THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 3, 1950

A Job For The Humane Society

NEW VOTING PATTERN IN NORTH CAROLINA

TWO PATTERNS of sectional voting appeared in the Democratic primary Saturday in which Senator Frank P. Graham led his next highest opponent, Willis Smith, by 50,000 votes.

1. More than a majority of the counties of Eastern North Carolina's "Black Belt"—long a center of resistance to the old state political organization—have now joined the Scott organization.

2. About two-thirds of the Western counties with Republican minorities—always the most faithful to the "Shelby Dynasty"—have also shifted to the side of the current state organization.

The first of these appears to be the East's approval of Senator Graham's and Gov. Scott's liberal economic program.

The second seems to be caused by the Western counties' dependence on the dominant faction of the Democratic Party —the Scott administration—for aid and patronage to fight their Republican adversaries.

Naturally, approval or disapproval of Senator Graham's personality, record and platform was a factor, as well as many others.

Even so, the reasons for these voting patterns go back into North Carolina history. And the key most likely is found in a book by a man named Key—"Southern Politics", V. O. Key Jr., that is.

He explains what has brought North Carolina politics to the point where it is today: the breaking up of the socially responsible but economically conservative state political machine and the formation of an organization headed by liberals and based on several rather disparate elements.

Part I

FIRST, take a look at the East.

Here a surprising election outcome was the way the white voters—among whom the most damage was expected in a campaign appealing to racial prejudice—stood fast against the "Negro" cry.

Senator Graham won more of the counties where the Negro population ranges from 40 to 60 per cent, in spite of the fact that certain elements of his opposition had emphasized his friendliness to Negroes.

Economic considerations, then, seem to have outweighed any other. The reason for the East's economic liberalism will be shown.

In the nest of counties which have formed opposition in a long series of elections, Senator Graham maintained Hodgecombe, Hertford, Bertie, Caswell, Greene, Lenoir, Nash, Wilson and Martin.

Senator Graham gained a lead also in counties which have at least twice shown opposition to the old state machine's candidates—Hyde, Vance, Wayne and Washington.

In all these counties Negroes make up from 40 to 60 per cent of the population. And in general here the Negro electorate is small in porportion to its potential strength.

• • •

VOTING habits of the "Black Belt" counties can be seen from their support of four independent candidates who ran against the former state machine.

The elections were:

1. The 1932 Senatorial primary when Bob Reynolds was "the poor man's candidate"—45 to more than 50 per cent.

2. The 1932 gubernatorial primary when Richard T. Fountain was a leading opponent—45 to more than 60 per cent.

3. The 1936 gubernatorial primary when Dr. Ralph McDonald was the "radical" candidate to the sales tax and Clyde R. Hoey—30 to more than 60 per cent.

4. The 1948 gubernatorial primary when Mayne Albright ran on a platform stressing opposition to "machine government"—twenty to more than 30 per cent.

Why should this area be a "bed of revolt"? Mr. Key, the answer, please: "Insurgency in economic matters." Or memories of the deep depression. Or perhaps approval of Gov. Scott's fight for roads, telephones and rural electricity.

This explains, too, for example, the lack of enthusiasm of these counties in 1932 for J. C. B. Ehringhaus Sr., a native of the area.

This defection has been attributed by Mr. Key "to the severe privations suffered by the farmers during the depression, responsibility for which they fixed on the Gardner administration which supported Ehringhaus."

So in 1950 the Eastern counties followed a liberal leader—Senator Frank P. Graham.

Only four of the "resistance" counties of heavy Negro populations were gained by Mr. Smith—Halifax, Northampton, Warren and Franklin. His other principal strength in the East was the group of counties which had always voted with the state organization—Chowan, Camden, Gates, Pasquotank, Perquimans—all east of the Chowan River—and Granville.

The counties of Senator Graham's strength, on the other hand, were, in the 1948 Gubernatorial primary, also centers of Albright and Scott strength in the first primary, and of the combined Scott-Albright vote in the second primary.

After all these years on the outside, the Eastern "rebel" counties have found a home—in the long rustic arms of W. Kerr Scott.

• • •

Part II

WHY DID so many Western counties—"the most intense in their loyalty to the old organization"—support Senator Graham, the candidate Gov. Scott appointed and campaigned for?

How did Senator Graham carry two-third of the counties which in the 1944 Presidential election gave the Republican candidate a majority or else as much as 35 per cent of the vote?

All things being equal, Mr. Key again may have the key.

He says: "In (Western North Carolina) counties when Democrats are in a minority or must fight to win local offices, leaders look to the state for aid and succor.

"Faced by a common threat they appreciate the necessity for concerted action under strong State leadership."

An example was the 1948 Gubernatorial primary. While Charles M. Johnson was the candidate of the old organization, the Western counties voted for him.

Again in the run-off, although Mr. Scott picked up some added support, these counties generally continued their support to Mr. Johnson.

Now that Mr. Scott is with the established organization, a significant number of these Western counties gave their support to Mr. Scott's man—Frank P. Graham.

Mr. Key concluded that Western fidelity to the old state machine, organized by F. M. Simmons and carried on by the "Shelby Dynasty", resulted in "a relatively cohesive state organization."

He notes that the organization was likely to carry in the Democratic primary most if not all of the counties of high Republican strength.

• • •

ALTHOUGH the pattern which seems to be emerging in Western North Carolina is not as clear as in the East, Senator Graham carried more of the former "faithful" organization counties than did his opponent now outside the State organization.

A shift does seem to be in the making.

Roundabout changes in attitude have been seen before in these counties—for example, their feeling toward Senator Simmons in 1930 after he supported Hoover in 1928.

In 1934 his candidate for Governor, Angus McLean, defeated Josiah W. Bailey, whose strongest support came from the "traditionally anti-organization Eastern counties". The Western counties gave heavy majorities to the machine candidate.

In 1930 Mr. Bailey ran for the Senate against Mr. Simmons, who had been for 30 years a Senator and organization chief.

What happened: "The close counties, the loyal organization counties could not afford to tolerate party treason. They joined . . . to elect Bailey, whom they had shown little sympathy before," says Mr. Key.

Are the Democrats of Western counties now gravitating politically to the current State organization being formed by the present administration, giving it support in the mountains as well as on the coast?

Time will tell more precisely.—H. Mack Bell.

From The Christian Science Monitor

'OBVIOUSLY'

WE ARE having trouble with this word. Two uses of it in the news seriously complicate not only the issues of foreign policy but the problem of spotting friends of Moscow.

One comes from Col. Robert R. McCormick. He says: "Anyone who speaks up for the United Nations is obviously either a Communist or uninformed." There, now, you UN supporters, you can classify yourselves! Obviously you must be one or the other. For our part, we'd prefer to be uninformed—at least uninformed by the colonel's yardstick.

The other "obviously" came from Senator Robert A. Taft. He said that the United States' contracting to arm other nations "all around Russia" is "obviously an aggressive move." Now we hope nobody will call the minority leader of the United States a "Communist sympathizer" because of this statement. But obviously (we mean quite possibly) the Moscow radio will be able to make good propaganda use of this criticism of American policy.

It is not easy to understand Senator Taft. However, we should note that he would warn Russia that an attack on Europe will mean war with the United States. But he objects to any promise to an ally. He voted to give arms to Turkey, but doesn't think Europe is threatened and is not sure it would resist if threatened. He says the Russians may attack out of fear.

It seems to us Mr. Taft has not recognized the part that power has played in Soviet expansionism. No free nation, not even Czechsolovakia, has been captured merely by political infiltration. To build up power in western Europe to balance—or begin to balance—the might of the Red Army does not seem to us obviously aggressive. We'd call it imperatively defensive. Nor can we get the picture which makes Mr. Taft fear that one of the Western democracies will "instigate" war. We try to understand Mr. Taft, but we just can't—obviously.

Report From Washington

Capitol Hill Doubts A Second Race

By TOM SCHLESINGER

WASHINGTON, CAPITOL HILL sources believe there will be no Senatorial runoff race in North Carolina.

Graham's 50,000 plurality is given as the main reason, with financial considerations, secondary.

Insiders don't believe Smith could pick up the Reynolds vote in toto, if only because those favoring Buncombe Bob's $100-a-month old-age security will tend to favor Graham who backed the liberalized social security bill rather than Smith who advocates strict economy.

Both camps are rumored out of money, too. But Graham would find it easier this time picking up cash with his impressive showing, while Smith followers would tend to be reluctant after already giving an estimated $250,000 and getting only second best.

A minor point brought out is that a runoff would cost the State in the neighborhood of $100,000.

• • •

Up to Saturday, the score stood 5-1 in the battles of liberals vs. conservatives this year. Liberals scored in Pennsylvania, Oregon and Alabama, while Florida was the lone conservative win.

NORTH CAROLINA'S outcome seemed to bewilder the experts. The Washington Star, for instance, pointed out that more than 50 per cent of the votes cast were unfriendly to the Fair Dealers.

North Carolina, The Star said, has been considered the most Truman State in the South, and "It is somewhat disconcerning therefore to find an ardent anti-Fair Deal Democrat . . . running so strongly."

But The New York Times saw it as a "vote of confidence in Senator Graham and in President Truman's program . . . " The paper pointed out editorially, " . . . there is no question that he (Graham) represented the 'Fair Deal' in the primary and that he bore the brunt of the opposition to everything for which it stands to Southern conservatives."

And, so it went in the press this week.

• • •

SENATOR HOEY probably will not head the subcommittee investigation into Federal employment of sexual perverts . . . He was the forgotten man in the primary, and heard the returns to 1:30 A. M. in Shelby. He had "no comment" on the race other than it was the "meanest" he could recall in state history . . . Senator Bailey was taking an informal ten-day vacation with Senators already making plans to spend the Summer here because legislation is so far behind schedule.

THE seniority system in Congress came in for another blasting this week, with Rep. Graham Barden as the target.

Under this system, the North Carolina lawmaker becomes chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee with the death of Rep. John Lesinski.

And, as matters observed, it is hard to conceive a more comprehensive political embarrassment for the President.

In most respects, Barden as chairman would be the antithesis of Administration-minded Lesinski.

Political leaders say this is no time for the President to challenge the right of Southern Democrats to committee preference despite how they vote. The effect could be, for instance, the defeat of Senator Graham in the possible runoff of June 24.

It could infuriate other Southerners who have benefited by the seniority rule, and result in complete bogging down in the House of Administration measures. Key leaders in such an insurrection could for instance, be Chairmen Doughton of Ways & Means, Cooley of Agriculture, Vinson of Armed Services, Rankin of Veterans Affairs and Whitington of Public Works.

Why is the chairmanship so vital?

• • •

A COMMITTEE chairman has great power to promote or thwart bills. He can often kill a bill by delays and other parliamentary maneuvers such as turning it over to a subcommittee and "packing" it. Barden is an able and aggressive legislator, and will be a strong chairman. This is a fact of much strategic import in a committee that in the past has reported out many important bills by a 12-12 count.

• • •

ADMINISTRATION leaders frankly are upset. They point out that three of the most thankless of the present Congressional campaign issues are wrapped up in the Barden committee. These are Taft-Hartley, fair employment practices and Federal aid to education. On all three, Barden opposed the Administration's stand.

They also point to his voting record over the past two years on other issues. He voted against the Brannan plan, the admission of displaced persons, public housing, extension of rent control, the Marshall Plan and military aid to Western Europe. He voted for the Republican tax-reduction bill and to override the President's veto on it, and for the Mundt-Nixon bill to outlaw the Communist Party. In the first three months of this Congressional session, he voted as often with the Republicans as with Democrats on key issues, according to the Congressional Quarterly tabulations.

• • •

BUT if you think Administration leaders are upset, you ought to see the labor leaders. They say Barden has almost always voted "wrong" on labor issues.

And they don't see any relief in sight. At 53, he is set for a long stay. His North Carolina district is a safe one and has probably strengthened himself in it by successfully disputing with Cardinal Spellman the issue of appropriating Federal funds for parochial school buses. He was unopposed last Saturday.

Lesinski, labor leaders said, almost always voted "right."

In the field of Federal aid to schools, Barden is considered a crusader. He's a man of strong convictions but of easy-going temperament. For almost sixteen years, he has advocated Federal aid to schools, but probably won't push it at this late date. He was chairman of the House Education Committee before it was merged with the Labor Committee by Congressional reorganization.

While on the House floor, the only North Carolina lawmaker voting against the final compromise ECA extension Bill last week. The House approved the measure 240-44 (with Doughton, Kerr and Redden favoring). The Senate passed it 47-27 with Senator Hoey for, and Senator Graham recorded backing it. . . . There was no N. C. opposition, and Doughton, Jones, Kerr and Redden voted for Federal participation to the extent of $13 million in construction of a new high-speed parkway between Washington and Baltimore.

Acheson Report A Record Of First-Rate Achievement

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

MEASURED AGAINST the background of the handicaps piled on him before he left for the conferences in Paris and, London, Secretary Acheson's report to Congress is sober record of impressive achievement. It is an account of the development of Atlantic organization from a group of committees on a paper chart to an actuality.

On both sides of the fence critical voices are already being raised. There are those who say that this is only half enough — a faltering step forward instead of the bold frontal approach essential to make the defenses of Western Europe a reality within 12 to 18 months.

In the other camp are the isolationists of the old school who see in the Atlantic organization an iron-clad commitment to take America into war. Their voices will be raised loud and long in the forthcoming debate on the President Truman's request for a new appropriation for foreign arms aid. It is reported that the request will be for $1,225,000,000 for 14 countries, nine within the Atlantic pact framework and five — Greece, Turkey, Iran, Korea and the Philippines—outside it.

NOT A LARGE SUM

When one considers the extraordinary range of geography to be covered, and the threat of Communism, breakdown and chaos in those far-flung areas, then the amount to be asked in arms assistance seems almost pitifully small. It is just here, in my opinion, that the chief weakness of the policy of strength through containment is apparent.

If the Atlantic community were a separate and untouchable entity, existing on an island whole and complete, then the progress toward federation in Acheson's report would have more significance. But it is in the inter-relationships of the Atlantic pact countries with the rest of the world that the threat to security and peace exists. And it is in the ever-widening circle of these relationships that American strength is spread thinner and thinner.

The future may show that the most fateful decision taken by Acheson on his European mission was given only a glancing mention in his prepared report to Congress. That is the decision announced in Paris on May 8 that the United States intended to give both military and economic assistance to the regime of Bao Dai, who is supported by the French in Indo-China.

The French army of 150,000 in Indo-China is extremely hard-pressed by the guerrillas operating under the direction of the Moscow-trained Communist Ho Chi Minh. Obtaining replacements for this army in France is reported to be difficult to the point of impossibility. Thus it is hard to see any limit on the amount of this aid if it is to be effective in putting down the revolt and restoring order.

ASIATIC DOUBTFUL

Furthermore, our friends in Southeast Asia, particularly in India, believe that we have made a political as well as a strategic error. They say that Bao Dai can never be considered anything but a puppet of the French and that, therefore, he cannot rally the people for a real fight in an effective resistance to mass revolt. Consequently, they prophesy, that the end will be another China — defeat for the futile expenditure of arms and economic resources.

Intervention in Indo-China must also be considered in the larger setting of a divided world. The Soviet Union has recognized Ho Chi Minh and his forces as the government of Indo-China. For reasons of prestige and practicality, Russia now will be likely to put all possible support behind the guerrilla leader. In this way the two major powers can be drawn into at least an undeclared war on a battlefield where most of the disadvantages will be ours.

This, it will be said, is the counsel of timidity. Obviously, it was necessary to do something in Indo-China and quickly. That was the loud chorus of advice from the critics in and out of Congress who helped to the dangers of another Chinese debacle.

But the direct approach, embracing Bao Dai, ignores the possibility of using the United Nations as intermediary. Through the U. N. it might have been possible to enlist such a peacemaker as Prime Minister Pandit Nehru of India, who is keenly aware of the implications of the step America has taken in Indo-China. Nehru also understands far better than any Westerner possibly can, the nature of the aspirations of peoples who have lived so long under colonialism.

Why All The Rapture About The Wedding Of A Traitor?

By ROBERT RUARK

NEW YORK

A LADY I know limped into town the other day, rather the worse for violent handling, and when people asked her how come the contusions, she had a short and brilliant answer. "I was hit," she said, "by a barstool in Far Rockaway."

This is how I feel when I read the rapturous notices of the recent Judy Coplon-Albert Socolov nuptials. I feel precisely as if I had been hit on the head by a barstool in Far Rockaway.

Cupid rates a good press in this country, which is indoctrinated to the teeth on the theorem that love conquers all, but it is possible to become a mite nauseated when we go into the fashion-editor details of what Miss Coplon wore at her wedding — turns out it was a red dress — and when we quote the happy bride at length.

CONVICTED SPY

You see, Miss Coplon is a twice-convicted spy. She has been accused and found guilty of conspiring with a Russian agent named Gubitchev to steal state secrets from the American government. It is possible that when the ball runs out on her honeymoon, she will spend the formative years of her married life — say about 15 of them — peeking through the bars at Gubitchev has reported, instead of being jailed, so I suppose Judy got her husband on the rebound. After all, they did plead that love for Gubi led her into espionage.

Judy married her lawyer — a latecomer to the drama. She got herself a fresh firm of legal counsel after a spat with Archie Palmer, barrister for the first trial and for part of the second. She and Palmer seemed chummy enough, until the intimacy ripened into harsh words. Archie took his colorful hat in his hand and Judy suddenly had a younger, comelier mouthpiece.

Judy has had a rather exuberant tilt with Famous, in addition to her alleged affection for Gubi, the long-gone spy, she was testified against by a Justice employee who kissed and told, on the witness stand, appearing for the state. It is therefore rather difficult to dignify her rapture with the same dewy feeling I had for the wedding of Shirley Temple or even the recent retroactive legal bliss of Miss Bergman.

"She Married Her Mouthpiece" is an interesting title, and would probably make a dandy movie, and I have no doubt that her marriage will figure strongly in any future appeals, the American public being agog at any sentimental and prone to slobber in the presence of romance. But I don't feel a heavy urge to pelt the pair with roses.

A spy is a despicable creature, when spying with his own country. I felt no anger at Gubitchev, the Russian, because he was working for his own land, on orders, and we are human on our own spies, not risking their necks in far places. Gubi, according to his own lights, was a patriotic citizen.

A LATHROP CRIME

But the Coplon woman has been twice convicted of espionage against her own land. The defense in both her trials has been cheap and shoddy filibustering. On the record she is altogether as unsavory a person as has been presented lately. As a lover who likes his native land, I am for hanging spies and traitors, since I know of no crime so loathesome or so callously premeditated.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

'I Do Not Enjoy Being Called A Liar'

WASHINGTON.

SOME people seem to be laboring under the impression that I enjoy being called a liar. Thick-skinned as I am supposed to be, I do not.

I particularly do not enjoy being called a liar by Senator Taft as he virtually did the other day after I reported that he entered into a deal with the Southern bloc to deliver six Republican votes to continue the filibuster. I do not enjoy it because I like Taft and consider him a healthy influence in government; second, because it gets me in wrong with my wife, Mrs. P. happens to think that Taft can do no wrong—a state of affairs which, unhappily, she does not always believe applies to her husband.

In this case I tried to argue with Mrs. P. that her idol from Ohio should at least exercise some originality. After all, I have been called a liar by such celebrated figures as President Roosevelt and the Senator from Ohio could certainly have found more descriptive language. One of the fundamental requirements of a politician is imagination, and in this case Senator Taft did not even show the imagination of Harry Truman.

In all seriousness, however, I should like to point out that it's the easiest thing in the world for a politician to hurl the charge of liar at a newspaperman; but it's something else again to make it stick.

By way of illustration, perhaps I may be forgiven if I call the roll of those who have called me a liar—or worse—and let the public decide who told the truth.

Early Russian Friction

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S famous epithet of "chronic liar" was given in the late Summer of 1943 after I reported that Stalin was irate because Cordell Hull had failed to consult him regarding the preliminary terms for the Italian surrender.

In view of subsequent events, probably FDR and Secretary Hull might wonder why they ever bothered to deny a story that friction was developing with Russia. But at that time they were anxious to give every appearance of complete co-operation with Russia, and the story was denied first by Mr. Hull, then by President Roosevelt, who also threw in the "chronic liar" crack.

Six months later, March, 1944, confirmation of the story began to appear when Stalin demanded one-third of the Italian Navy, and it became known that he had designs on the Italian colonies and was intent on breaking up the British-French control of North Africa and the Mediterranean. And with every passing month, the wartime friction between Russia and the United States has become more obvious.

I am not arguing that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull may have had excellent diplomatic or military reasons for their caustic statements. At this moment we are only concerned with the truth.

Vaughan And SOB

PRESIDENT TRUMAN gave a new twist to the conventional charge of "liar" when he dished out the latest "s-o-b" after I had criticized Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan for accepting an Argentine medal at a time when dictator Peron was attempting to get a large loan from the U. S. Government.

Since then, Congress has refused to let Vaughan have his Argentine medal; Peron has got $125,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank, and a Senate investigating committee found Vaughan guilty of all sorts of irregularities, such as putting race-track construction ahead of veterans' housing; doing unusual favors in return for deep-freezes; demoting army officers because they tangled with John Maragon; and trying to increase grain quotas for whisky distillers at a time when grain was crucially needed in Europe.

In the end, the Senate committee rendered an official report including, in official and eloquent language, that General Vaughan might be something faintly resembling an s.o.b. himself.

Sen. Elmer Thomas of Oklahoma also hurled the "liar" charge when I reported, May 6, 1946, that he had been speculating in cotton through his wife. Two years later an Agriculture Dept. report officially confirmed his speculation.

Congressman Parnell Thomas — Denied kickbacks and called me a liar, but is now in jail.

John Maragon—Called me a liar for exposing his operations, but is now in jail.

Tanforan Race Track executives—called me a liar and threatened a libel suit when their violation of housing regulations (in connection with General Vaughan) was exposed. They went to jail.

Patenotre tax fraud—Attorney Ellsworth Alvord called me a liar and wrote newspapers threatening a libel suit. Later, his clients plead guilty and paid a million-dollar fine.

Congressman Andrew May—Called me a liar over the Erie Basin munitions fraud. He and the Garsson brothers went to jail.

Detroyers to England—When this column reported in 1940 that the United States would trade 50 destroyers to England for island bases it was categorically denied by the White House; then officially confirmed two weeks later.

Senator Lundeen—When Senator Lundeen of Minnesota was killed in an airplane crash in 1940, I revealed that he was en route to deliver a pro-Nazi speech written for him by George Sylvester Viereck, a paid agent for Hitler. Senators Wheeler and Bennett Clark immediately delivered scathing speeches denouncing me. Viereck was prosecuted for being a German agent. During the course of the trial it developed that he had written Lundeen's speeches. He went to jail.

Louisiana scandals—When corruption in Louisiana was charged by this column regarding Gov. Richard Leche, Democratic National Committeeman Seymour Weiss and various of the old Huey Long gang, the charge of liar echoed all over Louisiana. But, in the end, all the officials named went to jail.

These are some, though not all, of the people who have called me a liar.

Now I don't want to give the impression that I consider myself always right, because I'm not. Being human, I make mistakes. But on important issues I simply can't afford to make them too often.

Having got steamed up on this subject, I have exhausted my quota of space in today's paper to discussing my differences with Senator Taft; but I'll have to come back to that in a future column. After all, I've got to get that straightened out for the sake of harmony in the Pearson family.