THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

80th Anniversary Year

THOMAS I. ROBINSON ..... Publisher
J. E. DOWD ..... General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH ..... Executive Editor
WILLIAM M. REDDIO ..... Editor

SATURDAY, MARCH 6, 1948

Second Call For Eisenhower

CHARLOTTE'S vote for Eisenhower and Wallace, running 1 and 2, respectively in THE NEWS Presidential poll, registers a vigorous protest against the two old political parties—and a loud call for TKE—that should command more than local attention. Between them, the General who is not in politics and the maverick who is running as a Third Party candidate compiled 1,149 votes, close to half of the total of 2,588 ballots for the twelve men in the field.

Results of this poll move The Asheville Citizen to call Charlotte the "Disgrunted Queen" in an editorial commenting on the showing of these "two improbable and surprising candidates". Eisenhower and Wallace, which was discussed earlier in these columns. Says the *Citizen:*

THE NEWS thinks it sees in this paramoutncy of no-party and third party personalities something of a "Charlotte protest vote." That may be, though the Queen is proverbially placid and unprovoking off-year and on-year now that Sunday movies and other ponderables have been riveted down. To THE NEWS it appears editorially that in the "confusion over the issues and candidates . . . Wallace serves as a convenient outlet for . . . dissatisfaction."

Granting that such polls can be rigged by the multiple votes of constant reader, nevertheless Charlotte's Presidential temper is remarkable. We respectfully call this back-sliding of all good Mecklenburghers to the attention of Dave Clark and The Southern Textile Bulletin, prescribed a foreslime and longtime with the heresies of Chapel Hill. The situation at home is getting positively out of hand.

• • •

THE final count simply makes the point more emphatic that the revolt spirit reflected in this poll goes deeper than Southern anger at President Truman over his civil rights stand. The fact that the popular General Ike outran Wallace by more than 225 votes on the last day of the balloting does not make this any less of a protest against the established politicians. In both cases, the voters are saying they want a new man and one who stands outside the regular party machines.

Interestingly enough, this endorsement of Eisenhower in a Democratic stronghold comes at a time when many Democratic leaders are casting about for a replacement for Truman, when some of them are calling for Eisenhower as the party's nominee and when the General is being showered with protests against his decision to stay out of the Presidential contest.

• • •

ALTHOUGH Eisenhower was talked as a GOP candidate, a good many experts have contended that he fits better into the post-Roosevelt Democratic Party picture than the post-Hoover Republican Party. They point out that he was given command in European theater by a Democratic President and that he was made Chief of Staff by a Democratic President; that he is essentially the product of a Democratic administration; and that his own personal beliefs on domestic and foreign issues are closer to the Roosevelt philosophy than that of Taft or Dewey.

Of course, Eisenhower apparently removed himself from Presidential consideration with his famed statement of some weeks ago in which he voiced opposition to the principle of electing military men to high public office. But there was one loophole in that statement. Eisenhower said he was disqualifying himself in the "absence of an obvious and overriding reason" to enter politics. A popular draft from the Democratic National Convention might be, in Ike's opinion, an "overriding reason."

With Eisenhower as a candidate, the Democratic Party could be reasonably sure of having the Presidency another four years. It would end the Southern revolt and get most of the protest vote. Indeed, this development might cause Wallace to quit the race, if not to return to the party fold. Beyond that, a tremendous groundswell for Eisenhower could very easily carry the Democrats into full control of the Senate and might even let them recapture control of the House.

Perhaps all this is a pipedream but it is an interesting possibility which the Democratic convention may attempt to make reality by drafting Eisenhower if Harry Truman keeps putting his foot in his mouth.

Good News From Brussels

AN IMPORTANT statement of American policy is given by Undersecretary of State Lovett when he declares that the United States wants any European Union to be strictly European. He makes it clear that the American Government will not take part in the Brussels meeting of the five nations—Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg—which currently is drafting a long-range mutual defense agreement.

At the Brussels meeting, the basis is being laid for the Western European Union to stem Communist aggression which originally was proposed by Foreign Secretary Bevin of Britain. It will be broadened to include other nations besides the five now meeting in Belgium, when they are able and willing to join. It will establish stronger military, economic and political ties among the countries that are rallying in the democratic camp.

Communists will, of course, assail this union as a front for American imperialism but the manner in which this organization is being formed constitutes impressive evidence that the United States is not embarked on a course of aggrandizement and is employing defensive, not offensive, measures. It is true that this country is encouraging the European Union and that it has close ties with all the nations that may enter it. However, by remaining outside the union, it assures the Europeans of a measure of independence which preserves their national integrity and their democratic rights. At the same time, it does not commit this nation to further involvement in purely European affairs.

This union can be created without violating the spirit or the letter of the United Nations Charter. In fact, the Charter makes express provision for the formation of just such regional security systems. A precedent was set last year in the case of the Western Hemispheric Security Zone. Such pacts simply buttress the United Nations, giving force to the principle of collective security on which UN is based.

True Heroism At Belmont

A SUGGESTION that is decidedly in order comes to THE NEWS from C. P. Deal Sr. of 2101 Crescent Ave., Charlotte, who writes that eighteen-year-old Clarence Perkins of Belmont "deserves a Carnegie Medal if any one ever did and I for one would like to see him get one."

It was the quick thinking and daring action of young Clarence that saved the life of a three-year-old girl, Brenda Sue Strickland, who fell feet first to the bottom of a 60-foot well at the home of her aunt in the Sterling Mill community. Two unsuccessful efforts to rescue the child were made by older men before Perkins volunteered for the task. John Lawing, 36, and David Ashe, 70, were lowered into the shaft, which is only two and one-half feet in diameter. They were unable to lift Brenda in that cramped space.

At his own suggestion, Clarence Perkins was let down the well head first, with a rope tied around his ankles, which was held by a group that included several policemen. He finally reached the outstretched hands of the frightened, crying child and they were drawn slowly back to sunlight and safety. Once outside, pretty Brenda Sue was found to have escaped with minor bruises and a cut on her right thigh. She, her family and friends are now looking forward happily to celebration of her fourth birthday anniversary May 19.

As C. P. Deal Sr. writes in his letter to THE NEWS, this was an act "of heroism in the most complete degree.

"Being a master mechanic myself," Mr. Deal adds, "it has been my lot to overcome difficulties quite often but nothing like that."

The Belmont story, which appeared in THE NEWS Thursday, is a notable demonstration that courage and the spirit of self-sacrifice are strong qualities of the American community. In this emergency there were three conspicuous heroes, not just one, responding to the call of distress on a moment's notice. Accounts of the rescue make it clear that there would have been other volunteers if they had been needed.

From The St. Louis Star-Times

Good Old Vivien

THINGS haven't seemed quite normal for a long time now, but we haven't been quite able to put our finger on what was wrong. Now we know. What the national scene was missing was the hyperthyroidic babbling of Vivien Kellems.

Back in 1943, disliking the way the war and the Government were being run, she announced she wouldn't make the final payment on her 1943 income tax. Urged everyone else to join her in this tense sit-down strike against the Government, too. Then in 1944 she frothed over "leaks" from her personal correspondence with Count Von Zedlitz, representative for German-Nazi steel interests in Argentina. But since, she has been unnaturally quiet.

Now she has broken loose again, still in the old rut. Addressing the Los Angeles Rotary Club, she warmed up with a mild suggestion that the whole income tax be abolished, just like that. Then she proclaimed to the world at large that she was going to stop withholding Federal income taxes from her employees' wages. Let the Treasury pay her a salary for her work, by George, or she wasn't having any of it. Good old Vivien—one against 145,000,000, and all the rest blithering idiots save only she.

There's always something about the sight of the embattled on the barricade. Usually it's something inspiring. In Miss Kellem's singular case, because her sword is so silly, her barricade so flimsy, it's just something hollowly funny. But at least it's something. And it's so good to have things back to normal again.

'Isn't Inflation Terrible?'

People's Platform

Proof Of Washington's Faith

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

HAVING recently read the letter of Mr. A. M. Gaunt in which he describes the great Father of our Republic, George Washington, as a "Deist", and while not undertaking to engaged in an argument with Mr. Gaunt relative to the theological views held by this great man, it seems to me that the best evidence of his views on the Christian religion would be his own words, and I therefore offer the following "Prayer for the Nation" which was written by General Washington at Newburg, June 8, 1783, and sent to the governors of all the states:

"Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in thy holy protection, that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government, and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at Large.

And finally that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy nation.

Grant our supplications, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

This beautiful prayer was printed and distributed to the members of the armed services during the late war by the Government through the office of the Chief of Chaplains of the Army and Navy, and is to be found in a little book entitled, "Song and Service Book for Ship and Field". The undisputed evidence is that General Washington was a vestryman of Pohick Church near Mount Vernon and that he attended divine services there and at Alexandria, in New York, in Williamsburg and other places. He couldn't be a confirmed member of the Episcopal Church because there was no Bishop in this country at that time to administer the rite. Certainly, however, judging from the words of this prayer which he composed, he was a believer in the "Divine Author of our Blessed Religion".

—FRANCIS O. CLARKSON.

Cross-Wise In The Craw

CHARLOTTE

TO my Burkholder cousin in Shelby, I would like to answer his letter in THE NEWS of Feb. 20 under "A Shelby Burkholder Replies".

First Mr. B., you seem to think that my articles are sour grapes, repeating the same things over for the purpose of power, personal ambition, free advertising, and that some things I say get crosswise in your craw. First Mr. B., you got your own article so screwed up that it is hard for me to figure out are you a Burkholder, a New Dealer or both. You use the clever New Deal-Communist system of suppressing the press, indirectly classing me with Hitler and accusing me of telling a big lie over and over to get people to believe it.

If what I have been saying makes you think you got something crosswise in your craw, chances are you have a serious case of New Deal stagnation, and as long as your craw is in such a terrible uproar your mind certainly will not conceive what the New Deal has actually done to you. You said that I implied that I would repeal the old age pension law, stop the mail because one postmaster stole some postal funds. No, Mr. B., I would not repeal the old age pension law, but I certainly would repeal the gang responsible for mis-administering the law. I would not stop the mail, I would not jam the Supreme Court, I would not destroy or hamper any branch or part of our Federal Government as it was established and founded on the written, tried and proved Constitution of these United States of America.

Now Brother Burkholder and all our readers, I would repeal, eliminate, and eradicate every subversive New Dealer from every branch and channel of our Federal Government along with all Communist elements hovering under the wing of the New Deal, regardless of party, rank or position. Until this is done, our laws, regardless of how good, will be used to strengthen the racketeers and clothe them with power and more power over our people; to regulate, control and order them around in confusion while they satisfy their gullible appetite for money, power and more money.

By this very article I am writing, you accuse me of being another Hitler; but glance back at the record of the last fifteen years. They repeated and repeated the same things over and over again and again. For fifteen years we had promises of prosperity, peace and security from the cradle to the grave; regulations, subsidies, controls, bureaus, emergencies, corruption, blunders and public debts were piled up over and over again until it has stacked up to a whirlwind confusion of world racketeering to such an extent that no one knows what is going on or what will happen next.

There is no use in repealing anything till we repeal the crowd that refuses to live by the laws of our land, who disrespect the Constitution and violate the very oath of office.

You also add, I should be a good sport and let Mr. Roosevelt rest in peace. In my articles I try not to mention Roosevelt, but when some one brings up Coolidge's, Harding's and Hoover's last administrations, then we might as well include Roosevelt in the Chorus. If you want Roosevelt to rest in peace, they should not use him on the screen to lure more dimes from our good hearted people to fatten what I think is one of the most hypocritical rackets in the U. S. Remember all the files get caught on the attractive side of the paper.

—P. C. BURKHOLDER.

P.S.: There does not seem to be a Burkholder in Shelby, so the next time anyone chooses to hitch a Burkholder name to an article, you better choose a larger city for an address, where tracing is more difficult.

Where Does He Get Off?

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

REFERENCE to V. G. Beckham's evident "Crusade Against Life", published in the People's Platform March 4:

He sounds exactly like a fellow that started out to drink everybody under the table and ended up by "crying in his beer".

And where does he get off with that crack that "we must remember that we will not have a Russian army to do our fighting for us next time". I guess our 5,000,000 casualties were just taking a sight-seeing tour of the world.

Only one of the current remarks suit this Beckham to a tee. "Drop Dead."

—JACK B. HOWELL.

Joseph & Stewart Alsop

Stassen's Strategy

WASHINGTON

THE habit has grown up of lightly discounting ex-Governor Harold Stassen as a youthful political amateur whom the Republican professionals will eat for breakfast at Philadelphia. Among the professionals, however, a quite different theory has gained ground rapidly in the past month. The new theory pictures Stassen as himself one of the toughest professionals in the business, and a bolder gambler than any of his rivals in the bargain.

Unlike most pre-convention theories about candidates, this one actually seems to be supported by the facts. Stassen has kept his name before the public. He has kept his candidacy building steadily despite handicaps. And he has now maneuvered himself into a remarkable and little understood position. For he may be able to deal a heavy blow to one or both of the front-runners, Governor Thomas E. Dewey and Senator Robert A. Taft, and even if he cannot then make the grade himself, he will have an excellent chance for the Vice-Presidency on a ticket headed by any Republican but Taft or Dewey.

PRIMARY TESTS

The New Hampshire primary in which both Stassen and Dewey are bidding for New Hampshire's eight delegates, will give some notion whether Stassen carries enough weight with his party to make his strategy stick. But more important tests will be the Ohio primary on May 4, in which he is pitted against Senator Taft in the latter's own bailiwick, and the Oregon primary on May 21, in which Stassen will again challenge Dewey.

The Ohio situation has already been well publicized. Stassen is gunning for ten to twelve delegates from Ohio's fifty-three. He has entered twenty-three candidates in the race, concentrating them in the industrial districts where Taft is believed most vulnerable. He has Stassen men running in such big towns as Youngstown, Dayton, Springfield, Toledo, Akron and Canton. He has also entered one delegate-at-large, the popular former Chief Justice Carrington T. Marshall, whose name is expected to help the Stassen slate.

Taft spokesmen claim that Stassen is butting his head against a stone wall in Ohio, that the Republican organization is absolutely solid for Taft and that Stassen will be lucky to capture a single delegate. Stassenites assert with equal vehemence that there are serious rifts in the Ohio Republican organization just below the top level, and that there is mounting enthusiasm for Stassen among the rank and file. At any rate, the Ohio Stassen group headed by his henchman, Earl Hart, is hard at work and Stassen himself will descend on Ohio on March 19 for a series of speeches in the most hotly contested districts.

THREAT TO TAFT

If the Stassen showing in Ohio is poor—two or three delegates—his gamble will have failed. But if he succeeds in capturing ten or twelve delegates from Taft, he will have dealt the Ohio leader a blow from which it is difficult to see how Taft can recover. Moreover, a Stassen success in Ohio will increase the chances for a Stassen success in later primaries, and particularly against Dewey in the crucial Oregon primary.

Thus is is the Stassen strategy to maim, or at least seriously to wound, both the leading contenders, at the same time inheriting the strength they lose. Obviously this strategy has not endeared him to either Dewey or Taft. It is hardly to be expected that after such treatment either man will throw his support to Stassen in the event of a deadlock. Indeed, Taft supporters are already circulating the report, no doubt somewhat colored by wishful thinking, that negotiations are under way to prevent the mutual disaster of a deadlock. It is hinted that the search is for some formula for assuring that if a deadlock threatens one or the other of the two men will bow out.

Whether or not there is any substance in this report, Stassen's strategy obviously amounts to a bold, all-or-nothing gamble. The gamble may fail—indeed, the odds are against its success. But if it succeeds, Stassen will have at least an outside chance for the grand Presidential prize. And failing that, he still have an excellent chance for the consolation prize, the Vice-Presidential nomination. For the betting is now heavily on Senator Arthur Vandenberg if the long-heralded Taft-Dewey deadlock does develop. There is reason to believe that if Vandenberg were nominated, Stassen might gladly accept the half-a-loaf of second place on the Vandenberg ticket.

Marquis Childs

Vandenberg Vs. Ball

WASHINGTON

TWO MEN in the Senate of the United States offer a remarkable study in contrast. They stand out against the harsh glare of swiftly moving history like the figures in a medieval morality play.

One, it is hardly necessary to say, is Sen. Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan. The tribute that the Senate paid him, when he finished his speech opening the debate on the European Recovery Program, was the kind of tribute that comes rarely in any man's career in Congress. It was a recognition, disregarding for the moment political and ideological differences, of a great achievement.

The other man is Sen. Joseph H. Ball of Minnesota, who seems to have made himself the leader of the opposition to ERP. It is not open and avowed opposition. That would not succeed because public opinion has come around so completely to acceptance of the need to try to restore Western Europe.

It is there complicated than that. Sen. Ball says cut the program from $4,300,000,000 to—no, let's say three and a half billions or maybe four billions. He says this in spite of the careful studies that have been made—by the Harriman Committee, for example. He says this despite Secretary of State George C. Marshall's warning that such a cut would reduce the whole business to a mere breadline, barring any hope of rehabilitation and recovery.

ONE MATURE, ONE NOT

In the morality plays of the Middle Ages, the leading characters were always labeled. They were Virtue, Vice, Malice, Envy, Lust. Our time is too complex, too complicated for such simple labels. If you had to apply tags to two such contrasting personalities and performances as those of Vandenberg and Ball, Maturity and Immaturity might fit as well as anything else. That, it seems to me, is the real meaning of Vandenberg's achievement—maturity.

It does not seem very long ago that the Senator from Michigan was a carefree party-goer in partyconsciousness. His ideological coloration was that of his region—isolationism with a mixture of indifference. No one doubted his ability. But he coasted along pleasantly and he rarely had to extend himself.

World War II brought to him an understanding of what the weapons of modern destruction meant. It brought maturity and a crushing sense of personal responsibility. Once, at Lake Success, during an interval in a United Nations session, he said to me:

"I never dreamed I would come to accept the weight of responsibility that I feel today. And if I had thought it would be something like this, I'm afraid I might have turned my back on it."

But the point is he didn't turn his back.

BROKE PARTY LINES

In 1944, Sen. Ball bolted the Republican Party and came out for President Roosevelt's election to a fourth term. He said he was doing this on the issue of foreign policy and the very continuance of the war. By taking this step he greatly embarrassed Harold Stassen, who first appointed him to the Senate, and he has obviously tried to be to erase any thought that he ever favored Roosevelt or the policies of Roosevelt. After all, he does have the problem of getting re-elected in November on the Republican ticket.

But this gives to his course a curious zigzag effect. When he was a working newspaper man at the time of his predecessor in the American Newspaper Guild, Ball was one of the red-hots who wanted to demand that employers negotiate every conceivable circumstance and condition. Yet when the Taft-Hartley law was being debated he took such an extreme position that Stassen could not go along with him.

Perhaps the zig and the zag in Ball's career can be put down to the process of growing up. He is twenty years younger than Sen. Vandenberg.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Sen. Brewster And Pan American Airways

WASHINGTON

(Editor's Note: Drew Pearson's column today takes the form of a memo to Senator Ferguson of Michigan, chief Senate investigator.)

MEMO to Senator Ferguson of Michigan:

You will recall that last Summer serious charges were made against your Republican colleague, Senator Owen Brewster of Maine, by the West Coast airplane builder, Howard Hughes. Senator Brewster was accused of being a lobbyist for Pan American Airways and of using his high office for the commercial advantage of one airplane company.

Although these charges were publicly made and although Senator Brewster himself asked that he be welcomed an investigation, nothing has happened since, I understand that Senator Brewster since has informed the Justice Department that he did not wish to be investigated. However, in view of your own record for conducting impartial probes, and in view of the fact that you are courageously going after your Democratic colleague, Senator Thomas of Oklahoma, I feel sure that you will also wish to explore thoroughly the serious charges against a Republican.

Accordingly, I tender herewith certain evidence and the names of witnesses which I believe important in the case.

Interview Brewster's Housekeeper

I SUGGEST that you interview Mrs. Ellen Jenny Brown, RFD 4, Dexter, Maine (telephone St. Albans 4 ring 13), who has served as Brewster's housekeeper for the past three Summers. Mrs. Brown is a lady with a New England conscience who believes that senators should live up to their oath of office. I am sure she will tell your committee the truth.

She will tell, among other things, how Brewster used to fly up to Dexter, Maine, almost every week-end in a private airplane belonging to Pan American Airways. The Brewster Summer house in Maine was kept open from May 1 to November each year. And when Mrs. Brown first went to work for the Brewsters the Senator spent almost every week-end at home.

He would be picked up by a private Pan American plane in Washington, and Mrs. Brown is in a position to testify regarding this because she used to answer the telephone when Sam Pryor, vice-president of Pan American Airways, would call to say when the Senator would arrive. The calls usually came from Washington or Greenwich, Conn., the latter being Pryor's home.

The Senator also filled many speaking engagements and Mrs. Brown has the impression that he also flew to them in a private plane. When Charles Brewster, the Senator's son, returned from overseas in 1945, Brewster brought him to Dexter in a private Pan American plane.

When the Brewster-Hughes hearings were held in Washington last Summer, the Brewster household was through into an uproar. Brewster immediately stopped flying Pan American planes, taking a train from Boston instead or else flying by Northeast Airlines to Bangor. Mrs. Brown was cautioned not to mention to a soul the Senator's past association with the Pan American Airways.

Accepting Favors Unethical

AS you know, Senator Ferguson, Congress some time ago passed a law making it illegal for railroads to give free passes to members of Congress. This was because so many favors were passed out to congressmen by the railroads in the old days that it got to be a scandal. The Civil Aeronautics Board also has stringent rules against free trips on commercial airlines.

Therefore it would seem to any average citizen highly unethical for a U. S. senator to be constantly accepting free airplane trips from one airline, especially when, at the very same time, he was trying to push a law through Congress benefitting that airline.

Violation Of Lobbying Law

MAY I also point out that Sam Pryor of Pan American Airways has not been registered as a lobbyist and that his activities in connection with Senator Brewster would appear to be in violation of the law.

If you need further evidence, I suggest that you also contact Ernest Gluck, 24 Ormond St., Rockville Center, L. I., whose nephew Stanley, worked for Pan American in Washington from September, 1945, until September, 1947. Stanley told his family of seeing Brewster several times get into Pan American's private plane in Washington. At first Stanley was willing to testify, but his mother persuaded him not to. However, if you put him under subpoena he will doubtless tell the truth.

I also suggest that you check the flight records for Pan American Airways plane NC-4000, piloted by Capt. Alfred Uertord of New York.

If those records have not been altered or destroyed they should tell an interesting story of trips carrying Senator Brewster. Robert Loyd, one of the secretaries for Pan American in New York, had charge of filling out these manifests.

Pan American also has a file of the inter-office memorandums in its special-service division regarding courtesies extended to public officials. These should be checked—especially two dated Dec. 3, 1946, and Dec. 9, 1946, in Miami. These pertain to Senator and Mrs. Brewster's trip to South America and clearly show the interest of Juan Trippe, president of Pan American, in the Brewster travels.

I also believe that Robert Thatch, former vice-president of Pan American, could throw some interesting light on Pan Am's connection with Brewster; as well as Marshall Bannell, former public relations expert for Pan American.

While I realize the Senate's reluctance to investigate one of its own members, nevertheless when such serious charges are made it would seem to be the Senate's duty to explore these charges thoroughly in order that public confidence in the good name of Congress may not be lessened.

Respectfully yours,
DREW PEARSON.