



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

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1952

A BETTER APPROACH TO FOREIGN TRADE

AS A RULE, "liberals" are supposed to be in favor of big government handouts and "conservatives" are supposed to be against them. But the roles are reversed when protective tariffs are the issue. Right now, the wool industry affords an illustration and, perhaps, a lesson.

Last year wool boomed to \$1 a pound, then dropped more than one-half. An estimated 20 per cent of the 1951 crop, and three-fourths of the 1952 crop, are stored by growers who are hopeful that the price will bounce back up above the government's \$4-cent support price. The U. S. consumes about 600 million pounds of wool yearly, of which almost two-thirds is imported. It comes from countries which produce—and can sell here—good wool cheaper than domestic producers do.

Most woolmen, particularly the leaders of the wool growers' associations, are routine-trotting entrepreneurs to whom socialism and subsidy are almost synonymous evils. But yet sheepmen are begging for—and receiving—governmental subsidies, although they call them by other names.

They managed to get a "Buy American" rider into the Defense Production Act. They have persuaded the Secretary of Agriculture to ask the Tariff Commission for a ruling on whether imports are threatening the domestic

price support program. They are pressuring the Treasury Department to impose duties on imports from Argentina, and Uruguay. Treasury has so far been adamant, and Agriculture, remembering how it got its fingers burned the last time it went into the wool business, is reluctant.

Imposition of new fees and quotas would not only hurt the wool trade agreement, it would undoubtedly start a wave of retaliation in the form of tariff hikes, by other countries.

To get at the nub of the problem, it seems to us, requires a change, admittedly difficult to accomplish, in our national attitude toward foreign trade. Now, protection of the domestic producer, in many fields other than wool, seems the paramount concern. But would we not be on much more solid ground economically if the guiding rule were an extension of that free enterprise philosophy—that the product should be obtained as cheaply as possible, whether from a domestic or foreign producer? Some economic operations would fail certainly, as they might even now despite heavy subsidies by the taxpayer. But government's proper role could then be the conversion of uneconomic industries which must adjust to the realities of competitive life.

LET'S FORGET ABOUT THIS IDEA

WE DOUBT seriously whether a proposal by the State Merchants Association to enact a law permitting N. C. creditors to garnish the wages and salaries of their debtors is worth all the editorial comment it has received. As we understand it, the constitutional amendment would be necessary, and we don't believe that the people of North Carolina will ever consent to such a change in their fundamental law.

Nor should they. The proposal is all wrong as a matter of principle. Admittedly some merchants have trouble collecting their accounts. Some of them in smaller towns are overburdened with accounts receivable. But in the final analysis, the extension of the creditor's right to garnish wages or salaries is a risk that must be assumed by the convenience of charge accounts, but must be prepared to accept the risks involved.

ATTN: WIVES AND HUSBANDS

THE Chapel Hill Weekly is puzzled, and we're responsible. It all started with a News editorial in which we repeated an argument often voiced by persons who don't vote. They say "My husband is collecting, and just stay out of each other's vote, so we'll just stay out of the polls." We've read the editorial and don't see any suggestion that such an attitude is criminal, as the good editor of the Weekly suggests. But we did point out that such an attitude leads, in fact has already led, to minority rule in this country. And it involves a sacrifice of sovereignty, which is intended in a democracy to reside in the individual, to be exercised at the polls.

But look here, says the Weekly. Up in Congress and in other legislative bodies, legislators are "paired." That is, one member who would vote "Yes" and another who would vote "No" just arrange to be absent, and the voting outcome will be the same. And, comments the paper:

"What's the difference, in morality, between a pairing in Congress and a pairing between husband and wife in the imaginary case cited by The Charlotte News."

WHEN IS A GIFT NOT A GIFT?

A GOOD MANY MEN in public life seem to have trouble drawing an ethical line on the acceptance of gifts and favors. Not so Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois, who shows the same straight thinking on this problem that he does on many other aspects of government.

Senator Douglas draws the line at \$250.

"If a gift is worth more than that, I send it back with a courteous note. If the present is worth less, I accept it and then I give it to my staff or send it to one of the hospitals in the area. If the gift is from a longtime friend, either I or my family will use it."

From The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

A MISS IN REPRESENTATION

NOR DOUBT the facts will be chasing after Senator McCarthy's misrepresentations for some time, but what a disarming and Governor Stevenson neatly pinned a truth on the Wisconsin rambler. The facts of the case provide further insight into the McCarthy method:

On Sept. 3 at Shorewood, Wis., McCarthy quoted from what he called a Justice Department "leak." He read that Communists had discussed plans to get forged passports from Communists employed in the State Department. The implication was plain that this was an official report on communism in that department.

This was about as far from the truth as McCarthy could get, or about 20 years distant. For as Governor Stevenson noted, the McCarthy quotation dealt with an incident in 1948, though McCarthy did not say so. Nor is that all.

Attorney General McGranery has explained

What could be simpler? It fixes a line, draws a distinction beyond which in the Senator's opinion, a gift becomes unacceptable.

Maybe it has its ridiculous aspects. Maybe it's about as high the RFC employee who said he would accept a ham that weighed up to 12 pounds, but not one that weighed over 10 pounds.

But at least it's a rule, and it strikes us as being a sensible one that ought to satisfy Senator Douglas's constituents as well as keep his conscience quiet.

The McCarthy quotation dealt with a statement by an ex-Communist he had met in a Russian agent in 1928, and discussed how to get Communists in the State Department and how to forge passports. There was no testimony to show the so-called plans were even more than a pipedream.

McCarthy mentions none of these facts, of course, nor the date. Presumably not even he would accuse the Coolidge Administration of harboring Communists. Presumably, that is.

Marriage is an institution where a man loses his bachelor's degree (and the woman loses her maiden's degree)—Dillon News.

'Just Pot Luck, You Know'



HEARST
FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

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.

Ike Support Shocking

THE News that the News will back Eisenhower was a shock to me and others like me. I run a barber shop, and hear what almost everyone thinks about a deal like you are pulling. How can you?

But bigtimers are always for the wrong man. Is it your editor or your paper who will back Ike? I know you won't print this but you will read it and in so doing find out how I and a lot more of your readers feel. I believe I must stop reading your paper.

—MONROE HOLLAND

Ike Stand Delighting

Editors, The News: I HAVE just read the news dispatch about your paper deciding to support Eisenhower for President.

It is good to find Americanism coming out of strong people who have the courage to change their mind. It is a good thing that you naturally feel in Charlotte.

One of our citizens, Bob Cruse, a chief, is in a half a block from your building and he is a former Charlotte man, raised there and lived there until a few years ago. He is delighted in your stand.

—WHIPPLE Y. CHESTER

Has Had Enough

Editors, The News: I SEE you are backing Eisenhower. Who will back you? Send your paper to "Old Ike." I do not want your paper.

—M. M. SHERRILL

God Bless Us

Editors, The News: PATRIOTIC papers like The Charlotte News, El Paso Times, Santa Rosa Press Democrat, Richmond News-Leader and Columbus Ledger place country above party. God bless all the editors.

—HORACE K. GARTSIDE

Sound Editorial

Editors, The News: YOUR answer to the question: "Adli or Ike?" on the editorial page of Thursday afternoon's News is my opinion. I am sure that every respect, I am certain such a forthright statement, coming as it has after months of careful consideration will be appreciated by the readers of your splendid paper.

W. HUGH HALLIBURTON.

McKlenburg History

Editors, The News: IN The News of Oct. 2, an error was made in regard to the rock wall and iron fence around the oldest Sugar Creek cemetery. It was the McKlenburg Declaration of Independence Church, DAR

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON

WAGE Stabilization Chairman Archibald Wood and therefore not in a position to speak with authority," declared Hopkins loftily.

"Well, I don't like it when somebody puts a gun to my head and says, 'You must do this or that' to our economy, or face a strike," about back Oct. "I also do not like having a wage agreement like this shoved at me, when both sides know that it is a violation of the Defense Act to make such a conclusive agreement without our approval."

Cox said that 13 cents of the proposed 26-cent-an-hour pay hike was "allowable" under Wage Board regulations, but added he would have to be shown some "real evidence" before he would approve the remaining 11 cents.

Industry Supports Lewis

HOWEVER, the Wage Board's eight industry and labor members were favorable to Lewis. They compose a majority of the board and can outvote Cox and his colleagues who represent the public.

Strangely enough, it was mine operator spokesman Harry Moses who made the strongest defense of the proposed pay hike, on the ground that the coal miners hadn't had a raise for "20 months." Moses also pleaded that the miners do not enjoy the "fringe" benefits—such as paid holidays—of workers in other industries.

However, Joseph Moody, spokesman for Southern operators, argued that the full wage increase would "murder my people."

There is asking for approval of the agreement, under

It's An Awful Grind To Run For The Presidency

BY MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

ONE thing both Presidential candidates must at the midpoint of this increasingly bitter and completely agree. That is that the campaign goes on much too long, and in its mounting demands, puts an almost intolerable burden on the two principals and the men immediately around them.

To test their nerves and discover good material for chieftains, certain American Indian tribes set up a course which contestants were to run with club and stone to make the going tougher. The Presidential campaign is the modern equivalent of this primitive running of the gamut.

It subjects the candidates, one of whom must soon take to the impossible burden of the Presidency, to serious physical strain. The current campaign has gone on longer than most and the demands in this era of television are much greater.

At the end of a long day in a motorcade or on the campaign with frequent stops and a half dozen talks, the candidate must in the evening face the television audience. He is expected to draw from \$50,000 to \$80,000 in being spent for the network. Far more important, he knows that in millions of homes across the country his manner, his air of confidence or the lack of it, his physical deportment are being closely scrutinized.

There is some reason to believe that the voting public, too, is getting fatigued by the talk-shows on week after week. Small turnouts were reported for Eisenhower in Salt Lake City and for Governor Stevenson in New Orleans. One of the latest surveys made for

the Eisenhower strategists is said to have shown that only between 10 and 11 per cent of the potential audience is listening to the speeches of the two candidates. The odds, and this percentage would naturally be much smaller for the lesser stars.

The thought is that the prolonged campaign is helping Stevenson, a comparative unknown, to put himself and his ideas across. He needs, as the reasoning goes, all the time he can get. But it is a dubious theory since the span of political attention in this country is short.

Surely some basic changes should be undertaken before another four years by. With the increasing use of television the campaign can be greatly forestalled. The two political contests would be held in the first and second weeks of September. The campaigning could then wait around the first election. This would leave about five weeks for an intensive effort, and surely that is long enough.

What is another forgotten in the heat of battle is that either Dwight Eisenhower or Adlai Stevenson in a few weeks faces some fearful decision. Theoretically there will be an interval for recuperation between Nov. 5 and January 20.

But unless the successful candidate and next President retires to some remote mountain fastness, and the loser retires to the Himalayas it is hard to say, he will be besieged by all kinds and conditions of office-seekers and policy-framers. They will bend his ear and twist his arm for a thousand and one purposes. For the victor, a new ordeal will be almost before the other one has ended.

Unchanged Eisenhower Still Has Principle, Political Innocence

By JOSEPH ALSOP

WITH THE EISENHOWER PARTY

THE important thing to realize about General Eisenhower's campaign is that a working theory lies behind it. In these last weeks, the General has said and done a good many things that have seemed out of character. He has gone so far, in fact, that Col. Robert M. McCormick, the bitter enemy of everything Eisenhower has been presumed to stand for, has now joyfully hailed "the new Eisenhower."

Yet if the Colonel understood this working theory being followed by the General, he would not be so joyful. He might not be so jubilant about the General's apparent transformation.

SPECTER OF DEFEAT

They argue that another Republican defeat will give Sen. Robert A. Taft and his party a new lease on the party machinery, if only by default. They argue further that the conservatives, even Senator Taft himself, will be quite unable to dominate this alleged Republican party. The men who are actually in the driver's seat, they say, will be the new breed of right-wing Republicans—men of the stature of Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy and Sen. William Jenner.

The truly words, "Fascist Party" have been known to be whispered in the inner recesses of the Eisenhower train. Men haunted by the specter of a new party, they are inclined to make sacrifices to expedience, in order to avoid the loss of the Eisenhower victory. They are so inclined to expedience, rightly or wrongly, seemed relatively safe to the Eisenhower strategists, that stopped the plane into the horrors of Ablett.

After a bad start, Eisenhower has become an incontinent public personality. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.

He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery. He is a man who is much admired, but as a man he remains a bit of a mystery.