

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

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1957

City Fathers Should Heed The Alarms

THE time has come, said Park Commissioner Joe Grier, "to do something about planning park facilities for the perimeter area."
"We've been losing time," said Councilman Herbert Baxter a week later, "and we need to speed up action to extend other city facilities to the perimeter area."

swallowed up in continuing expansion of residential building.
The time element also has a considerable bearing on urban redevelopment. Vast amounts of time and concerted effort must be spent in planning and research before the city can even consider whether or how it will participate in the program for clearing of blighted areas and effecting other community improvements.

As to the extension of water and sewer facilities to the perimeter, time as well as a promise is involved. The promise was that the city would do everything possible to install city services in the perimeter by the time the city limits are extended officially.

We do not suggest that the legal and financial complexities involved in these undertakings are slight. Each of them requires much time, thought and effort.
We do think, however, that the time has come for City Hall and Park Center staff spelling action with a capital "A."

The notes of urgency struck by Commissioner Grier and Councilman Baxter were proper and timely.
May they reverberate long and loudly.

Labor's High Command Does Its Job

THE American labor federation has distinguished itself by forthright condemnation of Teamster Union leadership for corrupt practices.

The Ethical Practices Committee of the AFL-CIO issued a lengthy and detailed blistering Dave Beck, Jimmy Hoffa and other assorted fatcats who clammed up before the McClellan Committee. The committee found, for example, that Hoffa "associated with, sponsored and promoted the interests of notorious labor racketeers."
Beck and Hoffa "used their official union position for personal profit and advantage, frequently to the direct detriment of the Teamster Union membership."

The committee, in brief, told the Teamsters to clean up or get out of the AFL-CIO. The cleansing agent obviously indicated was a purge of Hoffa and other tainted officials from the ranks of Teamster leadership.

It is easy to say, of course, that the

AFL-CIO had no choice other than to condemn Beck and Hoffa. The McClellan Committee had made their activities household knowledge in the U. S. A. whitewash couldn't cover such a well-known record. Nonetheless, it is not easy for a newly-and-not-too-firmly-merged organization to threaten to out its largest unit and by so doing to risk internal warfare. Obviously the AFL-CIO is counting on the indignation of individual Teamsters to sweep Hoffa & Co. out of union office. Its job was to raise the standard of morality, and that it has done emphatically.

Hoffa, on the other hand, is counting on indifference of individual Teamsters and the ambition of minor officials to put him into the Teamster presidency at the union's convention.

It is too much to expect that he will step aside, thus removing the blackeye he has given his union and allowing it to retain its place in the labor movement.

It's a pity in more ways than one. With his interest in "rehabilitating" racketeers and his intimate acquaintance with some of the larger ones, Hoffa might go far in that field by giving his full time to it.

You Must Give The Old Bag A Shove

IN one respect at least Soviet people are nothing like Soviet machines. The machines, like the jet airplane being shown off around the world and the satellite being readied for "an assault on the universe," are sleek, shiny and streamlined. The people are, in a word, baggy.

Moscow admits the seediness of the comrades and in a typical reaction has sent out a team of anthropologists to measure the man in the street. The object is to find under the ill-fitting frocks and suits of the Russians their real proportions so that the clothes can be made to fit them. Baggy must come to an end, according to the arbiters of taste.

This is progress. Or is it? While the commissars were searching Marx for appropriate damning reference to untidiness, the fashion designers of Paris were showing off the dresses that they dictate for women of the free world.

One outfit is tied tightly across the knees and thighs. It also is tied tightly at the top. In between, the dress is baggy. Special shoes are needed, of course. They have wheels on them, and milady is pushed about from place to place by her escort.

All the Paris outfits don't require shoes with wheels, of course. But many of them have that bulging, billowing effect around the midriff. "Style-conscious wo-



This Is Progress?

men," as they say, will be—in a word—baggy.

Thus it is difficult to say whether the Russians in condemning bagginess are progressing or regressing, coming or going. Of course, it has always been that way with the Russians—and with the Paris fashion designers.

From The Raleigh News & Observer

TELEPHONE ETIQUETTE

J. TILSON, manager of the phone company here, ought to know his telephone etiquette. And it may be bold to question any of the phone laws down for politeness on the phone. In the particular, however, Mr. Tilson seems to have the receiver before the mouthpiece.

"Either identify yourself, or your telephone number," says Mr. Tilson, "when you answer the telephone."

That's undoubtedly a nice, polite thing to do. But there's at least a small school of telephone answerers who feel that the person making the call has the first identifying duty. Of all the unpleasant characters on the Bell System's far-reaching lines, the person who calls up and demands that the answerer is before he identifies himself is undoubtedly the worst. After all he is making the call—he's the one who wants to communicate—and as the stranger at the door, asking admittance, he ought to say who he is. All of us know the fellow who makes a call and then begins it: "Who's this?"

To such the only proper answer is: "I haven't the slightest idea."

Telephone answerers ought to be polite, as Mr. Tilson says, but the first part in politeness as they are in communication ought to be the telephone callers.

An adoring grandmother willingly consented to baby sit for her small grandson and tucked him cozily into bed. "Now, there," she said, "let's have a bedtime story, shall we? Fuzzy Wuzzy was a bear. Fuzzy Wuzzy had no hair. Fuzzy Wuzzy wasn't fuzzy was he?" There was no answer as the small boy looked at her steadily. "Well, darling, was Fuzzy Wuzzy fuzzy or wasn't he," she said. "Grandma," the boy said, "you are drunk."—WAKEFIELD (MASS.) ITEM.

June brides of today aren't as pretty as were the June brides of 25 years ago, says a columnist—who is a quarter of a century older than he was 25 years ago.—NASHVILLE (GA.) HERALD.

Tar Heel At Oxford Dissects British 'Anti-Americanism'

By EDWIN M. YODER
Editors' Note: Is it true? Do the British really hate America? A Rhodes Scholar from Mehane dissects the surface of a nation's conscience for the answers in this special report to news readers.

THE phenomenon of "anti-Americanism" here in Britain is a surface of a good bit of comment on both sides of the Atlantic — and even on the



BERTRAND RUSSELL An Undeniable Fact

other side of the English Channel. Readers of Art Buchwald's Paris column in the New York Herald Tribune issued it off as another one of his frequent tricks when Buchwald recently advertised in the Times of London for letters from Britons. They were invited to tell why they dislike Americans.

Now no less a figure than Bertrand Russell has turned his attention to anti-Americanism. In the New York Times Magazine he deplores his own finding — an "undeniable fact that a great many people in Britain have hostile emotions toward the United States."

SNOBBERY AND FEAR

It would be false to say that I don't know what Russell is talking about — the aristocratic and cultural snobbery, the nostalgia indeed for Britain's days of political power, the British liberal's fear that the U.S. is hedging in its protection of minority opinions and the rights to free speech.

I have heard the same arguments — often put strongly if with unvarying politeness — and in deploring the hostility between the U.S. and Britain, as he does, I have countered with many of the same answers. But as an American living among the British, with a different vantage point, I take a somewhat different view of the problem. If I had to choose a label for what I have seen and heard, I would choose "American discomfort" rather than "hostility."

SUBTLER SENTIMENT

I am convinced that if there is any generalized opinion about the U.S. among the British it assumes a form subtler than hostility. The "discomfort" I speak of applies doubly in Britain where anxiety, affection, and misgivings about the U. S. are present so curiously interwoven.

The cause of this discomfort? It is not just what Russell has in mind when he writes of "a nostal-

'Custer's Last Stand' Conservatism On Trial

By DORIS FLEESON

SACRAMENTO, Calif. FROM a party point of view, Sen. William F. Knowland's effort to gain control of California is mortal combat for power between the pre-Eisenhower regular nomination and "modern Republicans."

A severe setback for Knowland might well be a Custer's Last Stand for the conservative regulars who have been steadily forced to the wall since Sen. Robert A. Taft died.

The division has been more or less forced upon the major public protagonists — Knowland and Vice President Richard M. Nixon — by the logic of events. It is replete with irony.

Knowland came to Washington as the protégé of Chief Justice Earl Warren, then California governor, who is the outstanding liberal Republican of the nation. Knowland was completely loyal to the Warren presidential candidacy in 1952 at the expense of the vice presidential nomination that Taft unquestionably could have procured for him.

In contrast, Nixon arrived here with the hope of a conservative anti-Republican in the Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Syria Will Be Russia's Prize Exhibit

DAMASCUS

THE Russian goal in Syria unquestionably is to develop that country, not only economically and socially as a model to the Arab world. There is no sign of Syria's adoption of a political doctrine, Moscow is too smart to try this.

The Kremlin knows communism is anathema to the Moslems, but it also knows these areas have lain fallow for centuries under Turkish rule and are now ripe for cultivation. Accordingly, the Kremlin has stolen the United States Marshall Plan — Point strategy and political doctrine with more money than Uncle Sam ever thought of spending.

Whereas the United States offered Syria \$50 million and the World Bank 5 per cent interest, Moscow offered Syria

glia owing to the loss to America of that dominant position in the world which Britain enjoyed during the hundred years from the fall of Napoleon to the First World War. "But something close to it. An undefined, vague idea of what the U.S. and her people are really like, what we are doing, and what kind of country we are evolving into.

BIG 'I'

I don't believe, personally, that the nostalgists would make a great deal of difference to the Briton, outside the circle of die-hard who romanticize the post-Napoleonic era and do not see themselves as precisely 100 years out of date, if the U.S. appeared to be exercising her power in an orderly and predictable way.

When we think of ourselves as going on about our business without any of the national self-consciousness the fact that we seem disorderly and unpredictable to our closest ally probably comes as a shock. Nor is it particularly our fault that we seem so. Our common language, political institutions and values tend always to be cited grounds for mutual bliss. As far as it goes, this is justified. But it fails to go far enough and it leads to a common heritage often conceals basic differences in temper and approach which are rather drastic, and it leads to a practical view on both sides of taking too much for granted.

REVERSE IS TRUE

At the same time we naturally assume that Britain understands, or should understand what we are up to, the truth seems just the other way around. At lunch today we talked with the principal of a school which had made the problem with perception:

"It took us hundreds of years of trial and error, many mistakes, a few big mistakes — to learn to use our power effectively. It frightens us to see you being so confident about your power without this long experience."

Here capsuled is the attitude of many enlightened Britons — discomfort, apprehension. Their attitude is not at all unfriendly or hostile. They are not habitual fair-landers. If they are scared or uncertain about us, who or what is to blame?

COMMUNICATIONS

One big culprit, I think, is the communication barrier. No matter how hard the British newspapers try, and some of them try very hard, it is impossible for them to capture the essence of American life. This leads easily enough to a seeming preoccupation with extremes. Take, for instance, the case of Sen. McCarthy — whose damage to our prestige abroad is even now, months after his death, as three years after his coming-appears, remembered. While he rode high and handsome, a foreigner easily gleaned exaggerated fears of his power — and it was uncomprehendingly great as it was. He is the senator's challenge to the State Department, libraries, schools, universities, teachers, the Congress, the Army and even the President himself.

RACIAL CONFLICT

The same applies, with little change, to incidents arising from the South's race problem. Clinton and Little Rock loom as the typ-

ical South in crisis, not Winston-Salem, N. C.

So, too, in our attempts to cope foreign problems and obligations. The prevailing impression remains that we are confused. We are in the Briton's estimation from extreme to extreme. From the extreme of threatening "massive retaliation" to the extreme of weeks-long negotiation with the intractable Soviet. From the extreme of voting against Britain and Britain in the U.N. on the Suez issue to the other extreme of staging a muscle-flexing show of power in Syria and Jordan. Our erratic foreign policy does not gain in European estimation when it appears that Secretary Dulles controls the master switches. He is emphatically and universally distrusted here, and the Alsop brothers were hardly exaggerating when they recently called him the most hated man in Western Europe since Joseph Stalin. Whether it is Dulles' fault or not, Britain has no confidence in him as the leader of free-world diplomacy.

The hard lines of this chaotic picture would be softened in the British eye if person-to-person

communication between the two countries were really close. But the British are unable, due to currency restrictions, to travel extensively on our soil. Said to say, the average American tourist is not always an effective bearer of our good intentions. If he is like many tourists met this summer, he spends three days to a week in a whirlwind dash across Britain. At the worst, he reflects the attitude toward Britain which I heard from one American serviceman:

"We ought to foreclose on that country," he observed, "and turn it into a rest and recuperation camp for the Army."

OUR WORST SIDE

The tragic thing about the American Discomfort is that it is largely based on misconceptions. We have succeeded to an amazingly great degree in recent years in showing our worst side. This applies both to political and personal impressions. The Briton often sees the American off guard, forgetting that the indifferent tourists who crowd his streets, his cafeterias, and even his night clubs have been lifted from their

wings by all the ab-

rogations in publishing the names of the children involved, as it is well known that children under 16 are considered minors in the court.

Blame Authorities, Not The Students

Charlotte

ONE wonders if the prestige of the United States abroad has not been harmed more by some of the comments in your editorial on Saturday, September 14, than by the actual deeds referred to, as the "hot winds of racial violence blowing out of the South this week."

In one of the Charlotte papers September 14, the principal of the high school was quoted as saying that no such mistreatment was reported in his school, promising being spat upon and being hit by an eraser. This would indicate that the school authorities did not feel it necessary to use such a play of words as was contained in your editorial.

Everyone working with children knows there is nothing complex about a situation in which they are forced to accept something they do not understand, the authorities knew of certain reactions, whether children or adults, but the unjust publicity to these children should have been directed to the authorities who permitted them to be exposed to the point of exploding emotions. Furthermore, the local court rul-

ing was violated by all the ab-

rogations in publishing the names of the children involved, as it is well known that children under 16 are considered minors in the court.

In your paper Wednesday, September 18, you carried a new item to the effect that Dorothy Counts had made the statement that she had not had too much difficulty — the eraser which was so publicized in the "assault" was not a blackboard eraser, but the end of a pencil. In view of this, the play of words in your article, and other articles, promoting integration, referring to these white students as hoodlums, rock-throwers, etc., seem out of proportion with the incident.

In the interest of desegregation there seem to be many who have lost sight of the rights and privileges of white people. The NAACP in New York is now fighting to eliminate all segregation regardless of laws of zoning for school districts. They demand that where there is a strictly white school community, these white students be transported into districts populated by Negroes, and in turn, Negro students be brought into these schools. For further enlightenment the U. S. News & World Re-

port of September 20 furnishes complete details.

School Superintendent William Jansen cautioned against going too far in efforts to increase integration by artificial means and pointed out that a citywide program of re-zoning and bus transportation of pupils was adopted to overcome the segregation because of housing patterns. He cautioned that the integration program should not sacrifice the "neighborhood school concept" and that pupils would not be transported long distances in order to achieve "racial balance."

Are those of us who oppose integration to be so intimidated by such a play of critical and unjust phrases as appeared in your article that we will fear to oppose further moves such as the one described by Dr. Jansen, thereby removing from our way of life the neighborhood schools in order that there may be a "racial balance"?

No citizen wishes to see a disturbance caused by either white or Negro children, but the authorities of schools and state officials should well consider their actions before the pattern set becomes established.

— MRS. LUCY JENSEN

'May I Make A Suggestion, Friend?'



Bulgaria's Offer

At this juncture Communist Bulgaria came along with an offer to buy Syrian wheat at \$5 per ton above the world price in exchange for various Iron Curtain commodities. Syria now is getting Czech arms, Hungarian telephones and the I. T. T. plant Hungary seized

from the United States, plus other equipment. It was partly through this barter deal that Iron Curtain experts got into Syria on the most comprehensive development program seen in the Near East. It puts into effect for Syria what Harry Truman started planning for the entire Near East — namely, irrigation, roads, public works, to give the Near East the same 80 million population it had under the Roman and Greek Empires instead of the sub-standard ill-nourished 25 million it has today.

All this is taking place in a country with which the United States enjoyed excellent past relations and which until recently had been following American leadership.

own element — and are thereby bound to be different. He sees us at the height of our legendary money-consciousness (after all, it does take money to travel), loud, demanding, complaining of food and weather. Before he knows it, the U.S. begins to take the shape of an overgrown myth. It becomes shrouded in a mystery and eccentricity that he can't penetrate; and it all makes the Englishman uncomfortable: American and America are by tradition supposed to be artless and transparent. It is not long before this true unfamiliarity becomes sinister.

This is what I would define as the American Discomfort. We can do much by taking it much less for granted that everything we seem open and above-board to the British. The British can do much by doing away with a lot of stereotyped notions about America which they have gleaned from superficial observation. Hostility seems a smaller threat to me than the possibility that by refusing to recognize the complexity of our relationship we may allow ourselves to drift needlessly and dangerously apart.