

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

TUESDAY, JULY 16, 1957

Editorial Correspondence

The Middle East Will Know No Peace Until The Refugee Problem Is Settled

By CECIL PRINCE
Editor, The News

CAIRO, Egypt. LOOK at it this way," said the young Egyptian. "Suppose a red Indian chief came to your home in Charlotte and said you were living on the land of his ancestors and that he must have it."

"Oh, no," you would say. "My people have lived here for hundreds of years. They have lived and died for this land. They have tilled the soil and made it bloom. It is not only my land—it is my life."

"Suppose the red Indian chief said, 'I have a paper from Geneva or The Hague or New York which says this land is really mine. I must drive you off.'"

"And so he does."
"Would you like that?"
The young Egyptian's face darkened. He frowned and leaned forward.

"So," he said. "How do you think the Arabs feel about the Jews in Palestine? It is not just this. It is the same for thousands—not hundreds—of years. It represented home. It was all generation after generation of Arabs had ever known. Yet they were driven out and now must live like animals in cages."

It was wrong, my friend. It was wrong. Is it any wonder that the politicians say that we must drive the Jews into the sea and reclaim our homelands?"

You hear this argument all over Cairo today—in the cafes, in the offices, wherever you seek out opinions. There is a curious uniformity to the answers for emigrants get to their questions. It is only later, when a certain confidence has been gained, when questions probe deeper into the Arab consciousness that variations in reactions and attitudes are discernible.

So it was that the young Egyptian who spoke of "driving the Jews into the sea" was willing to concede that such a solution to the problem of Israel was no solution at all.

Since variations on the current propaganda line in Egypt are not looked upon with anything resembling approval by President Nasser's government, the name of our friend must necessarily be omitted.

Let us call him Abdel Farag Fayed.

HE is typical of many young intellectuals in Egypt today—superbly educated, well traveled, brilliant, and yet prefers French to Arabic in casual conversation, thoroughly in sympathy with the aims of the Nasser regime.

But on the question of Israel, he speaks with a kind of measured moderation that is new in the official utterances of the government he admires with such boyish devotion.

"Let us put it this way," he says. "You cannot cancel a wrong with another wrong. Israel is a fact. Whether we like it or not, it has existed for ten years. Thousands upon thousands of Jews from all over the world have come there and put down their roots. It is ridiculous to think that we can drive them into the sea now."

He smiled quickly, shrugged.

"Oh, of course, our politicians speak differently. But they must. They are talking to the streets. The people in the streets can understand only black and white. Israel is necessarily black. If we could only solve the problem of the refugees—hundreds of thousands of Arabs who live in such misery in those camps in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and the Gaza Strip—then perhaps we would acknowledge the existence of Israel. Until then—until this terrible problem is solved and suitable homes are found for these unfortunate people—there can be no peace in the Middle East."

Is there any real hope that the problem can be solved soon?

"Let us be realistic. There is no hope for an early solution. No one can say where the refugees can be relocated. But Egypt cannot take them at present. We are already suffering from over-population. Jordan is too poor to absorb them. Lebanon is too small. Syria does not want them. Even if Israel were to permit it, many refugees would not want to return to Israel to live under the Jews and be a minority subject to oppression."

Abdel Farag Fayed paused. "If only America would help us solve..."

Could America help?
Yes, but to be realistic again, it would take the best efforts and best thinking of all nations. American influence alone will not help. Too many of us are suspicious of the Americans. We see the efforts of trading British and French colonialism for American colonialism. That we do not want. We in the Middle East are weary of exploitation from abroad."

Abdel Farag Fayed, like other young Egyptians of his class, sees Egypt's role as one of "positive neutralism." "We must line up with neither the East nor the West," he said firmly. "Egypt, like India, must remain positively in the middle. In this middle ground we can do things for the United States. But we will not let either side dominate us. As I said, we are weary of exploitation by foreigners."

This weiness has already triggered war changes in Egypt. Foreign-owned businesses for American colonialism. But while British, French and American influences are being systematically erased, Soviet influence is appearing everywhere. Entertainers for Cairo night clubs, imported from Paris, now come from central Europe, some from behind the Iron Curtain. (American rock 'n' roll has been banned by the government, although it is still a great favorite of Egyptian youth and is still heard in after-hours nightclubs.) Soviet money is pouring into Egypt. It was announced here just yesterday that Russia was Egypt's best customer for cotton. A shipload of Russian tourists is arriving in Alexandria tomorrow—the first of an expected wave. Iron Curtain products are appearing on the shelves of stores—while imports from the West have been reduced.

"Because we buy their products does not mean that we will buy their ideas," said Abdel Farag Fayed. "We can do business with Russia without being swayed by the Russian bar."

NASSER, it was explained by Abdel Farag Fayed, is not pro-Communist. He is merely an "enlightened socialist," interested only in "extending the limits of freedom" in Egypt.

But Abdel Farag Fayed is quick to point out that Egypt is not ready for freedom. It was explained that 90 per cent of Egypt's population is either illiterate or simply doesn't care.

"The people cannot rule themselves in Egypt," said Abdel Farag Fayed. "They don't know how. A Nasser is needed to guide them."

His guidance is often harsh and oppressive. But Abdel Farag Fayed assured us that he is clever enough to keep the people with him. Those who are not with him are muzzled.

"Have no fear," said Abdel Farag Fayed. "President Nasser is a clever man."

How clever?
History will decide—and soon.

City Gains More Than Census Ciphers

THE total vote on city limits extension was surprisingly large.

The majority for extension, moreover, was abundantly sufficient to keep Charlotte in the front rank of alert and progressive U.S. cities. Those who cared enough to vote have contributed much to all Charlotteans. They have taken an option, so to speak, on the necessities of a good future for a great city.

Charlotte owes sincere thanks to these citizens, and to the very efficient get-out-the-vote organization headed by Carl G. McCraw.

Much is expected from this vote in the way of material progress. It is confidently forecast that after extension becomes effective in 1960, Charlotte's bidding power for new industry and commerce, jobs and payrolls will be greatly enhanced. Since there is industrial significance in plans for, as well as the fact of, a city's expansion, the enhancement may come before 1960.

The plans are now approved. Charlotte will be in the 200,000 population group by the time the 1960 census takers make their rounds.

But the real treasure Charlotte is to gain from this vote must be found in terms of individuals rather than in census ciphers. Basic to extension was the fact that city and perimeter residents face the same problem—the building of a sounder, more satisfying urban life. The two areas will be joined together in fact and the voices of the perimeter residents will be heard in the city's public affairs. Some of the metropolitan area's ablest and best qualified leaders live in the perimeter, and thus have been disqualified for service by city officials and on municipal boards and commissions.

Up to now, the perimeter has been helping to shape Charlotte's future indirectly. Now it will have a direct impact. Charlotte will be the better for it.

Everybody's in on the Atomic Act. Now comes a blurb from the National Lumber Manufacturers Assn. that together houses are more radioactive than wooden houses; but it finally gets around to conceding that your grandchildren may not be deformed if you live in a frame home. —TALLAHASSEE DEMOCRAT

A Fearsome Twosome

Cosing The Nuclear Cub

By JOSEPH ALSOP

LONDON. THE latest turn in the interminable and confusing disarmament conference in Geneva seems to have revealed the primary Soviet objective. It has not been disarmament at all. It has been "limiting the nuclear club," to use the conference cast phrase.

The "club" at present has two full members, the powers possessing a full panoply of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, the U.S. and the USSR. It has one half-way member, Great Britain. Halting further nuclear and thermonuclear weapons tests will close the club books to further members, since no nation can hope to become a serious member of this fearsome club with exhaustive weapons testing. Closing the club membership books without further delay is in fact the single point on which an absolute identity of interest now exists between the United States and the Soviet Union. No doubt there are a good many people in Washington, like Admiral Lewis Strauss, who are strangely blind to this identity of American and Soviet interests. Even if Israel were to permit it, many refugees would not want to return to Israel to live under the Jews and be a minority subject to oppression."

Abel Farag Fayed paused. "If only America would help us solve..."

Could America help?
Yes, but to be realistic again, it would take the best efforts and best thinking of all nations. American influence alone will not help. Too many of us are suspicious of the Americans. We see the efforts of trading British and French colonialism for American colonialism. That we do not want. We in the Middle East are weary of exploitation from abroad."

Abel Farag Fayed, like other young Egyptians of his class, sees Egypt's role as one of "positive neutralism." "We must line up with neither the East nor the West," he said firmly. "Egypt, like India, must remain positively in the middle. In this middle ground we can do things for the United States. But we will not let either side dominate us. As I said, we are weary of exploitation by foreigners."

Abdel Farag Fayed, like other young Egyptians of his class, sees Egypt's role as one of "positive neutralism." "We must line up with neither the East nor the West," he said firmly. "Egypt, like India, must remain positively in the middle. In this middle ground we can do things for the United States. But we will not let either side dominate us. As I said, we are weary of exploitation by foreigners."

This weiness has already triggered war changes in Egypt. Foreign-owned businesses for American colonialism. But while British, French and American influences are being systematically erased, Soviet influence is appearing everywhere. Entertainers for Cairo night clubs, imported from Paris, now come from central Europe, some from behind the Iron Curtain. (American rock 'n' roll has been banned by the government, although it is still a great favorite of Egyptian youth and is still heard in after-hours nightclubs.) Soviet money is pouring into Egypt. It was announced here just yesterday that Russia was Egypt's best customer for cotton. A shipload of Russian tourists is arriving in Alexandria tomorrow—the first of an expected wave. Iron Curtain products are appearing on the shelves of stores—while imports from the West have been reduced.

"Because we buy their products does not mean that we will buy their ideas," said Abdel Farag Fayed. "We can do business with Russia without being swayed by the Russian bar."

NASSER, it was explained by Abdel Farag Fayed, is not pro-Communist. He is merely an "enlightened socialist," interested only in "extending the limits of freedom" in Egypt.

But Abdel Farag Fayed is quick to point out that Egypt is not ready for freedom. It was explained that 90 per cent of Egypt's population is either illiterate or simply doesn't care.

"The people cannot rule themselves in Egypt," said Abdel Farag Fayed. "They don't know how. A Nasser is needed to guide them."

His guidance is often harsh and oppressive. But Abdel Farag Fayed assured us that he is clever enough to keep the people with him. Those who are not with him are muzzled.

"Have no fear," said Abdel Farag Fayed. "President Nasser is a clever man."

How clever?
History will decide—and soon.

whole will gain by the prevention of the nightmare situation which must otherwise arise. This is the situation in which great numbers of nations will possess the absolute weapon, and Swiss manufacturers will be mass producing model T style A and B bombs for sale to the Egyptians, Syrians and the like.

Undoubtedly the Soviets went into the disarmament conference with many other possible objectives in mind. But judging by Valerian Zorin's latest outburst, they started with the thought that the talks had at least one truly practical and attainable objective. They saw the identity of U.S. and USSR interests which Admiral Strauss and friends have so strangely failed to see. They were undoubtedly much influenced by their fear of Germany as a nuclear power. Therefore they hoped to stop the weapons tests and so to close the nuclear club.

SHARP CONFLICT. But the Eisenhower administration was afflicted by divided councils. More important still, the United States delegation in London could not speak for all the other western powers, as Valerian Zorin can speak for all the nations of the Soviet bloc. In truth, there was identity of interest between the U.S. and the USSR but a sharp conflict of interest between the U.S. and the other western allies.

This conflict of interest has produced a good deal of behind the scenes drama. In the British government, for instance, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan and Foreign

Minister Selwyn Lloyd have held that Britain would gain on balance if the nuclear club were closed now, despite the very incomplete stage of British weapons development. But this decision has been bitterly disputed by Defense Minister Duncan Sandys.

SOLID AGREEMENT

Again, the French delegate, Jules Monch, has consistently taken the view that France should agree to being excluded from the nuclear club in return for that only in return for a solid agreement on general disarmament. But the French general staff, certain French permanent officials and several leading politicians, including Prime Minister Bourges Maunoury himself, have the gravest doubts about Moch's view.

About ten days ago, therefore, Prime Minister Bourges Maunoury attempted to alter Moch's previously agreed instructions. Moch immediately offered his resignation as French delegate to the disarmament meeting. The difficulty was not overcome until Moch had made an emergency trip to Paris and returned with his original instructions fully confirmed.

Thus, in effect, the views of Admiral Strauss and his friends in Washington played in with the quite differently motivated views of America's Transatlantic allies. The result was the final Strauss proposal. In this proposal, halting nuclear tests and so closing the nuclear club was firmly linked with a broader system of disarmament and a very full and inclusive system of inspection and control.

In the circumstances, Valerian



"While You're Talking, I'll Bring Some More Chairs"

Zorin's indignant, intransigent roars are altogether understandable as the Kremlin's true primary aim is considered. But despite the check that has been experienced in London, the great common interest of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. still remain. The problem of preventing the nightmare of general atomic armament has nothing really to do with the problem of disarmament. The problem of preventing the nightmare can well be solved independently, with only two provisions. A general disarmament must make the rather curious delusions of atomic monopoly. And the American administration must make the rather modest transfers from our vast stocks of nuclear weapons, which will persuade our allies to join in closing the atomic club's membership lists.

Power



HERBLOCK BY THE WASHINGTON POST

Once Again

Nasser's Not Sure

By WALTER LIPPMANN

NEW YORK. ONCE again, as with the budget, the President has let it be known that he is not sure he is fully in favor of a major measure which has been put forward by his administration. Indeed, in the case of the civil rights bill, it appears that he has had a quite misleading impression of what is in it. Thus, at his press conference on July 3, he said in response to a question that while he is not a lawyer and did not "participate in drawing up the exact language of the proposals," he did know "what the objective was that I was seeking."

Protecting the right of Negroes to vote in elections for Federal officials is, in fact, the objective of part III of the bill. The objective of part III is to strengthen the federal power to enforce all the civil rights laws, including the law which calls for integration in the public schools. The President has certainly been misled, in fact it is hard to see how he can have read the bill. If he thinks that it is directed solely, or predominantly, at securing and protecting the right to vote, for as the text shows clearly, the bill is a comprehensive measure for the better enforcement of all these civil rights, which exist in the laws but are in fact denied or nullified in various parts of the country.

A PUZZLE

The President's lack of understanding of the bill enabled Senator Russell of Georgia to speak so heavily when he charged that the bill was an "example of cunning draftsmanship," and that it was promulgated by a "camp of deception."

It certainly is puzzling to find the President so inadequately informed about the objectives of the bill. But whatever the reason for his misunderstanding, there has been no cunning deception. The law which calls for integration is obvious that much more than the right to vote is involved. The attorney general, Mr. Brownell, during the hearings in the House committee and in a memorandum dated April 9, 1956, specifically indicated integration in the public schools among the federal activities to be promoted by the bill.

There is no doubt, therefore, that the objectives of the bill are much wider than to secure and protect the right to vote. This raises great questions of principle and of national policy. For while the right of qualified adults to vote and the right to have their children attend unsegregated schools are both civil rights, there are important differences between the two kinds of rights. Sen. Russell himself recognized this in his speech of July 2 when he said that "the American people generally are opposed to any denial of the right of ballot to any qualified citizen" but that even "outside the South there are millions of people who would not approve" of the use of force to compel integration.

In principle, it is the duty of the federal government to use its powers to secure and protect the right to vote. But to promote integration it is its duty to use persuasion in order to win consent. The two objectives—winning and integration—ought not to be lumped together, and the wise thing to do now would be to accept an amendment to the bill which separates them.

HIGH TIME

No doubt there would still be a die-hard opposition in the deep South. But a bill which did only what the President thinks that this bill does, would be much harder to defeat. It would be hard to filibuster against it for any long time. For there are indeed millions of Americans outside the South who think that it is high time that the right to vote was respected. They do not think, however, that integration in the public schools can be or should be achieved more rapidly than local sentiment will accept it.

Insofar as the right of Southern Negroes to vote can be secured and protected, they will acquire powerful means for establishing all their rights. I am not sure whether Sen. Russell's real reason for opposing the bill is his real reason that southerners of his eminence are now prepared to concede the right to vote. But if they do mean that, they mark a very great advance for the cause of civil rights.

A disfranchised minority is politically helpless. Let it acquire the right to vote, and it will be listened to.

People's Platform

Action Necessary On Denial Of Rights

THE REALITY surprised me as I am sure it did many others if your readers when your paper printed as an editorial your viewpoint as to why the Senate should reject the civil rights bill.

If your article is read over critically and analytically it can readily be seen that such was written by the hands of prejudice

and conceived by the mind of ignorance. Your opinion seems to be that federal legislation should not be resorted to when a citizen's rights are intimidated, yet you think a way can be found to appease such persons without actually granting them their constitutional rights. And just how do you think that can be done? The senators and a majority of the congressmen from the southern states are already making fools of themselves by trying to fulfill the desires of their prejudiced-minded citizens.

In conjunction with your article there appeared two letters from the People's Platform written by anti-integrationists who also had, and evidently still have, narrow-minded concepts concerning the advantages of an integrated society—not just for social purposes, however. But if we as a nation are going to remain the leading nation of the world to do something must and is going to be done about the problem of segregation. —WALTER J. HILL

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Washington. THE leadership of three Congressmen is going to cost the taxpayers about two billion dollars extra for the new federal highway program. This will be the gas, electric, telephone, and water companies for moving their poles, pipes and conduits when the highways are widened.

In the past this has been paid by the utilities themselves. But the utilities are now telling state legislatures that Uncle Sam will pay 90 per cent of the bill, so the states might as well let the federal government pay for moving poles, pipes and conduits.

Paved The Way

The three congressmen who paved the way for this juicy hike in the federal highway bill are: ex-Congressman George Dondoro of Royal Oak, Mich.; Gordon Scherer of Cincinnati, Ohio; and Henry McGregor of West Lafayette, Ohio, all Republicans.

The utilities get valuable access rights along public roads without paying a cent for the privilege, also frequently write off moving costs against taxes. Hence most states in the past have required them to move at their own expense.

Rep. George has retired from Congress, but Dempsey and Jones are backing a new law that would prohibit any further handouts to the utilities, and have been either introduced or passed to pay the utilities for moving their facilities as old highways are widened into modern highways.

Valuable Rights. The utilities get valuable access rights along public roads without paying a cent for the privilege, also frequently write off moving costs against taxes. Hence most states in the past have required them to move at their own expense.

Note—Rep. John Baldwin, Republican of Martinez, Calif., also urged that the utilities not pay for moving their facilities. His proposed concession was so half-faced in its generosity that it

3 Congressmen Cost U.S. Millions

had no chance to win. The smoother approach of Dondoro, McGregor and Scherer of letting each state decide, played into the hands of utility lobbyists.

Washington Pipeline

Tommy Thompson, new Ambassador to Russia, was ordered to Moscow last week regardless of his illness. The American Embassy, as usual in time of crisis, was abandoned. Prediction: Thompson will get meekly out of Moscow. Kansas City Star publisher Roy Roberts, bitter political critic of Harry Truman, was an admiring spectator at the Truman Library dedication, which he introduced. Since Roy married the widow of Truman's old press secretary, Charles Ross, friends say he's become a real human being.

Our Biggest Carrier

This column recently told the inside story of how Capt. Robert Moore, skipper of the USS Saratoga, spent \$85,000 to redecorate it for Eisenhower's overnight cruise. Members of the Saratoga's crew mimeographed a thousand copies of the column for distribution aboard ship.

When Captain Moore got wind of it, however, the mimeographed copies were confiscated. Captain Moore strides the bridge with a long cigarette holder clamped in his teeth, is as sharp a ship handler as the Navy has. But there are some other incidents taking place aboard the "Sara." Our biggest carrier, which creates a morale problem the Navy might well investigate.