THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 20, 1952

MR. JONAS TAGS THE CULPRIT

CHARLES RAPER JONAS put his finger on the real culprit when he told members of the Charlotte Rotary Club that Congress is mainly responsible for big spending and deficit financing.

"It is popular to blame the President for all of this," said the GOP candidate for Congress from the 10th District. "But I think Congress has to share part of the responsibility. The President doesn't have a dime to spend that Congress doesn't appropriate."

That's a point that can't be emphasized too frequently. The President proposes, and Congress disposes, as the saying goes. The President can ask for everything under the sun, but Congress holds the purse strings. And it is the responsibility of Congress to hold expenditures down at least to the level of revenues; otherwise, deficits are bound to occur.

Mr. Jonas made another point that bears repeating.

"We must remember," he said, "that officials in Washington are subjected to pressure by various special interest groups who have vested interest in continued government spending. They are not so much concerned about the welfare of the whole country as they are in what they can get out of the government."

And those special interests, he might have added, are not always the recognized lobby groups. Frequently local Chambers of Commerce, usually critical of Federal spending, join in wholeheartedly when there is a chance to get some new Federal project for their locality.

An economy-minded Administration, be it Democrat or Republican, can hold down budget requests if it chooses. And it frequently is better able to resist pressure from communities and districts than are individual members of Congress. In the final analysis, however, Congress authorizes all spending for the Federal Government. U. S. finances will not be re-established on a sound basis until Congress improves its appropriations machinery and develops a stronger will power.

NOW IT'S THE TALKATHON

TV IS NOT the only new force shaping this year's election. Now comes the Radio Talkathon, a candidate's endurance contest which gives the voters insight into the man's breakfast menu and sleeping habits, as well as his political views.

In 1950 Governor Dewey put in a long stint before the TV cameras just before election day, answering questions phoned in. The fact that he is a human fellow rather than an efficient and well-oiled machine, finally got across to the voters when he and the missus talked about their kids and running the mansion in Albany. This last-minute projection into the living room was generally considered the key factor in his re-election.

This year a group of enterprising radio and advertising men down in Florida have developed the talkathon—so far limited to radio—and furnish candidates a bundle of services. There are advance men, publicity men, floor managers, production directors. Radio Talkathon—they've even copyrighted the title—hires telephone crews, local and long distance. All the candidate has to do is sit before the mike and answer questions until he gives out. And of course foot the bill. Here the technique approaches self-sustenance. At intervals a mellifluous-voiced announcer gives the pitch for funds—small donations of course. "Dollars for Decency" and such. And they roll in, by the thousands.

Judge Frances Cherry, who whomped Gov. Sid McMath two to one in the runoff for the Arkansas Democratic gubernatorial nomination, rose from insignificance to victory via the Talkathon—he put in one 26-hour stint. Last week Leonard Schmitt, opposing Sen. Joe McCarthy for the Wisconsin GOP Republican nomination wound up his first talkathon, which lasted 25 hours. The effect of his use of talkathon (Schmitt, like Cherry, was largely unknown before entering the race) won't be known until the state primary Sept. 9.

The Radio Talkathon, it seems, increases the distressing emphasis on verbosity rather than clarity. We don't believe General Eisenhower, who used to reprimand aides for not putting reports on a single page, or Governor Stevenson, who has the facility for packing a storehouse of ideas and philosophy into a 2,000-word speech, will care for the technique. But—and this will make both of them ponder—it appears to be a vote-getter.

Personally, we'll take a solid 15-minute political speech, then switch to Groucho or Young Doctor Malone if we feel like entertainment or trivia. The fact that a candidate likes his eggs over light is not really important. But when he tells voters in his own voice that he eats ham 'n eggs, likes cowboy movies and reads biography, they are reassured that he is one of them. The candidate and voters are then in tune—and the public says "I'll vote for that man." So get set for a lot of buncombe—before election we'll probably know more irrelevant information about candidates than we have any use for.

A WARNING

NEITHER the police accident report nor news stories on the tragic death of 16-year-old Bobbie Bickett indicated whether or not his bicycle was equipped with headlight and rear reflector, as municipal law requires. And it is entirely possible that even those protective devices would not have been enough in the combination rain and haze early Tuesday morning.

But the accident should be a grim reminder to all parents that the mere act of peddling a bicycle on city streets in non-daylight hours is exceedingly dangerous. Even when bicycles are properly equipped with headlight and rear reflector, they do not stand out boldly in the glare of an automobile's lights. When they are not so equipped, it is an invitation to disaster to ride during the hours of darkness. Yet many motorbike owners apparently ignore the law. THE NEWS gets many reports from motorists who have narrowly averted running down bicycle riders.

The provision of lights and reflectors and the exercise of unusual caution is a small matter, but it may mean the difference between life and death.

BIRDS WE LOVE, BUT . . .

AN ANONYMOUS editorial writer for the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, who got all worried over the fact that an oriole in Ohio hanged herself as she tried to weave a horsehair into her nest, immediately started pondering all the dreadful things that happen to birds.

"Imagine this world if suddenly the birds were gone," he wrote with unblushing effusion. "No wren singing the merriest of all songs. No lordly cardinal whistling. No thrasher flinging the leaves in a tempest of search. No robin stretching a worm. . . . The death of the oriole makes us think of all birds, and how much we owe them, their song and their color, and how lonely we would be without them."

Well, at the outset let us put ourselves foursquarely on the side of birds, too. They eat bugs. They'll clean up your table scraps, especially scrambled eggs or mashed potatoes or steamed rice (without gravy, please). Some of them are irresistibly cheerful. Even if you've made up your mind to be mad at your kids, they break down your willpower.

But not all birds—not that Papa Jay who perches on the telephone wire right outside the upstairs bedroom window every morning at the crack of dawn and rails and screeches until somebody puts some bread crumbs or seed in the bird automat down below. And not only is he loud and strident, but he must be a creature of low morals. All Summer long he's feeding youngsters, who jabber as irritatingly as he does. Surely, his legal family could not be that large.

Or the cardinal who first visited the surroundings three years ago, and since then has either let others in on the secret or raised youngsters with unconscionable frequency. Now there are cardinals by the dozen, and they like the same telephone wire. So when Papa Jay is not around, Papa Cardinal is cracking sunflower seeds with his tough beak. They pop like so many little firecrackers.

Yes, birds we love . . . but not at 5 or 5:30 A. M. in that last hour or two before the alarm clock goes off. If they weren't such brazen little gluttons, preferring a free handout to scratching for bugs, they'd be considerate enough at least to let their provider finish his night's sleep.

From The New York Herald-Tribune

HOW TO STOP THE KLUXERS

NORTH CAROLINA has shown how to deal with the Ku Klux Klan. It simply refused to tolerate the night-riding terrorists who appointed themselves as community custodians of morals. This gang of cowards had spread a wave of fear through Columbus County, in the southeastern part of the state, by floggings, cross-burnings and general violence. North Carolina cracked down. Wholesale arrests were made, indictments followed swiftly, and stern punishment was assessed in a series of trials. There was one Federal case, an interstate affair involving South Carolina, but otherwise the sovereign state of North Carolina handled matters by itself.

In the case just concluded in Columbus Superior Court, there were 63 defendants, including Imperial Wizard Thomas L. Hamilton. A dozen floggings were involved; both whites and Negroes had suffered. The prosecution was so effective that the chief Kluxer pleaded guilty. Punishment was thorough. Prison terms and fines were assessed all along the line. Judge Clawson L. Williams sentenced Hamilton to four years in prison, saying: "The day has not come in North Carolina when a man has to barricade himself in his home with the setting sun." That was well spoken and it is a safe prediction that at least one part of the country need have no further concern about the Klan variety of outrages against law and order. If other states should happen to be plagued, let them look to North Carolina for a model of extermination.

Top Officials See No Way To End Stalemate In Korea

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

TO ALL who have access to top intelligence reports, the prolonged and painful effort to reach a truce in Korea now seems entirely hopeless. If it were not for the propaganda use which the Communists would make of it, the talks would be abruptly abandoned.

There is every likelihood therefore that the mean, nagging, sometimes almost forgotten war of stalemate will continue through the political campaign about to begin. How much it will figure in that campaign is at the moment anyone's guess. If the Taft wing of the Republican Party had triumphed in Chicago instead of the Eisenhower - Dewey wing, "Truman's war" would have been roundly denounced at least a dozen times a day.

What to do about that war is also at the moment anyone's guess. A build-up of air power in Japan and Korea is reported with the intention of making North Korea untenable for an effective military force. But almost no one will contend that this can end the stalemate, close out the conflict and thereby make it possible to reduce the United Nations army in South Korea.

A-WEAPONS READY

As was first reported in this space, new atomic weapons will be used if the Communists should launch a large-scale attack. With every day that passes, the capacity to use those weapons expands and improves. General James Van Fleet, in command of the U. N. army in Korea, is confident an attack can be repelled with comparatively small U. N. losses.

No signs are evident, however, that such an attack is in the making. The Communists seem also to have accepted the inevitability of stalemate. North Korean leaders are for the first time talking about permanently dividing the country into separate nations of North and South. At the same time, 77-year-old President Syngman Rhee, newly re-elected, goes on talking as he has done from the first about conquering North Korea, driving out the Communists and forming one government which would be his.

In the division of responsibility between military and civilian authority here in Washington, a disturbing fact has been apparent. Military men have in public increasingly discussed high policy by way of explanation for what was being done or about to be done. They have done so, it seems fairly clear, because civilian authority had either defaulted or was so impaired for one reason or another that the civilian voice would not carry weight with the public.

That will not happen during the campaign. Someone on the civilian side must now explain what is to take place in Korea, and someone outside the Department of Defense.

General Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs and the three chiefs have refused all speaking engagements. The only exceptions are at war memorials where dedicatory remarks are limited to the theme of heroism and patriotism. They did not speak at the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention in Los Angeles and they will not address the American Legion convention in New York next week.

At one of his rare press conferences recently, Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett instructed reporters on how to say no in two syllables. You simply drag it out with emphasis, said Lovett. The explanation was forthcoming when he was asked if he were going to take part in the political campaign.

OUT OF POLITICS

President Truman, as Lovett pointed out, has several times directed that no one in the Defense Department should take any part in politics. Thus does the burned child shun the fire. Truman made Louis Johnson Secretary of Defense after Johnson had raised badly needed money for the Democrats' '48 campaign. And the political repercussions of that appointment were most unhappy.

Lovett, who is either an independent or a crypto-Republican, has stayed strictly non-political. Out of a vast store of knowledge and experience — he was an Assistant Secretary for Air in charge of the huge plane procurement program in World War II — he has tried to administer the department on a strictly objective basis.

He is planning to leave on or before that date in January when a new President takes office. But the new President will find it very hard to replace Lovett and his twelve years of almost continuous effort for America's security in a world in convulsion. It is that all-important continuity which will lead the new President, if he is wise, to try to persuade Lovett to stay on at least for a time. Neither war nor threats of war can be conveniently broken off and picked up again in accord with our quadrennial system of elections.

Parties Have Similar Rules In Event A Candidate Dies

By JAMES MARLOW

WASHINGTON

A GRIM thought but practical: What happens if one of the presidential or vice presidential candidates dies before election day next November?

No presidential candidate of either major party has died before election. One vice presidential candidate died just before election. And another declined the nomination and had to be replaced.

The two parties' plans for such an event are similar but not identical.

While the delegates to the Democratic National Convention every four years name the party's two candidates just before closing they take out insurance by voting to continue a rule adopted long ago.

The rule says that if either of the candidates dies before election day the Democratic National Committee will pick some one in his place. The committee—106 men and women from the states and territories—runs the party between conventions.

The Republican convention delegates, after making their presidential and vice presidential choices every four years, vote to have a replacement made this way if death overtakes one of their candidates:

1. Their Republican National Committee can do it. It has 138 men and women members from the states and territories.

2. Or this committee can call another National Convention, if it wants to and if there is time to do so before election day.

Suppose anything happened now to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower or Sen. Richard M. Nixon. Would the committee call for another convention? It seems doubtful. The time between now and election day is too short for all the arrangements necessary before a convention can even start. So the committee would make the replacement.

But the committee members, most or all of them, would probably want instructions from their states or territories on how to vote. This might cause a bit of a mess.

Neither party has made provision for instruction of committee members by their state organizations. They'd have to work this out by themselves.

In 1912 James Sherman, Vice-Presidential candidate on the Republican ticket headed by President Taft, died on the Saturday before election day. The Republicans had no time to replace him. It didn't matter much. They lost.

In 1860 the Democratic Party split in two: one faction called itself the Independent Democrats, the other the Democrats. The former nominated Stephen A. Douglas for President and Benjamin Fitzpatrick for Vice-President.

Fitzpatrick declined the nomination. The Independents' national committee then named Herschel V. Johnson as Vice-Presidential candidate. That was the year the other half of the party, calling itself just the Democrats, picked J. C. Breckenbridge for President and Joseph Lane for Vice-President.

It was also the year when the Republicans won with Abraham Lincoln.

'That Was When I Was Just A Little Kid'

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

(While Drew Pearson is on a brief vacation, the Washington Merry-Go-Round is being written by several distinguished guest columnists, today's being Sen. Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois.)

By SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS

WASHINGTON

THE 1952 Democratic and Republican national conventions are now a page in history. But for the first time more than 60,000,000 Americans have become intimately acquainted with such a page. Shamefully enough, this page is not too clean.

The candidates for the highest office of the land emerged from two gigantic jamborees. Those jamborees served as a false front for the back-room deals of a small group of political leaders.

Luckily, the 1952 conventions came forward with two fine candidates. However, several times in the past half-century Democratic and Republican bosses have blatantly disregarded the will of their party's rank and file. In one case, that of Warren G. Harding, a boss-selected candidate succeeded in becoming President. Everyone knows the result—the Teapot Dome Scandal of 1923.

None Could Feel Cheated

ALTHOUGH the two 1952 conventions came up with good candidates there are still many people who, rightly or wrongly, feel that they have been cheated out of a chance to vote for their first choice in November. Our democracy is today marred by the paradox of 60,000,000 "voteless" citizens in our nonprimary states. If all the people had the opportunity to vote in Presidential primaries no one could ever rightly feel that he had been cheated out of a chance to vote for his man in November. Primaries enable the people to speak in clear and unmistakable terms as to whose name they want to see underneath their party's emblem.

Television has shown Americans everywhere that to make democracy live the present system of nominating Presidential candidates must be reformed. But how? The ideal method is one of adopting a constitutional amendment which would permit Congress to set up a national primary. Such an amendment has been proposed by Sen. George A. Smathers (D-Fla). The Smathers proposal for a national primary is similar to the one suggested by Woodrow Wilson in 1912. I am a co-sponsor of the Smathers national-primary amendment and intend to do my utmost either to insure its passage, or a substantially similar amendment at the next session of Congress.

However, there are those who have a vested interest in the status quo and they may do everything in their power to block the Smathers amendment, or one like it. Should this prove to be the case, those of us who are backing the amendment may have to compromise with this group. I think we might then settle for the Presidential-preference primary bill which Rep. Charles E. Bennett (D-Fla.) and I introduced in the last session of Congress.

States Encouraged Financially

OUR primary bill seeks to increase the number of primaries now held. Its passage would be an important step forward in our march toward a national Presidential primary. It directs the Attorney General to negotiate agreements with the states for the holding of preference primaries before July 1 of a Presidential election year. The states are encouraged to enter into such agreements with the Attorney General since, if they do, they will receive financial assistance for the use of their election facilities and services.

These agreements would provide for a payment which is limited to not more than 20 cents for each vote cast in a Presidential-preference primary. The Attorney General would be given the responsibility for carrying the bill's provisions into effect. In co-operation with the states, he could make such determinations as qualifying deadlines, primary dates, terms of agreements with the states, how binding the primaries are to be upon the delegates, etc.

Even though the preference primaries conducted under the sponsorship of the Attorney General would not legally bind the national convention delegates to vote on all ballots for their state's Presidential preference, they would serve as a strong persuasive influence on the delegates.

After watching the national conventions on television the people are, I believe, determined to get their rightful say in the selection, as well as the election, of the President of the United States. The people are increasingly refusing to be shunted aside in the nominating process. The grass-roots feeling for a national primary is tremendous. Let the voice of the people be heard!

New Plan To Select Nominees Is Needed

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.

Dean For Governor?

LINCOLNTON

Editors, THE NEWS:

FOR several days now I have simply been flooded with messages from dog lovers all over the good old North State urging me to run for Governor in 1956.

I must admit that at first, when these messages began reaching me, I was flabbergasted, to say the least. For instance, five wealthy ladies have offered to support me for Governor come 1956, plus a large number of other ladies and gentlemen, as well.

Therefore, I wish to take this opportunity to thank each one of those very fine people through the People's Platform for their wonderful faith and confidence in me.

All of this has come as such a great surprise that I honestly haven't reached a decision as yet. At the time I wrote a short note to the Platform concerning Mrs. Della Armstrong's cute, smart and very intelligent dog, I never dreamed this would happen to me. But, since it has happened, I want everyone to know that I am very humble and deeply grateful.

I shall let you good folks have my decision as to whether or not I will be a candidate for Governor on the Democratic ticket in 1956 within the next 30 days.

J. R. DEAN

Enough Of Trivia

PITTSBORO

IN your issue of Aug. 13 under the People's Platform, I find such captions as these, GOP Receivership and Eisenhower's Albatrosses. Are not these mere trivia (crossroads' matters, to use the Latin?

I am not concerned about the receivership of any party. Parties have come and gone even in this country. The Federalists and Whig parties, once strong and great, have disappeared, to say nothing of minor ones. What concerns me is the probable receivership of the government of these United States, or the most likely alternative, dictatorship and the loss of all freedom.

Let's look at the situation as it actually is. Within two decades we have come from a national debt of $17 billion to one of $266 billion, from a national budget of $4 billion to $85 billion, from a Federal payroll of less than 600,000 to one of 2,500,000, from an army of less than 200,000 to 3,500,000, to mention only the major expansions. And, frankly, no one knows the potential indebtedness of the Federal Government, as hundreds of agencies are using the national credit, whose commitments Uncle Sam will have to make good in the end. Think of what just one agency may experience, that of Federal Housing, in the way of losses.

The foregoing is the Federal Government's situation. Let's now look at the picture as to the individual. The July 31 report shows that the installment payment plan indebtedness was approximately $14 billion, half for automobiles, the highest of all time; the individual indebtedness at an all-time high, both in volume and per capita; and further that the farm debt was also at an all-time high, resulting from the change to mechanized farming mostly. And the most distressing of all, the American dollar is at an all-time low, the lowest since the continentals, a state paper currency.

Now, we are not going to have fair weather all the time. The current apparently prosperous conditions are deceptive, like the mermaids possessing the head, face and breast of a prize-winning beauty, but at the same time possessing the tail of a fish. We rode out of the depression in the early '30's on the national credit. Can we do it again? Where is the reserved credit with which to do it?

I do not intend to be in any sense partisan in what I am saying. I am only reciting the record. But I think what Mr. Stevenson's family paper says about the record of the current administration in Washington should be, at least, persuasive. It says that the Truman administration is the all-time low in waste, inefficiency and corruption. Of course, he wants to get away from such a record, I do not think he can, or, if he could, that he should be permitted to do so. He can't, in fairness, accept the good and disavow the bad.

In the language of the old Romans, Spatium sumamus ad cogitandum (Let's take time to think). This current political trivia gets us nowhere.

—JOHN W. HESTER

Bird-Friend Hits Veto

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

Editors, THE NEWS:

GOVERNOR STEVENSON'S veto of the bill to restrict cat vagrancy in order to conserve song-insectivorous birds would not be brought up by me, if it were not that items on the subject are appearing in the press.

After the bill was passed by both Houses of the Illinois Legislature a reporter said to me, "The Governor has a pet cat, watch out for a veto." I replied, "It would be impossible for a Governor to veto such a bill for such a reason." A California legislator who has a cat, said to me in all seriousness, "If you can prove to me that your bill would benefit millions of people, I would be willing to sacrifice the interest of my cat." Of course, cats like to run at large and kill and eat birds, but what does it mean to the public?

The veto said: "I cannot believe there is a widespread public demand for this law." The fact that the Illinois legislators passed the bill showed that there was a large demand.

The veto objected to the use of cat traps, but all humane societies use cat traps. The bill specifically provided that any traps used must be of the humane kind. Many vagrant cats would be impossible to catch except with traps.

The climax of the veto was that "The problem of cat versus bird is as old as time." But the same may be said of war, crime, and other evils. That is no reason for doing nothing or making it a laughing matter.

GERTRUDE CHARNY
President, FRIENDS OF THE BIRDS, Inc.