly querulous attitude of some City Councilmen toward experts engaged to advise the Council. The peevishness goes considerably beyond the rejection of the experts' advice, which is one of the Council's more vigorously exercised prerogatives. It descends fairly regularly into disparaging remarks about the experts' qualifications and into careless complaints about their conduct. This week, for example, Councilman Steve Dellinger was displeased with a report by City Engineer L. C. Cheek, Jr., and accused the engineer of "trying to take over the place." Councilman Ernest Foard, who just a few weeks ago seemed astounded by Council's blithe rejection of a recommendation by city planners, now seems to have found his own. He complained without investigation, about the work of Air Pollution Control Director Charles Frost and intimidated, without investigation, that Frost was exceeding his authority. In recent weeks, Traffic Engineer Herman Hoos, has come in for his regular share of licks, as have the planners and zoners, and the job classification director.

Intentionally or otherwise, the Council majority gives the impression it wishes the experts would go away and get lost. This is the mystery. For not infrequently when it turns its deaf ear to the experts it engaged, the Council majority bumbles rather stilly into indefensible positions. There are some curious examples. Item: City planners urged Council in good time to have Charlotte and its perimeter exempted from the state four-corner zoning law. Council ignored the advice. Then, when it was petitioned to override the planner's decision that under the law the northwest corner of the Park-Woodland intersection had to be zoned for business, Council overrode the

planners. Result: Council is under a court order to obey the law and rezone the corner. It has made a show of defending residential property but there is no substance in the show. Item: Without consulting Traffic Engineer Hoos, Council ordered parking restrictions lifted on sections of Tuckasee Rd. and Central Ave. Council knew better. These sections had been widened by the state. Council became well acquainted in the Providence Rd. case last year with the fact that the state widens roads in order to move traffic, not to park vehicles. Result: The state issued a pointed reminder of its policy, and Council conveniently forgot its order for removal of the parking restrictions. It made a great show of providing parking space for the customers of Tuckasee and Central merchants, but there is no substance in the show.

We dare say that if when Councilman Foard goes around to see Air Pollution Control Director Charles Frost he will find a reasonable man who is trying to do a difficult job with as much diplomacy and tact as he can muster.

There are times when the experts are wrong. There are times when they are right, but because of various pressures Council feels it must override them. This is the situation that prevails. But it is not normal for the overseers of a business—the Council—to ridicule publicly and deride the professional help who handle the day-to-day chores of the municipal government and whose batting average, to understate the matter, compares most favorably with Council's. This does the Council majority no credit. It invites disrespect of competent and hard-working officials and a much-avoided municipal government. To close overseers of the municipal scene, it seems to invite some of the more querulous councilmen themselves.

## The County's Problem Was Different

The decision of the County School Board to deny requests for reassignment of 27 Negro children to white schools was not unexpected. It was well known that the county faced far graver problems than the city in attempting to meet the requirements of the law. Its far-flung school system, its absence of clear-cut district lines and its unusual population patterns presented a new and rather unique set of circumstances. Yet the county board, too, was faced with legal necessity to show conscientious regard and good faith in the protection of individual rights. It could not accept the notion that North Carolina's pupil assignment law had granted it a blank check to extend segregation indefinitely, regardless of any genuine discrimination. School authorities simply have the responsibility under the law of assessing the "varied local school problems" and developing plans to solve them. The courts, meanwhile, are responsible for determining that the action of school authorities constitutes "good faith implementation" of the Supreme Court's 1954 decree banning mandatory segregation of the races in the public schools. In the opinion of the U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court "has not decided that the states must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of

the right of choosing the schools they attend. What it has decided is that a state may not deny any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains." The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination. The test, then, was the presence of discrimination and this test had to be applied to each Negro applicant the county had for a white school. On the basis of lengthy investigations, the County School Board found each of the applicants lacking sufficient reasons for a transfer. Each petition was denied. At the same time, the board assured any dissatisfied parents that they may appeal the decisions and that a prompt and fair hearing will be held. Beyond that, there is the right of appeal to the courts. The courts themselves are permitted to exercise "practical flexibility" in shaping the remedies and "reconciling public and private needs." It must be assumed that the County School Board performed its duty conscientiously and with due regard for the protection of individual rights and the public at large. Furthermore, it must be assumed that it knows the variety and complexity of local problems. Clearly, the County School Board's difficult decision is worthy of the same respect accorded the City School Board's equally difficult decision last month.

## There's Gloom In The Klavern Tonight

BESIDES bumbling about cow pastures, the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan also disport themselves on softball diamonds. There is a team under that name in the Chattanooga commercial softball league. The northern press has been very indignant about it. So have a lot of people in Chattanooga. But although three teams sponsored by big industries withdrew from the league in protest of the Klan entry, all attempts failed to get the Klan out. The team went to the Tennessee

State Softball Tournament at Nashville. There the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan were put out. The Marvynville, Tenn. First Baptist Church team whipped the Klansmen 2-1 in the double elimination tournament. A Knoxville team's pitcher then hurled a no-hitter at the Klan to complete the job. This was a good way for the Klan to go to the showers. Perhaps there is a meaningful bit of symbolism in it for the boys out in the cow pastures.

From The Manchester Guardian

## ROYAL RECEPTION

ONE of the more striking anniversaries which is likely to be remembered has been unearthed by a Paris correspondent. This is the story of the royal reception which was given, just over a century ago, to the first giraffe to arrive in France. A present from the khedive of Egypt to the French king, Charles X, he arrived at Marseilles from Alexandria with a French consul, three cow providers of her milk ration and three grooms, and was greeted by a fireworks display. And it was feared that transport by road might break her slender legs, she walked the 500 miles to Paris, creating sensations in hundreds of villages. A two-piece suit of lar-lined cloth protected her from rain. She wore a neckcloth, a military hat and a sword. Her suite now includes a vet, an interpreter (for her Egyptian attendants) and a squad of mounted gendarmes. Wherever she passed, school children were given

a day's holiday. In many villages she walked under floral arches.

In Paris, after the king had formally accepted the gift of her, she was installed in a zoo and was the theme of songs and of a play. There were giraffe dresses, giraffe hats, giraffe hair styles, giraffe cups and bowls. Then, like many of our modern stars, she faded. She died in Paris, aged 21, completely forgotten.

We are saddened by the case of the west coast college athlete who flunked his course in history of the movies. It must have been tough on him to tune in antique films on the late, late TV shows. —DETROIT NEWS

"Congratulations, my boy. You will always look upon this as the happiest day of your life." "But I'm not getting married until tomorrow." "Yes, I know." —CARLSBAD CURRENT-ARGUS.

## Score One For Russia

# Syria Is A Soviet Outpost

By WALTER LIPPMANN

WASHINGTON NEW YORK WASHINGTON has been reacting calmly to the events in Syria, almost certainly because they have long been foreseeable, and are not a surprise.

The events stem from the basic situation among the Arab nations in the Middle East: First, that the great powers are rivals competing for their favor; and second, that there is rivalry among the Arab ruling classes, who are competing for the support of the great powers.

For these reasons, there has never been any chance that all the Arab countries would line up with us under some sort of pan-Arab Eisenhower Doctrine. As we have been making our deals with one group of Arab countries, another group—as it happens Syria, Egypt, Yemen—have been making tentative deals with the Soviet Union.

### LOSSES AND GAINS

We are involved in a complicated and tricky game of power politics, and we must expect to have losses as well as gains. We have had gains in Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Lebanon. Now we have

had a loss in Syria. The one thing that we can be fairly sure of is that the whole region is in flux, and that neither the gains, as in Jordan, nor the losses, as in Syria, can be counted on as permanent.

### RED OUTPOSTS

For while it may turn out to be the fact that the new military dictatorship in Syria is firmly under Soviet control, there is, I venture to think, bound to be a radical difference between a contiguous and a non-contiguous satellite—between one that can be reached over land by the Red Army and one that can be reached only by sea and air. It was possible for the Red Army to march into Hungary, to occupy it and to crush the rebellion. That would not be nearly so easy to do—what with the Baghdad allies being interposed—if there were a rebellion in Syria. For the Soviet Union it can be said that Egypt as well as Syria are rather in the nature of outposts than true satellites.

### INTERNAL INTRIGUE

It is generally agreed, as the President said at his press conference this week, that the coup in Syria does not call for any reaction under the Eisenhower Doctrine. The Syrian coup is not the calamitous series of events which began with Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal Co., but it also deprives the Western world of the

convicted. The basic principle of the Eisenhower Doctrine is that we will intervene only at the request of a legitimate government, and in the case of Syria the legitimate government is manifestly hostile to the Eisenhower Doctrine and to the United States.

### PROPER COURSE

The right course is the one that the administration appears to be taking—to leave the initiative to Syria's neighbors, allowing them to decide on the only action which is possible—whether the new Syrian government should be put in quarantine. That is the limit of the action. There can be no intrigue under the Eisenhower Doctrine unless Syria first openly makes war on one or more of her neighbors, on Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, or Israel. Insular as Syria is under Soviet influence it will probably not be encouraged, in fact it will probably not be permitted, to do anything which could precipitate a general war.

### FULLBRIGHT RECORD

In retrospect, it looks more and more as if Sen. Fulbright is right, and that our crucial mistake in the Middle East has been the abrupt rejection of the Aswan Dam. Not only did this touch off the calamitous series of events which began with Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal Co., but it also deprived the Western world of the



"Go On—I'm Backing You Up, Comrade"

chance to cooperate with Egypt in a great project which is of vital interest to the Egyptian people. The fact of our withdrawal, combined with the rude manner in which we withdrew, has excluded us from the chance to exercise a friendly influence. It has left the field open to the Soviet Union, and made it certain that Nasser's demagoguery would be turned against us all over the Arab world. Yet it is probably true that Nasser does not want, and will try his best to avoid, a complete entanglement with the Soviet Union. The central idea of his foreign policy seems to be that he can credit more by keeping the Soviet Union and the West bidding against each other. To do that he must be independent enough to keep both sides guessing, which, we may suppose, is what he means when he talks about a positive neutrality.

## 'Congress Just Isn't Giving Us Much Leadership'



HERBLOCK ©1957 THE WASHINGTON POST CO.

## They Won The War In Praise Of The 'Dumb Johns'

By ROBERT C. RUARK

IT SEEMS to me that we are jumping a little too eagerly toward putting down the Army and especially in discriminating against the bright boys by releasing the dumb Johns. A draft is not an induction to a country club—it is a demand on the nation. "Selective Service" was one of the most misnamed handles ever hung on the handcuff volunteer service. There is still an awful lot of work around a military installation that can be done, and perhaps better, by a man of lower than average intelligence. Every man jack in our future forces isn't going to be riding a rocket to the moon or tuning up the warhead of a hydrogen bomb. A great deal of any military life is plain drudgery, much of it unpleasant and without imagination. There is still a lot of work to be done, and it is a shame that the smartest people who feel he's above toil and wants to be an Einstein. My slow Jones, on the other hand, were almost happy to get off the farm out of the steel mill.

lands for the Navy in that ancient war which began in 1941, and I generally got better service out of the brain boys who read Freud in their spare time and went over the bill in port. My sea lawyers and trouble makers, with few exceptions, were in the upper third of the intelligence brackets. They were frightened of authority, and when you belated "jump" they jumped. As far as I know they didn't brood over menial chores, and they hit their watches with regularity. The professors couldn't stand the islands or the life in destroyers, and they broke, in various ways, and so my psycho ward had a full share of wise guys. Dumb guys seem to adjust to hardship. I do not advocate an armed force composed entirely of morons, even though war is a moron's game invented by intellectual idiots, but I also do not hold still for all this guff about an atom-age Army. A relatively small portion of any armed force will handle the tricky gear. The major supporting chores won't have changed much. And there'll always be room for the buck private who is dumb enough to do what he's told, go where he's sent, and die if he must. We need the Einsteins, true enough, in increasing proportion, but in any war anybody's got to do the dirty work, and the caliber of his skill makes very little difference.

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

## People's Platform Press Shielded Like

Great Falls, S. C.

HAD most of our newspaper editors, the press and the public concerned themselves with properly observing the faulty acts of our President during his first term in office and had they described these faults in true fashion as they are beginning to do it now, he would never have been elected to his second term with such a tremendous vote. The average person's news outlet is the daily newspaper, in which he seeks his information and knowledge about the goings-on everywhere and if that information is not properly presented he has no other outlet to get the needed information, and his judgment is made accordingly. It seems to me that the same editors and correspondents had a change of heart as they are beginning to find fault with our President's ways in action and beginning to criticize him more often for his blunders and misjudgment, but still with a grain of salt, not clear enough for the average person to notice it and understand it. Some of these correspondents, while they do criticize him, express all the same time sympathy and pity him because of the many responsibilities that he has to shoulder and also because of times his advisers, in whom he has the most confidence, differ in their opinions, which is the reason he often has to change decisions or instructions that he previously issued. When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

He usually comes out with a statement that he doesn't want to influence Congress in its decisions. So why is he working so hard to influence Congress about the Foreign Aid Bill? The Foreign Aid Bill is more important than the Education Bill? When the President first presented the budget to Congress and there was a cry from all sides about the excessive amount for defense and foreign aid, the President himself sent word to Congress to cut foreign aid. What made him change his mind? It must be the usual—some of his advisers changed his mind. He claims that if the 800 million dollars is not replaced, which the House just cut, the country's security might be affected. The Senate may get scared and help restore it. But I insist that if another billion were cut it would still affect the security of our country. I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

When interrogated at his press conferences about the reason for his changes, the usual reply is that he either didn't understand it correctly or that he didn't know of all the facts. If our President deserves that sympathy while serving during a peacetime period, how come that these same editors and correspondents couldn't find in their hearts any sympathy and pity for our two previous Presidents, who did serve during a war period and the burden of responsibility was much heavier than the present? I am certain that if we cut off handing out the aid so freely, particularly to Yugoslavia, Poland and some of the Arab countries and even India, it would not in the least affect our security. Does the President really think that if it came to a showdown that Yugoslavia would help the United States or would she stand on the side of the Communists? The same about Poland and how about India? We poured so much aid into that country, and on whose side she was always, at the United Nations Assembly, that she never always voted with the Soviet Union? And what about Saudi Arabia? She got plenty from our kitty. And when our ally, the British, was bound because of an agreement with Oman in case of an attack to go to her aid, the British found themselves being attacked by our weapons that we supplied Saudi Arabia. And what happened in Algeria and Cyprus? Our two allies, the French and the British, are being attacked by the rebels, who are assisted by the other Arab states with the aid that we supplied them. Do we want to wait and meet with similar experiences elsewhere, shot down by our own equipment that we furnished the Yugoslavs, the Poles, India and the Arabs? —HENRY RAYE

## Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

HERE is more inside on the recent acquittal of Jimmy Hoffa, No. 2 boss of the Teamsters. One of the significant things during his trial, obviously for the purpose of wooing the eight Negro members of the Hoffa jury, was a full-page ad in the Washington edition of Afro-American, plus an appealing column by Samuel Hooskins. The latter told, among other things, how "Hoffa, long before the Supreme Court decision, was his May 17, 1964, school decision, was on the desegregation firing line.

## Is Hoffa Really The Negro's Friend?

more persons of color had important positions within the Hoffa organization. "While Hoffa was proclaiming his love for Negroes, a lawyer with a long membership record reached back to 1944 when a battery of lawyers for President Roosevelt's FEPC secured an appointment with Hoffa to cite the discrimination in the Teamsters Union against Negro truck drivers on cross-country trips. One Statement Only "When Hoffa entered the room," reported Miss Payne in the Chicago Defender, "he curtly informed the group that there was no need to open their briefcases, as he had only one statement to make and that would be all, with no questions allowed. "Then he reputedly said his union had

## Laying It On The Line

"Secondly," said the Chicago Defender columnist, "drivers used facilities of hotels and restaurants over the route of travel, and they didn't intend to be mixed up with Negroes. "After he finished his statement Hoffa arose and stomped out of the room. Note—Ex-boxing champ Joe Louis also got his expenses paid to come to Washington and appear in the courtroom in order to show Hoffa as the great friend of the Negro.

## Tenfold Increase

"Within the Teamsters' membership are 167,000 colored truck drivers," said the Afro-American columnist. "Many

## Issues Identified

"But on the other hand, if this campaign of labor is crushed by the anti-labor forces which also are anti-civil rights, the cause will suffer immensely. "Such are the issues in the Hoffa-Fischbach bribery trial." In blunt contrast with the Afro-American, another leading Negro newspaper, the Chicago Defender, has published another side of Hoffa's attitude toward Negroes. Esther L. Payne, energetic news