

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher
J. E. DOWD, General Manager
R. S. GRIFITH, Executive Editor
C. A. McKNIGHT, Editor

FRIDAY, JANUARY 11, 1952

'See—He's Still Got His Hat On'

Gov. Talmadge 'Vestige Of
'Ancient, Barbaric Culture'

By ROBERT C. RUARK

EISENHOWER AND THE CONGRESS

IN HIS HONEST, direct and sometimes naive approach to things, Sen. Paul Douglas has suggested that the Democrats ought to follow suit if the Republicans nominate General Eisenhower for the Presidency. The Senator reasons that Eisenhower would carry to victory a number of Republican Congressmen who would oppose him later, and explain.

"Should he obtain the nomination of both parties, people throughout the nation would be much more selective in their voting on local candidates."

It is highly improbable that the Douglas proposal will be embraced by the Democratic Party. But it emphasizes one aspect of the Eisenhower candidacy that needs attention, namely, the need for replacing isolationist Republicans in the House and Senate with men whose views on foreign policy are as enlightened as Eisenhower's.

Chalmers M. Roberts of the Washington Post has already pointed out that 20 of the 54 Senators seats at stake this year are Republican. Nineteen of the nineteen Republican seats are held by: Brewster, Bridger, Butler, Cain, Ecton, Flinders, Ives, Jenner, Kem, Knowland, Langer, Lodge, McCarthy, Malone, Martin, Smith of New Jersey, Tamm, Watkins and Williams.

On three key foreign policy votes last session—limitation of troops to Europe, the requirement that India pay in strategic materials for grain, and the attempt to cut foreign aid—nine of the nineteen Republican Senators voted against the Administration on all three, another four voted against on two and didn't vote on the third, another voted against the only time he voted.

In the House, there were 371 Republican votes (or pairs) on two key foreign policy questions—limiting the President's power by taking "peril points" on the reciprocal trade program, and reducing foreign aid. On

these two questions, 347 of the Republicans voted against the Administration and only 24 voted with it. "Are these the men and women to back Ike?" asks Roberts. "What are you Eisenhower Republicans doing in your own states and elsewhere to put up men with Ike's foreign affairs philosophy in this year's GOP primaries? There is talk that Governor Kohler may run against McCarthy. But who will run against Malone in Nevada or Kem in Missouri? Or Chipfield in Illinois or Crawford in Michigan or Clevenger in Ohio or Gavin in Pennsylvania?"

Those are good questions. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch asks them also, and points to a responsibility which comes ahead of organizing Eisenhower clubs over the country. This is the responsibility to work for and to achieve Republican Senatorial nominees who believe as Gen. Eisenhower does on foreign affairs.

Certainly there is reason for some concern over the prospect of a President doing battle with his own party on foreign issues, and the Eisenhower backers should bestir themselves to get some enlightened GOP congressional candidates into the primaries. But there are two aspects to the picture that both Mr. Roberts and the Post-Dispatch either ignore or treat very lightly.

One is the fact that, given a Republican President and a Republican Congress, some GOP Congressmen have been voting against the Democratic foreign policy as a minority group will start voting for the Eisenhower foreign policy as a majority group.

The other is the consoling thought that no matter what punishment an enlightened foreign policy might receive from an isolationist-GOP Congress under Eisenhower, it would suffer immeasurably more under Taft who, by and large, sees eye to eye with the GOP isolationists.

Letters should be brief, written on one side of the paper. The writer's name must be signed, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editor. The News reserves the right to condense.

Mecklenburg's Sorry GOP

Editors, THE NEWS: RELATIVE to the article of Mr. Erv Presser in the News of Jan. 8, I would thank you kindly to publish the following.

Contrary to Mr. Presser's misinformation I have voted in every county, state and national election since I have been in Charlotte. A vote moving from one precinct to another retains his voting status in the precinct from which he moved for four months. Mr. Presser does not know that.

As to organized precincts: There are 42 precincts in the city and 68 in the county altogether. However, the voters can draw from that district from one precinct to another retains his voting status in the precinct from which he moved for four months. Mr. Presser does not know that.

How many precincts were organized during the so-called administration of Mr. Presser as so-called county chairman? There have been a number of what purported to be county committee meetings since I moved to Charlotte. There were four meetings in the capacity of county committee members. That would be 68. Therefore Mr. Presser, and others of his ilk have reduced the so-called organization of the Republican Party in Mecklenburg to a de facto status. Instead of being an organization it is a mere clique.

In conversation with Mr. Presser on the street (not private by any means) he said in reference to political matters: "What do the people know about the difference between a politician and a politician? The difference can draw from that district perfectly the party rider psychology. Shows his conception of politics. That is the very thing I am fighting. That is the mental attitude which produces cliques, factions, and party-riding self-interests. It is embarrassing to admit that the Republican Party here has sunk to such a level."

It is embarrassing to admit that the Republican Party here has sunk to such a level. I relate a little past history. My first year in Charlotte I was invited to what was represented as a meeting of the Republican Party. I found the meeting a meeting to elect a county chairman. I found that only three claimed to be committee members. I found that "That is the way we do here."

Who consulted the Republican voters? Since then I have advocated the primary. That puts control in the hands of the voters. I advocate election of the county chairman by primary. I am superfluous to refer to the fact that Mr. Presser's so-called administration as so-called county chairman was on a par with his so-called election.

He has driven good men out of the party, HOTT EAVES

Democrat For Ike

Editors, THE NEWS: I HAVE just finished reading the editorial page of the Charlotte News dated Jan. 8. In regard to Eisenhower's candidacy for President.

It is true that many readers throughout North and South Carolina read these editorials and use them as a guide, especially during an election year. Hats off to the editors of this paper for selecting Eisenhower as their choice for President of the U. S.

There are several reasons why the voters of the U. S. should support Eisenhower. First, under a Democratic Administration from Woodrow Wilson to Truman we have had either a cold or shooting war. Second, the voters of this nation are sick and tired of the kind of government we have today. The only way to defeat the Truman Administration is for every one of us to register and beg his friends and neighbors to register and on election day let nothing stand in the way to keep you from the polls and voting for Eisenhower.

For Eisenhower will be your President even though you are a Democrat or Republican. Just forget about your party if you are a Democrat, for Truman has wrecked it.

—L. L. CHILDRESS
A Democrat For Ike.

Editors, THE NEWS: I AM a voter for your fine editorial on Eisenhower in Tuesday's paper, and for all the other fine ones you have written and will write in the future.

—CAROLYN W. JOHNSTON.

Women And Whisky

Editors, THE NEWS: WAS reading in your paper a letter written by Capt. Hamer about Mr. Boyle's article (on "predatory females") in which he said that if a woman is not a good wife, she is not a good mother. If wives and husbands will be true to each other there will not be any cause for divorces. How many broken homes we have today caused by divorce.

MRS. MAYME BARGER.

Quote, Unquote

Bride: "What's the best way to protect a wedding ring?" Mother: "Put it in dishwater three times a day." — Shelby (N.C.) Star.

Worrying about things makes a woman's hair turn gray, and worrying about that makes a woman's hair turn blonde or brunette again.—Kingsport (Tenn.) Times.

There is one state which permits a woman to work eighteen hours a day. Who guessed it? It's the state of matrimony.—Greeneville (Tenn.) Sun.

Tired of the sniping, Symington finally quit.

Not long ago, an old Senate friend of the President, worried over the corruption issue, remarked: "There's no use going to Harry and urging reform, because there's no one on the White House staff capable of following up and carrying through that reform. Since Clark Clifford's gone, Harry Truman's about as hard to reach as Joe Stalin."

This is what has happened to Truman's good intentions in trying to get Judge Tom Murphy to clean up corruption.

NEW YORK

With a feeling common to those who have been swayed for ignorance than of violent outrage, I recently read a long article signed by Governor Talmadge, Georgia's Governor. The gist was that television is undesirable, and that it is a waste of money. I was surprised to find that Governor Talmadge's friends are writing as a result of what they read in the newspaper and that they are writing more on the quality of the entertainment than on the quality of the entertainers.

It is unfortunate that the majority of the country is so out of touch with the entertainers and the people who elected him that we cannot sit through a steady diet of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and Talmadge's cultural code.

But unfortunately for these few restless troglodytes (troglodyte meaning savage who prefers to dwell in caves), so many people have gotten used to Joe Louis and Jackie Robinson and Lena Horne and Marian Anderson and Louis Armstrong and Dr. B. B. King, that I just don't see how we can remodel television to fit Herman Talmadge's delicate feelings.

I am not so distant removed from the land of cotton that I fail to realize that the period of adjustment between black and white is still in progress, and that many a year will pass before it is satisfactorily solved. There will, for some time, be Herman Talmadges to match against the few and the firebrands who unscrupulously endeavor to reshape a status quo in five minutes.

In the meantime, I suppose I must apologize, as a Southerner, for Governor Talmadge. We must bear, as in the case of subnormal child, the Ku Klux Klan and the vestiges of an ancient and barbaric culture that still exists in scattered form throughout the land. It is no good to punish them. If you ignore them they will even go away and make faces at each other.

—ROBERT C. RUARK

Differences In Far East Hinder U. S., U. K. Accord

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON, Jan. 10.—Stalin sent a message to the Japanese government, warning the Communist sever. The British stand appears to be a repudiation of the Anglo-American declaration of the Western alliance in Europe.

On the other hand, to many Britishers the American position on China seems unrealistic to the point of blindness. They argue that the United States should not try to control the Chinese mainland but should recognize the position of the United States in the Far East as it is.

An important factor from the viewpoint of American politics and Senate approval of the treaty is the fact that the American taxpayer is providing the money to subsidize the shaky Japanese economy. This is now being done indirectly in several ways, one of which is in Japan growing out of the Korean War has been running at a loss for goods, services and communications of one kind or another.

The United Nations civil assistance committee is spending about \$100 million a year to help Japan. This comes from the United States. It is a considerable part of the \$1 billion in aid which is spent in Japan. If there is an armistice in Korea, the United States would spend \$200 million in rebuilding Japan. The United States has pledged \$162 million. And this would mean that the United States would convert into dollars—aid, on the other hand, are stopped from reaching the Chinese mainland.

There has been no follow-through, and has been none since Clark Clifford's departure. Clifford's reason for getting out was also White House jealousy. Steelman made it his business to plan stories with the press that Clifford was responsible for various unpopular policies, while Matt Connelley made Presidential appointments for politicians likely to knock Clifford's ideas down.

Clifford had brains; and they didn't want brains too close to the President. So finally Clifford quit.

Timid Senator

SILVER-THATCHED Sen. Guy Gillette, Iowa Democrat, has been rebuffed by the Senate Elections Committee first to kill, later to tone down, the probe of Senator McCarthy under the Benton resolution. This is a continuation asking for McCarthy's expulsion from the Senate.

It didn't lack on officially, but when the first vote was taken on whether to investigate Benton's charges against McCarthy, Sen. Gillette was the only man who opposed.

He argued that McCarthy was a powerful figure, would retaliate against Senator voting against him, and the Committee should turn down the Benton investigation. However, when Gillette said that debate inside the Committee was going against him, he did not have the courage to stand on his own. Guy Gillette, who was voted with the majority, that made it unanimous.

Since then, however, Gillette has toned down the Committee's effectiveness by quickly firing three Congressional investigators who were working on the Benton resolution.

AGREEMENT TO DISAGREE

PRIME Minister Churchill and President Truman probably did not intend to do much more, in their series of discussions, than to reacquaint each other with the way for friendly relations to tackle the problems of Anglo-American relations. At any rate, they apparently accomplished little, in fact, much less than their communicative suggests.

They agreed to disagree on the issue of diplomatic relations with China. Left unsettled were the questions of naming an American or British admiral to the command of NATO's Atlantic navy, and adoption of the British or American rifle as standard equipment.

They announced that American use of atomic bomb bases in England in time of emergency will be subject to joint decision with the British government. They agreed on the efforts of European nations to form a United defense force.

These two announcements are logical and historic, and they point up the weakness of the Atlantic community. Now, the French and Americans get together and announce that the huge airfields were are building in French Morocco be used only for inter-governmental consultation. One would think such matters would come within the province of NATO, which is entrusted with the defense of all the member countries. And Britain and the U. S. cannot expect to

further the Atlantic unity they sometimes champion by maintaining a policy of friendly aloofness from the continental defense force. The goal of SHAPE is not an association of friendly armies, but a united military machine, and bilateral negotiations on matters affecting that common goal cannot but detract from that goal.

Regarding the Middle East, Churchill and Truman found a complete identity of aim. The aim is commendable, but the proof is in the pudding, and the Middle East requires quickly more than Anglo-American resources of accord to the interests of both of these countries are to be furthered. The communists did not even mention Japan, whose growing competition with Britain for markets has resulted in tactical British support of trade between Japan and Red China, in order for Britain to find an outlet for manufactures in other parts of Southeast Asia.

The issues are of such magnitude and complexity that they cannot be solved by personal diplomacy and diplomatic committee meetings alone. What is needed, badly, is a little more of the community attitude which says the nationality of an admiral, or the manufacturer of a certain rifle, is not as important as the ability and forces available to the admiral, and the production and readiness of the gun.

ONE WAY TO DE-EMPHASIZE

EVERYBODY has a solution for over-emphasized college athletics. College presidents want to abolish bowl games, and Spring training. NCAA officials want to limit grants in aid and standardize them. The University of Kentucky has decided to recruit Kentucky boys only. Bobby Dodd of Georgia Tech would stamp out all outside grants to athletes by classing them as "bribes."

Round and round it goes, and we might as well hit it a lick, too. It seems to us that there is a relatively simple and practical solution that will strike at the root of the over-emphasis evil.

A school can't control a lot of frenzied fans, or parents, as Bobby Dodd suggests. But the school can control its own admissions. If it did so honestly, professional football would decrease and the futile "poling" of conference superstars would be abandoned. The one essential ingredient: honesty on the part of the college authorities who should be academic and not athletic authorities.

Let the coach and alumni recruit to their hearts' content, but let the college not accept any applicants for admission unless they honestly qualify on the basis of scholarship and character.

Insist upon a reasonable load of scholarship work by all students and a reasonable, honestly calculated, for remaining in school.

Pay no more attention to who's paying an athlete's way than who's paying the way for Mr. Gottow's son. What's the difference? The college's business is with the boy, the student, not with his antecedents. But don't let the college subsidize athletics. Let only honestly merit the scholarship test.

Go ahead and play football freely. If it turns out that the honest college can't compete, that would be unfortunate, but maybe the quality of an honest football team would be surprising.

Perhaps we place too much reliance upon college academic authorities. But if they're not competent to manage their own households, then none is.

COMMISSION GOVERNMENT

NOTE A trend which seems to be increasingly popular as the national election approaches. It is to name a commission, bipartisan of course, to study controversial questions.

The Magnuson Commission is looking into national health needs. Another commission is studying Missouri Valley development, thus putting the proposed MVA on ice. The Frank Church committee is a committee which will investigate discrimination.

Thus the commission proposed by Senator Gillette to study Atlantic Pact country relations will probably be enacted. Maybe the Senate will even pass the law establishing a commission to study our overseas spending program, which Senator Ellender previously blocked.

However, we see the President told reporters Thursday that he had dropped the

idea of a special Commission on Corruption. After all, some issues are too big to be salted away for the duration of the campaign.

At one of the recent Community Association's concerns, a small boy sat near the front of the auditorium looking at his watch. A man behind him leaned forward and asked: "Does it tell the time?"

"No," said the little boy. "You have to look at it."—Caribbeid (N. M.) Current-Argus.

That was an interesting piece about the Pine Bluff student who took classes at both Memphis State and Southwestern. But he'd been seen still more interesting if he'd been playing football for both of them and they had a game scheduled this year.—Little Rock Arkansas Gazette.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

INSIDE reason for the governmental shift of Stuart Symington, one of the best men to serve the Truman Administration, is the soul-consuming jealousy of the White House staff.

It also reasons why Clark Clifford, the best staff member Truman had, left the White House, and why it's difficult to get good men to work for the President these days.

The little band of mediocrities around the President just do not want brainier men than they are to work. It shows up their own inadequacy. This little band of mediocrities is:

1. Matt Connelley, an ex-WPA investigator, and former Wall Street clerk, whenever he enjoys a convivial evening, resorts to comedy.

2. John Steelman, a former country school teacher, who tried to put the kids under his former boss, Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, and made life insufferable for the late Secretary of Labor, Lewis Schwellenbach. Steelman has wanted the balance of labor control to remain under him and is probably responsible for many of Truman's labor headaches.

3. Donald Dawson, who had his wife in the RFC, pulled wires to get RFC loans, and accepted hospitality from a Florida hotel which was applying for an RFC loan.

Truman Advisers Drive Off Good Men

LITTLE Lord Fauntleroy

SYMMINGTON's first troubles began when he was put in the highly important post of chairman of the National Security Council's Board of Economic Warfare, under Steelman. This made Symington senior adviser to the President on mobilization matters, with Steelman on the sidelines. A place John did not relish. It was Steelman who, after a little, began cutting Symington out of the line, finally convinced Truman mobilization should be completely under Charles E. Wilson.

Tired of the sniping, Symington finally quit.

Not long ago, an old Senate friend of the President, worried over the corruption issue, remarked: "There's no use going to Harry and urging reform, because there's no one on the White House staff capable of following up and carrying through that reform. Since Clark Clifford's gone, Harry Truman's about as hard to reach as Joe Stalin."

This is what has happened to Truman's good intentions in trying to get Judge Tom Murphy to clean up corruption.

There has been no follow-through, and has been none since Clark Clifford's departure.

Clifford's reason for getting out was also White House jealousy. Steelman made it his business to plan stories with the press that Clifford was responsible for various unpopular policies, while Matt Connelley made Presidential appointments for politicians likely to knock Clifford's ideas down.

Clifford had brains; and they didn't want brains too close to the President. So finally Clifford quit.

Timid Senator

SILVER-THATCHED Sen. Guy Gillette, Iowa Democrat, has been rebuffed by the Senate Elections Committee first to kill, later to tone down, the probe of Senator McCarthy under the Benton resolution. This is a continuation asking for McCarthy's expulsion from the Senate.

It didn't lack on officially, but when the first vote was taken on whether to investigate Benton's charges against McCarthy, Sen. Gillette was the only man who opposed.

He argued that McCarthy was a powerful figure, would retaliate against Senator voting against him, and the Committee should turn down the Benton investigation. However, when Gillette said that debate inside the Committee was going against him, he did not have the courage to stand on his own. Guy Gillette, who was voted with the majority, that made it unanimous.

Since then, however, Gillette has toned down the Committee's effectiveness by quickly firing three Congressional investigators who were working on the Benton resolution.