



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

Brodie S. Griffith Editor and General Manager
Cecil Prince Associate Editor
R. L. Young Jr. Managing Editor

SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1959

Editorial Book Review

The Mind Of The South Re-Examined

THE SOUTHERN TEMPER. By William Peters. Foreword by Harry Golden. Doubleday. 283 pages. \$2.95.

Dixie's psyche has been poked and probed by many touring writers since the Supreme Court's historic 1954 decision on desegregation in the public schools. None has laid bare the raw realities of southern attitudes with more deftness than William Peters.

Mr. Peters is a northerner, a doctrinaire integrationist and a connoisseur of human frailty. What he lacks in objectivity he makes up in an uncanny ability to isolate and render into readable prose the torrents of emotion that are sweeping the region today.

"The Southern Temper" would be a far more valuable document if its author were less dogmatic, however. There are times when the book is more a social tract than a dispassionate examination of the South's mental climate. Moral judgments are made with abandon and complex problems of the human spirit are reduced to a kind of righteous arithmetic in which two and two always add up to four.

Unfortunately, things are not always that simple in the modern South. There are no sovereign remedies to social problems that have been aged in anguish for generations. The flesh is weak and the conversion of the heart is sometimes a slow and painful process.

But if Mr. Peters is short on compassion there is nothing wrong with his powers of observation. He has traveled far, seen much and experienced a great deal. His impressions are recorded with superior journalistic skill although they occasionally read like program notes for a chamber of horrors.

Wherever there is social conflict there is cruelty. Man's inhumanity to man has been particularly heartless at times in the South and few major instances have escaped Mr. Peters' notice. He reports these incidents with great clarity, conferring the trappings of martyrdom on all likely subjects.

It is in his journalistic descriptions of major events in the post-1954 drive for Negro rights that the book performs its most valuable service. These milestones are carefully recorded and the participants adroitly drawn. The White Citizens Council, the Ku Klux Klan, southern politicians, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, ministers, reformers, white supremacists, newspaper editors, educators, law enforcement officials and ordinary citizens are all subjected to searching examination.

There is an excellent interview with Georgia segregationist Roy V. Harris, a comprehensive survey of Negro employment in the South, good descriptions of the Little Rock crisis, Montgomery's bus boycott, integration in the armed forces, desegregation in southern colleges and universities.

Some of the book's more provocative pages are devoted to the notion that southern white women — and more particularly white churchwomen — are lining up on the side of desegregation. It is an interesting theory although the supporting evidence that large or significant forces are at work along these lines is rather flimsy.

Mr. Peters leans heavily on recognized spokesmen of the "new South" and on the works of several noted sociologists. Consequently, readers are treated to useful summaries of — and long quotations from — the works of Lillian Smith, W. J. Cash, James McBride Dabbs, Harry Ashmore, P. D. East, Harry Golden, Carl Carner and John Dollard.

Unfortunately, however, Mr. Peters attempts to understand the variety of feelings among southern segregationists



Tar Heel Negroes Voting On Peasants Plan

are largely unsatisfactory. The lines between good and evil in this question are not so finely drawn as he seems to suggest. Nor can history, tradition, mores, customs and ancient social convictions be lightly dismissed.

It is regrettable, too, that the author of "The Southern Temper" did not give a great deal more attention to southerners of both races who choose to call themselves "moderates." The conflict in the South is not solely between the integrationists and the segregationists. There are others who are curiously involved in this social dilemma — men and women who stand somewhere in the middle, who know the region and its people and know, too, that time, understanding and great patience will be required to effect social change. Perhaps they do not qualify as martyrs — although they do take enormous risks. Yet they work constantly for unity, harmony and civilized relations between races and between regions within the framework of law. If this terrible problem is ever solved it is likely that the so-called "moderates" will solve it. And they will solve it safely, sanely, without coercive action and also without excessive pity.

Even though Mr. Peters' historical perspective sometimes goes awry, he is an effective reporter and he allows his readers to feel the full burn of feelings which, when stirred up, occasionally become irrational and violent. It is not a pleasant journey he takes his reader on, but it is an enlightening one.

What does it all portend? Mr. Peters sums up his own ideas rather succinctly: "Continued social desegregation for a certainty."

There will be violence, he predicts, and more closed schools. But, eventually, a new status quo will be established.

"How long it will take," writes Mr. Peters, "depends on dozens of unpredictable factors. In the Black Belt it will take longer — much longer — than elsewhere. Once desegregation has been established for a single pupil in every state, however, state boundaries will cease to have much meaning in the movement. And that day cannot be more than several years away."

"In any case, the movement has begun, and it is propelled by forces which, having their roots in history, cannot be turned aside. It is even possible, as one southerner speculates, that 50 years from now the South will have moved further toward complete equality for the Negro than the North. For, as he puts it, 'with the backlog of guilt for its past treatment of the Negro, the South, once it begins to move, may build up a momentum which carries it far past the North. After all, where can you find a more aggressive worker for any cause than a recent convert?'"

Mr. Peters has found the cause, but he has not yet found the convert.

From The Greensboro Daily News

'WE'RE OFF TO SEE THE WIZARD'

We have a bone to pick with certain librarians who, as Martin Gardner described them in the Saturday Review, are shouting, "Wake up and read what we think you should read."

Our complaint has nothing to do with the Hoyer Boys, the Bobby Twins or even such classics as "Little Black Sambo" or "Oliver Twist."

It concerns rather that magnificent feat of the imagination created by L. Frank Baum, the Oz books.

Now we are lit that not all of the Oz books are literature. The writing is not masterly. But the achievement lies in the quality of the imagination. Few authors, outside of the Brothers Grimm or Hans Christian Andersen, have put on paper such a fabulous array of wondrous characters. Dorothy, the Cowardly Lion, the Scarecrow, the Tin Man and the Wizard are classical in concept.

We are amazed that some librarians (we trust none hereabouts) have developed an allergy to fantasy and to the Oz books in particular.

"Kids don't like that fanciful stuff anymore," said Dr. Frank B. Sessa, chairman of the Miami Public Library. "The state librarian of Florida, Miss Dorothy Dodd, insisted 'The Wizard of Oz' on a list of books that she urged all public libraries in her state to withdraw

from circulation. (In Florida, the land of fantasy, of all places!)

Miss Dodd contended that the books on her list were "poorly written, untrue to life, sensational, foolishly sentimental and consequently unwholesome for the children in your community."

If that applies to the Oz books, hush. Children today are no more wedded to fantasy about missiles and atomic submarines than they were to Buck Rogers and the like 30 years ago. They liked broadside fantasy of the Oz variety then, and we'll wager they like it now.

So down with this tendency of librarians to tell our children what they like to read. Call it censorship or selection or what you will, it is an insidious influence.

At least seven editions of "The Wizard" are in print today and, according to Martin, all of them are selling briskly. Two years ago a Milwaukee librarian reported that the children had worn out 135 copies of "The Wizard" in eight years, were rapidly wearing out the 50 remaining copies and 25 more were on order.

So here's to L. Frank Baum's land of Oz. It has more mystery and excitement in one corner of the Wicked West than the North's domain than in all of outer space.

Oil Markets Westward

Iraq Just Won't Orbit

By WALTER LIPPMANN

WASHINGTON
Although there are many who think so, it seems to me misleading to suppose that the Russians have staged the Berlin affair as a distraction — in order to divert attention from their ambitions in Iraq and in the Middle East. The stakes in Germany are much bigger for them and for us than in Iraq. For in Germany the Soviet Union and the Western alliance, each armed with nuclear weapons, confront one another directly. Neither can or will surrender its vital interests to the other, and if they cannot find an honorable and acceptable modus vivendi, there may be no alternative to a great war.

OIL MUST FLOW WEST

As compared with this, the cold war about Iraq and Iran, though important and dramatic, is nevertheless secondary. The oil of Iraq must find its market in the West. The Soviet Union has no need of it, in fact no use for it. The Soviet Union will, therefore, not go to war to seize Iraq as it would most probably go to war to hold Eastern Europe. The West, for its part, will not go to war about Iraq because, when the chips are down, Iraq with its oil fields, like Egypt with the Suez Canal, must have a

IRAQ IS A RISK

The main reason for this, as I venture to think, is that there is no common frontier between any Arab state and the Soviet Union. With the exception of Albania, which is not much of an exception, the genuine Soviet satellites are all countries into which the Red Army has marched, and could march again. For this reason, Iraq, which does not touch the Soviet Union, is not likely to become a satellite. For the same reasons, Iran, which does have a common frontier with

the Soviet Union, is a great risk if ever there is a breakup of the Shah's regime.

WHAT TRAFFIC BEARS

Our wisest course in the Middle East is to refrain from any threats or promises which, in a slow-down, we could not carry out. In our relations with the Iraqi government we should be unexcited and reserved. We should make it plain, but without excessive rhetoric, that we believe in the independence of Iraq — that we believe and support her independence of the great powers including the Soviet Union and the United States — that we believe in her right and her capacity to find her own place in the Arab world.

This is a realistic policy. It is not "dynamic" and it is not dramatic. But it is all that the traffic will bear.

SOFT-BOILED

The old policy has collapsed. It was based on the illusion that Iraq could be aligned with the West by subsidizing and arming an oligarchy that was aligned with the West, and that this artificial arrangement could be regarded as a military bastion against the Soviet Union.

The architects and supporters of the old policy looked upon



Iraq: Land of Biblical Lore

themselves as hard-boiled and tough-minded realists. But the structure they built disappeared in a night. Let us then beware of those who would like somehow to resurrect that old policy.

In the light of what has happened in Egypt, in the light of what has happened to Nasser's affair with Russia, in the light of what has happened to Nasser's imperial dream of making Cairo the center of the whole Arab world, the time has come to discount heavily the

catastrophic view of the Middle East. The Arabs are a community from Morocco to the Persian Gulf. But nobody is one, if every, going to unite them in a single great state, not Nasser or any other Arab, not Mr. K. or any other Communist. For as long a future as we can see ahead, there will be many Arab states, and there will be no one great settlement, good, bad, or indifferent, of the Arabs' relations with each other or with the rest of the world.

What If The Soviets Do Mean Business In Berlin?

By JOSEPH ALSOP

PARIS
The NATO commander, Gen. Lauris Norstad, not long ago asked Gen. Charles de Gaulle for special permission to place medium range American nuclear rockets on French soil for the duration of the Berlin crisis.

The only purpose was to strengthen the Western deterrent for the critical period that was about to be opened by the de Gaulle would not have involved

any long range commitment. Yet the French chief of state refused to make even a limited and temporary compromise in his long dispute with the U. S. about nuclear weapons. He continued to insist that France must have entire control of any of these weapons that are placed in France. Congressional action would have been needed to give up the American "key to the cupboard" of the

nuclear warheads. Hence Gen. Norstad's plan was blocked.

PENTAGON FAKING

The incident was not in itself enormously important. Judging by the now-exposed Pentagon faking about the ballistic missiles emplaced in Britain, new rockets based in France would probably not have been ready in time for the expected climax

'Some Of You Still Seem To Have The Old-Fashioned Idea That We're Supposed To Deliver The Mail'



of the Berlin crisis. None the less de Gaulle's refusal of Norstad's request cast a glaring light on the divergences among the Western allies in their approach to Berlin.

The difference is not great between the French, the West Germans, and the Americans. Gen. de Gaulle's rejection of emergency rocket bases is, in itself, hardly comparable to the President's often repeated formula — "I won't give an inch (but I won't mobilize a man either)." The difference is between the Germans, French, and Americans, on one side and the British on the other.

FISH NOR FOWL

In brief, the British think the Soviets mean business at Berlin. They are deeply fearful of the outcome. To avoid the worst outcome, they are ready to go pretty far to conciliate the Soviets. The other Western allies are not ready to make the kind of concessions that are talked about in Britain behind the scenes. But they are not ready, either, to make the obvious military preparations to support a firm stand.

Prime Minister Macmillan pointed out to Gen. de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer that their strong positions on Berlin implied a need for special military preparations. In both cases he met with a blank response. Undoubtedly, Gen. de Gaulle is a special case, since his analysis of the Berlin problem is known to be decidedly somber.

ARE BRITISH RIGHT?

"It will probably end badly, perhaps very badly indeed,"

Such is de Gaulle's reported forecast. Yet in the actions he has taken, he has not differed greatly from President Eisenhower. He does not believe the State Department thesis, that "Khrushchev has got out on a limb and now wishes to get off it." Yet he behaves as if he believed it.

All these divergences raise many questions about the future, most of them extremely unpleasant. The most unpleasant and most urgent of them all is the question, "What if the British are right?"

This reporter happens to believe that the British are wrong. But even if you are convinced that the Soviets will not risk a nuclear war for Berlin, and even if you are also con-



GEN. NORSTAD He Offered Rockets

victed that the other Western allies will not surrender under threat, the question still demands an answer.

ECHO OF THE PAST

One remembers far too well catching the last plane out of Manila with the solemn assurance of Gen. MacArthur ringing in one's ears, that the Japanese would "never dare to attack the Philippines, and would surely direct their assault against the Netherlands Indies." This was altogether convincing at the time. Yet it was this judgment, wholly logical by every outward test, that produced Pearl Harbor.

If the U. S. fleet in the Pacific had not been waiting in Pearl Harbor, there would have been no Pearl Harbor. The situation today differs in a hundred ways from the situation in 1941. But the chance of Soviet error at Berlin would surely be greatly reduced if the Western powers made the effort to achieve a state of real military readiness, instead of contenting themselves with what may be called Eisenhower-McCarthy stand readiness.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Castro Makes Double-Talk On Panama

WASHINGTON
Fidel Castro's statement that he knew nothing about the Cuban inventory force that landed in Panama is Fidelista doubletalk.

Here are the real facts: The port from which the 96 Cubans, plus 300 sub-sequent invaders, departed was Batabano, a small anchorage in southern Cuba opposite the Isle of Pines. At Batabano is a Cuban naval post, plus an army post, plus a police barracks, also a gunboat in the harbor. Twenty miles away, at Managua, is the cadet school of the Cuban Army, with at least 300 soldiers and officers.

Batabano Has Eyes

Batabano is so small that it would be impossible for a force of 96 well-equipped men, and later 300 others, to depart without the knowledge of the Cuban authorities and without direct authorization of Fidel Castro. Army commanders have to answer to Castro for every move they make and no moves without direct orders.

Yet the oratorical premier of Cuba claims that he was in complete ignorance of the Panamanian invasion.

Not that it is that Fidel Castro attacks the United States in Cuba and

praises Americans when in the United States.

He Uncovered Teapot Dome

Few senators who listened to the earnest plea of Sen. Clinton Anderson of New Mexico to scrutinize carefully the part played by Adm. Lewis Strauss in the Dixon-Yates conflict-of-interest case, realized one reason why Anderson was so earnest. They did not know he had once played a vital part in exposing another great conflict-of-interest case.

Tell-Tale Horse

In South Dakota where he was born, Anderson contracted TB and went to New Mexico for his health. Working for the Albuquerque Journal, he unearthed the first clue to the famous Teapot Dome oil scandal. He learned that a prize race horse had been shipped from the East in a special railroad car to the New Mexican ranch of Albert B. Fall, secretary of the interior under Harding.

From New Jersey

Fall was a relatively poor man, and his sudden affluence aroused Anderson's suspicion. He investigated, and

in cooperation with the Chicago Tribune and the Denver Post, finally ran down the fact that the race horse had come from the New Jersey farm of Harry B. Sinclair of the Sinclair Oil Company, beneficiary of the Teapot Dome lease.

Anderson and his paper, the Journal, were subjected to all sorts of pressure, including an advertising boycott which forced Carl Magee, the publisher, to sell the Journal to a friend of President Harding's.

Six Foot 'Liar'

On one occasion, according to Werner and Starr in their book, "Teapot Dome," Secretary of Interior Fall came into the Journal office and asked in a loud voice, "Who is the s.o.b. who is writing those lies about me?" Anderson stood up. He is six foot two.

"I'm the s.o.b. and I don't write lies," he said.

Fall evaporated, Anderson went on to become congressman, senator, and a member of the cabinet.

The Teapot Dome scandal caused President Coolidge to appoint two special prosecutors, Owen Roberts and Alice Pommeroy, to prosecute Fall and Attorney Gen. Harry Daugherty, to-

gether with Sinclair and Edward L. Doheny.

No Prosecution

The Dixon-Yates conflict, which is by all odds the biggest collect of interest since the Teapot Dome scandal, was canceled by the Eisenhower administration because a banker representative, Adolph Wenzel, had been secretly placed inside the Budget Bureau to help pull off the contract.

Although the Justice Department officially cited this as the reason for canceling the contract, President Eisenhower, unlike Coolidge, has appointed no special counsel to prosecute the guilty.

More Links With Past

Note—One of those who helped unearth the Teapot Dome scandal was the late Sen. John B. Kendrick of Wyoming. His secretary was then a young man named Joe O'Mahoney who later, as senator from Wyoming, helped unearth the Dixon-Yates scandal. Another Wyoming senator, Gale McGee, is the most faithful Democrat on the committee now examining the Dixon-Yates collect, as it is called in Adm. Lewis L. Strauss.