THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON.....Publisher
J. E. DOWD.....General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH.....Executive Editor
C. A. McKNIGHT.....Editor

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13, 1952

VICTORY COMES TO THOSE WHO SEEK IT

A CHARLOTTEAN who has recently returned from a trip through the Middle Atlantic and New England states (he's an ardent Eisenhower supporter, by the way) reports that many of the Republicans he talked with have lost their enthusiasm for the forthcoming campaign. He thinks it is because (1) some Republicans are not yet sold on their candidate, Dwight Eisenhower, and (2) they are overly impressed with Adlai Stevenson. Frankly, he's worried lest the Republicans throw away their best chance in 20 years before the campaign even opens.

If the public opinion he sampled is any fair measure of the national state of mind, there may be several explanations:

1. The lull between convention time and Labor Day, when campaigns get into full swing, is somewhat disconcerting to the average voter. He may not understand why it takes so long for the winning candidates to heal convention wounds, map campaign strategy and tactics, arrange the intricate details of campaign tours, promotion, speech-making.

2. A concomitant of this period of planning is the issuance of rather vague and general pronouncements by the candidates. This, too, is somewhat discouraging to millions of Americans who want the candidates to sound off on specific issues, and be quick about it.

3. A third reason for low Republican enthusiasm may be the condition akin to shock that the Stevenson nomination caused. The nomination of Ike, a fresh and convincing personality, sent GOP hopes soaring during a period when it appeared that more Trumanism in one form or another would be the alternative. The Stevenson draft set up the first shock wave, and Stevenson's studied efforts since then to dissociate himself and his campaign from White House direction caused subsequent waves.

4. Finally, there is the bitterness among Taft supporters to which Marquis Childs refers in his column today. While some leaders of the Taft wing of the party have been brought into Eisenhower's campaign organization, many state and local leaders are still sulking. Some of them seem to harbor the secret hope that Eisenhower will lose.

Yet when you consider all these explanations, and any others that may come to mind, they don't add up to a valid cause for Republican pessimism. The Republicans have many assets in this campaign. Some of them—(1) a dynamic, eloquent, and convincing candidate; (2) a feeling among millions of Americans that it is time for a change of parties; (3) dissatisfaction with some of the details, if not the basic objectives of Administration foreign policy; (4) public disgust over revelations of shabby ethics in Washington.

But no mere recounting of assets will bring a Republican victory in November. There will have to be enthusiasm and plain hard work, in brief a speedy and complete reversal of the listless and faint-hearted attitude shown so far.

THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY SURGES FORWARD

WHAT is happening in Europe these days is not merely the formation of another board, another international committee or organization to voice platitudes about unity and plead for greater co-operation. The launching Sunday of the Schuman Plan's High Authority means that Europeans have decided misconceived ideas about nationalism and sovereignty are not only antiquated and economically costly. They have decided that these twin oogies can be disastrous. Thus they are abolishing them.

This they are doing by giving real power to an international organization, the "Community of Coal and Steel", which includes France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. Here is what this Community's executive body, the nine-man High Authority, can do:

Abolish, raise or lower all tariffs on any product of coal and steel in Western Europe.
Control freight rates
Break up and regulate cartels.
Allocate supplies in times of shortage.
Levy taxes on coal
Raise loans.
Make investments.
Allocate materials.

The members of the High Authority have severed all official connections with their native lands. Their new organization will have full diplomatic status. They will be, in a measurably increased sense of the word, Europeans, responsible to a two-house supranational parliament and an international court.

The United States of Europe is no longer merely a project. It exists. And by its existence it proves that men can loose themselves from the artificial barriers which they themselves have forged. It affords a glimpse of what can be—a vast free world market extending across the Atlantic, encompassing all goods, not merely the key items of coal and steel—if men of vision and determination continue to press for that goal.

A BIG MAN FOR A BIG JOB

WITH the welfare of North Carolina's school children at stake, Gov. W. Kerr Scott and Nominee William Umstead buried the hatchet, ignored political considerations, and recommended an outstanding educator, Charles F. Carroll of High Point, as the Democratic candidate to succeed the late Dr. Clyde Erwin as N. C. Superintendent of Public Instruction. It was an act of high level statesmanship for which both men merit the thanks of all Tar Heels.

Mr. Carroll appears to be exceptionally well fitted for his high post. *The High Point Enterprise* says "there is no school man we know who is better qualified for the position of state superintendent". *The Greensboro Daily News* says Carroll rated top in its list of potential successors to Dr. Erwin. And *The Asheville Citizen*, which kept an eye on Carroll when he was serving in Swain County some years ago, calls him "one of the nation's ablest school men".

He will bring to his new task the understanding of a native Tar Heel the experience of more than 30 years as teacher, principal and superintendent in the North Carolina school system, and the vigor of new ideas and new enthusiasm. An ace diplomat, he should get along well with the people, the officials of the school system, and members of the General Assembly.

Mr. Carroll is taking over the reins at a critical time. Despite major improvements since the end of World War II, our schools are still plagued with the difficult problems of inadequate facilities, teacher shortages, big classes, and a fast-growing school population. There is also the possibility that the Supreme Court of the United States, in cases to be heard within the next year or two, may upset the traditions of segregation.

A big job has been cut out for Mr. Carroll. He will need patience, tact, perseverance and, above all, the support of the people of North Carolina if the crisis in education is to be weathered and our children given a fair break in this uncertain world.

A QUESTIONABLE PRACTICE

A MAN who has been a steady caller at the Red Cross Blood Center since it opened told a story the other day of an innovation at the center. It is an innovation of which he disapproves, one which he believes contrary to the "volunteer" nature of the Red Cross program. He believes it could be harmful to the blood program over a period of time.

When the nurses had finished with him, and he was sipping a cup of water in the canteen, a canteen worker asked him his opinion of a certain form of entertainment, then offered him a free ticket to a performance. As he declined with thanks she then offered him a business card, the reverse of which bore a Red Cross stamp. This card bearing the stamp, she told him, would enable him to secure a discount on merchandise at the business house named on the card.

He told us that he was insulted and angry at the proffered rewards, which he considered little better than bribes, and disappointed that the Red Cross would have anything to do with such schemes.

Apart from his personal feelings, he said, he believes there are several dangers in such a practice:

Even if the merchant concerned in the instances above is completely sincere in his offers, the Red Cross can hardly refuse to do the same for any or all business firms, including those who might have a further "commercial" interest underlying an apparently innocent expression of appreciation. The Blood Center might become a veritable clearing house for all sorts of "bank night" schemes.

He further believes that if such a gift practice becomes more widespread, the blood donor might assume an attitude which would be in keeping with the early offers, that of holding out for more "loot" in exchange for his blood.

We recognize the fact that blood collections at times are woefully short of needs, and that perhaps, the Red Cross thinks in this instance the end justifies the means. But we have some doubt as to its value over the course of time, and believe that the Red Cross chapter leaders here would do well to think twice before allowing this practice to continue.

A test pilot who had flown a plane at a speed of 1,238 miles an hour was asked how it felt to travel that fast. He said it felt just the same as flying at 750 miles an hour. So now everybody knows how it feels—everybody, that is, except those who have never have traveled even as fast as 750 miles an hour.—*Lexington (Ky) Leader.*

Reports are that the corn crop in this section has been cut as much as 75 per cent due to the long drought, which is likely to make hog feed cost more than pork chops and moonshine whisky cost more than bonded liquor and any way you look at it somebody is bound to suffer before long.—*Omega (Ga.) News.*

The wife of a well-to-do industrialist was in the act of instructing the new maid in her duties: "Sometimes it will be necessary for you to help the butler upstairs," she said.

"I understand, madam, I drink a bit myself, sometimes," said the new maid.—*Punta Gorda (Fla.) Herald.*

'Mind If I Look Over Your Shoulder?'

People's Platform

Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editors. The News reserves the right to condense.

GOP Receivership

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

WHAT has happened to all the people who were protesting several months ago that all they wanted was a change in administration?

It now appears that since they are sure to have a change, a change wasn't what they wanted after all. What they wanted was a chance to commit political and economic suicide, or otherwise burn the house down. It will be admitted that some sweeping is necessary in the Democratic house, but I don't believe that anyone who will stop and reason a little would subscribe to the Republican attitude of believing that the only way to clean a house is to burn it down.

Some time ago I made th estatement that I believed the Republican Party had gone politically and morally broke during their convention or stockholders' metting, in Chicago, that they had gone into receivership and had appointed a good receiver by nominating Dwight Eisenhower.

By doing this they would probably preserve the two party system, and that maybe in 4 to 8 years, after working out of the receivership, it is possible they might elect a Republican President.

However, I doubt if we have heard of an organization going into receivership in July and then being able to sell stock in their firm within the short period from July to November. In effect when a person buys any particular ticket, that is the same thing as buying stock in the organization For my part, I want to buy no stock in any firm while it is in receivership.

—SYDNEY F. CROFT.

Eisenhower's Albatrosses

PINEHURST

Editors, THE NEWS:

WITH ONE exception there should be complete agreement with your conclusions in the editorial of Aug. 6 — "Ike Lays Down His Opening Barrage." The one exception covers the ninth objective where the General said . . . "We insure, by means which guard our basic rights, that those who serve in government are Americans of loyalty and dedication."

You say that this is "A pledge that subversives will be kept out of government and a direct slap at McCarthyism" and ask "What more could anyone wish?" Many could wish that the General would be more direct in his condemnation of McCarthy. Agreed as to the "pledge" but instead of his statement being a "slap" it sounds more like a light tap on the wrist.

Having been in the General social circle I consult the "best brains" of the country it is rather disconcerting to learn of some of those who are being consulted. Consider two persons who are to be active participants in the campaign, at the General's invitation:

(1) Wayland (Curley) Brooks, former obstructive reactionary Senator from Illinois, who was replaced by a Democrat. His record is known to all well-informed persons.

(2) Worse than Brooks, Senator Dirksen of Illinois is to be one of the General's big guns. Dirksen, the hand-maiden of Col. Bertie McCormick; Dirksen, who conducted a typical "McCarthy" campaign to defeat Scott Lucas in 1950; Dirksen who voted against 80 per cent of all foreign legislation in the 82nd Congress; Dirksen, who, at the Republican Convention publicly insulted Governor Dewey without whose support the General might not have been nominated; Dirksen, who as Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee will work to elect such as McCarthy, Jenner, Kem and Cain. It is not unfair to ask — Why does the General select such men as these? Surely the Republican Party has better material available.

The first mud in this campaign was thrown by the unctuous Dirksen who on August 4 accused Governor Stevenson of being an "associate of Alger Hiss" which he was but not in the way Dirksen implies. Governor Stevenson was "associated" with Hiss at the San Francisco United Nations Conference. Dirksen in using the "guilt by association" canard failed to state that such fine Republicans as John Foster Dulles and the late Senator Vandenberg were also associated with Hiss at the same conference and it is nothing to their discredit. This "association" may well have influenced Mr. Dulles, with others, to have Hiss appointed to the Carnegie Foundation.

Then, as proof of the unclean tactics some Republicans will employ, on August 7 Governor McKeldin of Maryland said that the "Red Charge" must be used against Gov. Stevenson because he "defended" Hiss. (McKeldin nominated General Eisenhower at Chicago and was himself elected in 1950 after a vile campaign in his own state.) Governor Stevenson did not "defend" Hiss; he made a deposition saying that when he knew Hiss, (which was prior to 1948), his reputation was good.

At that time there was not a whisper of suspicion against Hiss. With complete candor the Governor has said that "If he were asked the same questions again, within the same framework, he would have to give the same answers; but that he would have just as little cause to argue with the verdict of the court." This is to say that he does not disagree with the "guilty" verdict against Hiss.

Governor McKeldin and Senator Dirksen, by their own words, classify themselves as Republicans who are inoculated with McCarthyism. More will appear as the campaign progresses because too many Republicans have perfected this type of smear. McCarthy has conducted his infamous attacks practically unchallenged by most of his party, so that McCarthyism has become standard practice with many Republicans. Certainly it is an albatross around the necks of good Republicans. It is to be hoped that the General will denounce Dirksen's and McKeldin's dirt. If he does not many of his admirers will be disappointed and disillusioned.

ELMER M. SIMKINS.

National Party?

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Editors, THE NEWS:

THE Republican Party and the Democratic Party are slowly merging into what may well become in time an American International Party having a platform and political philosophy predominantly designed to bolster and support the losing imperialism and exploitation of weaker nations by the stronger nations.

I wonder how many persons there are who are in favor of an American national party dedicated to the preservation of man's exercise of God-given inalienable rights and our own national fortunes for the common good and welfare of America and the American people.

—LEWIS KANICK.

The GOP Split, Perhaps Temporary, Is Still Deep

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

TO look back to that day in June on which Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower returned from Europe to begin his campaign for the Presidency is to get a curious perspective on the politics of 1952. So much that was expected to happen did not happen. And, as a consequence, the political forces so long dominant in this country are shown once more to have an inherent power little diminished by events of the past year or year and a half.

Neither the Republican party nor any considerable portion of the American people have as yet shown any sign of being swept away by the attraction of a soldier hero. Gen. Douglas MacArthur was rejected. General Eisenhower is as yet far from winning acceptance.

At this midpoint between the conventions and the campaign the question remains just what it was in the weeks of bitter partisanship leading up to the meeting of the Republican that ended a month ago with the nomination of Eisenhower. That is the question of the division—the split personality—of the GOP.

This reporter recently spent a brief time in pleasant places of resort on Long Island and the New England shore. There were to be found many Republicans suffering from the split which Gov. Adlai Stevenson called by the psychiatric term, schizophrenia—meaning a division within the individual so serious as to prevent him from functioning effectively.

A REAL LIVE MAGNATE

One of these sufferers was a doughty individual who can best be labeled by a word seldom heard these days. He is a magnate. So stoutly has he resisted the trend to conformity that he could almost pose for the magnate who was held up to scorn in the cartoons of the Hearst press of another day—the figure in a suit covered with dollar signs, a look of determined truculence on his face. He holds an old-fashioned belief, this surviving magnate, in the power of money and especially of his own money, which is considerable.

On the dining terrace, with candle-lit hurricane lamps gleaming in the garden and the moonlight casting sharp shadows along the carefully clipped hedges, the subject of politics inevitably arose. In his forceful fashion the magnate said that Stevenson was bound to win. It couldn't be otherwise.

This was surprising in itself. But, what was even more surprising, the magnate seemed to draw a kind of satisfaction from this prospect. He uttered his pronouncement with something like glee, a savage kind of glee.

Could Senator Taft have won if the Republicans had nominated him? The question was put timidly, almost tentatively. The magnate snapped at it with the ferocity of a cutthroat trout rising to the fly.

Of course, he could. Certainly. Don't you know enough to know that? He could have won in a walk. And then, almost as though it had been an afterthought—Taft was my man.

It could hardly have been spelled out more clearly, the split that is still so deep one month after the nomination. On Election Day the magnate probably will vote Republican although he has talked about staying home and has even, horror of horrors, been heard to mutter threats of voting for Stevenson. This, mind you, from one whose record is so pure and unblemished that when it was discovered a member of his family had on one occasion voted for Roosevelt, in the first heated reaction lawyers were summoned and wills were taken out of safe deposit boxes.

VANISHING AMERICAN

No one could contend that the magnate is typical of anything but a virtually vanished species. His one vote, if he votes, will count for little. The question is how widely this attitude is held by ordinary mortals. There is some reason to believe it is fairly widespread, reflecting a deep dissatisfaction—a frustration that betokens the inability of a minority party rent by factional quarrels to elect a President.

We shall see in November whether this is true. But one thing, unfortunately, will never be determined by actual test. That is whether Taft could in fact have been elected, contrary to the forecasts of all the polltakers and prognosticators.

The magnate will never be convinced, nor will others who think like him. They will, in the event of Eisenhower's defeat, cherish an increased resentment and a more poignant frustration. They will feel that their turn has come to take over the Republican party, which would then become a party of reaction of midnight blackness.

The curious argument is being made, and undoubtedly will be heard of it as the campaign grows hotter, that, Eisenhower to one side, to vote Republican this year will be a vote to save the party from the extreme right and preserve it as a middle-of-the-road party. To voters who use reason rather than emotion and prejudice, this may have an appeal. But it is not likely to count much with those who for the past 20 years have voted their own special interests, in groups of one kind and another these last add up to a formidable total. They are the mass on whom the Democrats are counting one more time for victory.

Cabbies And Barkeeps, Unlike Their Patrons, Are Gentlemen

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

THE one jump in living costs which has failed to greatly annoy me has been the allowed rise in wine rates, which had remained static for a long time. If one can be allowed an admiration of a class, I am a cab-driver fan.

I also trust them. These daily pieces have been going down to the paper by cab for the last seven years, and I long since quit taking down the license numbers. In all this time I've never had a cab driver accept my money and fail to deliver the stuff.

I have heard a lot about rude cab drivers and surly hackers who fail to thank you for a tip or who are insulting when no tip is offered. I haven't met 'em — many of them, anyhow. It is easy to deal with the occasional one who takes your quarter tip as his due, with no thank you. You just get out on the right side of the cab and leave the door open. This makes it necessary for the driver to get out of the front seat, walk all the way around the cab, walk all the way back and re-enter his hack.

MAKES FOR POLITENESS

This ties up traffic. This causes horns to blow and raises rude remarks from other drivers and a dressing down from the cop if one is handy. It also improves the future politeness of the guilty one.

What I have never been able to understand is how hackers keep their sanity in a big town. Driving in New York is like visiting the dentist for a 12-hour stretch, six days a week. And hearing the same cracks about the weather from a dozen times a day would tie me in a straitjacket in a fortnight.

The only other class I know of that compares favorably in the mass is bartenders, a vastly underpaid group for the last seven years, and I long since quit taking down the license numbers. In all this time I've never had a cab driver accept my money and fail to deliver the stuff.

I have heard a lot about rude cab drivers and surly hackers who fail to thank you for a tip or who are insulting when no tip is offered. I haven't met 'em — many of them, anyhow. It is easy to deal with the occasional one who takes your quarter tip as his due, with no thank you. You just get out on the right side of the cab and leave the door open. This makes it necessary for the driver to get out of the front seat, walk all the way around the cab, walk all the way back and re-enter his hack.

MAKES FOR POLITENESS

This ties up traffic. This causes horns to blow and raises rude remarks from other drivers and a dressing down from the cop if one is handy. It also improves the future politeness of the guilty one.

What I have never been able to understand is how hackers keep their sanity in a big town. Driving him? The question was put timidly, almost tentatively. The magnate snapped at it with the ferocity of a cutthroat trout rising to the fly.

Of course, he could. Certainly. Don't you know enough to know that? He could have won in a walk. And then, almost as though it had been an afterthought—Taft was my man.

It could hardly have been spelled out more clearly, the split that is still so deep one month after the nomination. On Election Day the magnate probably will vote Republican although he has talked about staying home and has even, horror of horrors, been heard to mutter threats of voting for Stevenson. This, mind you, from one whose record is so pure and unblemished that when it was discovered a member of his family had on one occasion voted for Roosevelt, in the first heated reaction lawyers were summoned and wills were taken out of safe deposit boxes.

VANISHING AMERICAN

No one could contend that the magnate is typical of anything but a virtually vanished species. His one vote, if he votes, will count for little. The question is how widely this attitude is held by ordinary mortals. There is some reason to believe it is fairly widespread, reflecting a deep dissatisfaction—a frustration that betokens the inability of a minority party rent by factional quarrels to elect a President.

We shall see in November whether this is true. But one thing, unfortunately, will never be determined by actual test. That is whether Taft could in fact have been elected, contrary to the forecasts of all the polltakers and prognosticators.

The magnate will never be convinced, nor will others who think like him. They will, in the event of Eisenhower's defeat, cherish an increased resentment and a more poignant frustration. They will feel that their turn has come to take over the Republican party, which would then become a party of reaction of midnight blackness.

The curious argument is being made, and undoubtedly will be heard of it as the campaign grows hotter, that, Eisenhower to one side, to vote Republican this year will be a vote to save the party from the extreme right and preserve it as a middle-of-the-road party. To voters who use reason rather than emotion and prejudice, this may have an appeal. But it is not likely to count much with those who for the past 20 years have voted their own special interests, in groups of one kind and another these last add up to a formidable total. They are the mass on whom the Democrats are counting one more time for victory.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Stevenson Used Josephus Daniels' Idea

WASHINGTON

A LOT of people have claimed credit for helping Gov. Adlai Stevenson write a brilliant welcoming speech delivered at the Democratic convention in Chicago last month. The truth is that he wrote it all himself, though he did get one suggestion indirectly from a man now dead—Josephus Daniels, famed Secretary of the Navy under Woodrow Wilson.

When Franklin Roosevelt was President and Daniels was ambassador to Mexico, the latter wrote a letter, Jan. 1, 1936, referring to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, as follows:

"Dear Franklin:

"Here is an expression from Holmes which, if it has missed you, is so good you may find a use for it in one of your fireside talks. Holmes said:

"I find the great thing is not so much where we stand as in what direction we are moving. To reach the port of heaven, we must sail sometimes with the wind and sometimes against it, but we must sail and not drift, nor lie at anchor."

"New Year's greetings to you and Mrs. Roosevelt.

"Faithfully,

"JOSEPHUS DANIELS."

This letter was embodied in Carroll Kilpatrick's recent stimulating book, "Roosevelt and Daniels—A Friendship In Politics"; and Walter Johnson, history professor at the University of Chicago, reading the book, passed this particular quote on to Stevenson.

Thus a speech suggestion made by Josephus Daniels in 1936 to Roosevelt provided part of Governor Stevenson's speech in 1952 which helped to clinch his nomination.

Truman Vs. Stevenson

HAVING got his man the Democratic nomination, President Truman, despite yesterday's luncheon with Adlai Stevenson, finds himself more and more on the outside looking in. While he hasn't said anything about this, the palace guards have done a lot of squawking—privately.

They not only heard the report that Governor Stevenson was reluctant to come to the White House luncheon, but they know for a fact how much friction there was between Truman and Stevenson's right-hand man, Wilson Wyatt. They also know that Stephen A. Mitchell, the Adlai-picked Democratic national chairman, didn't pull many punches about embarrassing the Justice Department when he served on the Chelf investigating committee.

The palace guard have particular reason to remember the battles with Wilson Wyatt, because they were largely responsible for them.

Inside fact is that Wyatt's forced exit from the Truman Administration was about the biggest letdown a top official ever had. When he took over the job of Housing Expediter to build homes for veterans, Truman gave him a letter which instructed Wyatt to use: "The same daring determination and hard-hitting teamwork with which we tackled the emergency job of building the world's most powerful war machine."

Palace Guard Sabotage

BUT, after six months of trying to carry out this instruction, Wyatt found himself blocked at every turn by Truman's own staff. Treasury director, George Allen, held back on loaning him housing money. Harry Vaughan, the President's military aide, used to sit in a corner of the President's office holding his nose and pulling an imaginary chain when Wyatt outlined plans for veterans' housing, while Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder warned Truman that Wyatt would get him into trouble with the real estate people.

Finally, John Steelman, another White House assistant, tried to persuade Wyatt to remain on with drastically limited powers. This Wyatt refused to do and resigned.

Even here the palace guard stepped in. When the customary press release was drafted to announce Wyatt's resignation, it stated that he had asked to be relieved because he had "finished" the veterans' housing job.

"But I haven't finished my job," protested Wyatt, "and I'll stay on if I'm permitted to operate an all-out emergency program."

This did not please the palace guard at all, and for one hour Clark Clifford, then a member of the Truman personal staff, argued with Wyatt over the phrasing of his resignation. Clifford's idea was not to protect homeless veterans but to protect the man who had failed to help them.