



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1952

The News Will Back Eisenhower For United States Presidency

PRIOR to the July national convention of the Republican Party, *THE NEWS* strongly supported Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower for the GOP nomination. We set forth our reasons as early as Jan. 8 of this year, and everything that happened between that date and the opening of the convention strengthened our conviction that Eisenhower was the ablest man in the Republican Party.

Two weeks later, the Democrats held their national convention. Though the convention system has many shortcomings, it met the test of the times once again. In Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois, the Democrats found the ablest candidate in their party and gave to him the assignment of winning the Presidency.

Though our endorsement of Eisenhower had been limited to the campaign for the nomination, we had hoped, and expected, that he would win through Nov. 4. The nomination of Stevenson gave us pause. Like any other honest, open-minded independent voter, *THE NEWS* has delayed making a decision in the Presidential campaign until it could reassess the situation in the light of the Stevenson candidacy. It has now done so. *THE NEWS* favors the election of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower to the Presidency of the United States.

AT THE OUTSET, let us say that Governor Stevenson is a man of ability and courage. If the Democratic Party wins again in November, it will be far better than had it been since 1945. Were it simply a question of choosing between the two individuals, Eisenhower and Stevenson, in more normal times, *THE NEWS* would be in a real quandary. Both men have qualities that fit them for the Presidency.

But times are not normal, and the issues in the election are far graver than a decision between personalities. The great issues, as we see them, are three-fold. We shall take them up in the order of their importance.

Unity, Faith In Leaders Needed In Current Crisis

The great historical forces at play in the past half-century, including the Russian Revolution, the Chinese Revolution, and the American Civil War, have thrust America to the front of the world stage against the will of the American people and before they were ready, intellectually and emotionally, to take the role. The role is not the hard fact remains that foreign affairs are the dominant influence on our political and economic life today. What happens in Iran or Korea or Indo-China may have sharper impact on Main Street, U. S. A., than any purely domestic action the President or the Congress could take. Our taxes, the drafting of our young men, economic control, the size of the budget, our very survival as a nation—all these are in the hands of the government. It is the decisive exercise of our new, unwanted and awesome position of world responsibility.

Because we, as a people, are not yet ready for our role in history, the calibre of our national leadership, and the degree of unity behind that leadership and confidence in it, are of paramount importance. We are to avoid disaster. In general, *THE NEWS* has agreed with the basic objectives and many of the mechanics of the Truman foreign policy, beginning with the extension of military aid to Greece and Turkey and continuing through the historic decision to intervene in Korea. And in the sense that the greater part of the free world has been preserved, reasonably intact, that policy has succeeded, in spite of the frequent improvisations.

But the all-important requirement of uniting the American people, making them understand what our foreign policy is and why, and enlisting their unyielding support to the point of hard sacrifice and steadfast determination, the Truman Administration has failed. And it has failed because the American people do not have the implicit confidence in their leadership that must be the very core of our security.

The written record of General Eisenhower's views on foreign policy shows that he is fully alert and responsive to the historic significance of America's role in the world. He is a man of decision, with positive ideas on foreign policy and invaluable experience in the field. His tremendous popularity in the field will enable him to unite the American people with their confidence in the perilous months ahead. Without unity and confidence, no U. S. foreign policy, however sound, will succeed.

Unity Of The Free World Best Brake On Communism

If unity at home is essential, unity among the free nations and confidence in U. S. leadership is equally essential to success in the struggle against Russian imperialism. Without the strategic resources of the free world, without its manpower and industrial potential, without the bases that now stretch across the globe, and without the moral power of free nations, the United States

could not hope to win a long diplomatic struggle with Soviet Russia, much less a war. To solidify the unity of the free world and to spur the enthusiasm of our allies for the principle of collective security are among the most challenging tasks that the next President will face.

Here, once again, the magic qualities of leadership and total personality are all-important. Churchill rallied England in her hour of greatest peril. Roosevelt's big voice and lofty idealism inspired the whole world to do battle against the Nazis and the Fascists and then to join in the United Nations. For all of his good qualities, and they are more than he is given credit for, President Truman has lowered the prestige of the American Presidency in the eyes of the world. It must be lifted again, immediately and dramatically. The Eisenhower name is known and respected throughout the free world (and in Soviet Russia, too). He has been tested in the crucible of great decisions, and he has emerged as a man of courage and conviction. We believe, to wield the free world together so firmly that no threat will part the seams.

Changes Of Stewardship Bring New Men And Ideas

Finally, the third great issue in this election is imbedded in the very foundation of our system of government. It is, simply, the preservation of two responsible parties and the infusion into government of new men and new ideas that results from recurring changes of stewardship.

Left too long in power, a majority party grows tired, indecisive, petulant, and callous to public opinion. It becomes too-heavy with mediocre people. It develops irreconcilable factions which constantly quarrel and shatter any semblance of party discipline or responsibility. Its morality becomes sleazy, its ethics subverted. Just as minority parties need the sobering stambush of authority, so majority parties need the exhortation and occasional defeat. Without both, the independent voters of the nation are deprived of a real choice between two vigorous parties.

Even so, change per se is not enough. It must be a change for the better. There are men in the Republican Party with whom we might agree before we vote. There are men in the Democratic Party with whom we shall do battle again if they seek to use their support in this election as a club over their candidate's head, should he win in November. It was against these men that we sought prior to Chicago. Though Mr. Eisenhower has made some concessions to them, we have no doubt that the more positive and more progressive wing of the Republican Party will shape party policies if victory is theirs in November, and we are confident that the responsibility of authority will temper the irresponsibility and negativity that are usually the trademarks of a party too long out of power.

Collaterally, the Eisenhower candidacy offers an opportunity, unexcelled since the Civil War, to build a strong two-party system in the South and the border region from the shackles of one-party rule.

ON DOMESTIC POLICY, General Eisenhower has a fine old rugged philosophy that accepts the basic changes in our society of the last 20 years but resists further proposals for extending the sway of the Federal Government over the lives of the American people. He is no muckraker. He is a middle-of-the-roader, and he expounds that difficult way eloquently and convincingly. He has said that he will continue the Federal program with an "is this trip necessary?" attitude, and he promises that functions of government will be returned to the state and local level whenever possible.

Eisenhower places a high value on the soundness of the American dollar. He understands that a better balance between labor and management, between the farmer and the consumer, between the producer and the white collar worker is needed. He has not, and he will not, seek the support of special interest groups at the expense of the nation's welfare.

Finally, he is a man of deep religious faith, who holds that the simple virtues of honesty, integrity, frugality and courage should have a place in the 20th Century. His faith in America and his anger against those who would destroy it from without or subvert it from within are both inspiring in their character, plus his exceptional skill as an administrator and diplomat, all qualify him for the Presidency. Under his leadership, we are confident, the United States will emerge from these normal times into a brighter future and move into a clearer and brighter future.

It has been the history of our nation that great men came to the front in times of peril. Dwight Eisenhower is such a man, and we give him our endorsement with full faith that he merits it.



People's Platform

Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editors. The News reserves the right to condense.

'Bought' Votes

Editors, *THE NEWS*:
WHILE all the political talk is going on and our like to make two suggestions for constitutional amendments. These, I believe, would be first and major steps in re-establishing a true and equitable democracy in this country.

First, I suggest that all persons (excepting Civil Service and the armed forces) who live off government checks or who derive a major part of their income from the government should be disfranchised. This would apply mainly to the "Rocking Chair Crowd" and the employees of the bureaucrats. Remember, no matter which political party is "in," the votes of these people are already bought and paid for—not with the taxpayers' money, but with the taxpayers' money. It is not illegal to buy votes no matter where the money comes from.

Second: Forbid all closed or union shops. Let all working men be free and independent again. Those of you in favor, vote by clipping this letter and mailing to your Senator.

—RALPH N. JONES

National Anthem Overworked

Editors, *THE NEWS*:
MR. David Elms, waving a personal political halo in his letter, has expressed dismay over the fact that the national anthem did not precede the Central-Tech football game Sept. 27.

Mr. Elms holds that the Star Spangled Banner should always be played at such occasions. The sentiment with its implied compulsion, is however carrying the matter too far.

Rendition of this particular song is largely a case of tradition with some basis, but is not a consistent practice with all schools, and there is no record of any having suffered worse for it. There is a growing opinion among both youth and adults that playing of the national anthem at public gatherings is greatly overworked. That sincerity of sentiment respecting it has been lost, and serves primarily to afford self-styled patriots with opportunity to make a show of stiff-legged stance and a sacrosanct look.

For the most part people forget it was ever played five minutes afterward, and a great many are so absorbed with other interests that they never hear it when it is played. What possible good, under these circumstances, would playing the song be?

There is a time and place that the national anthem is appropriate. Football games, however, do not necessarily qualify any more than a horse-shoe game or potato sack race.

RUTH BLACK

Cursing A Sign Of Weakness

Editors, *THE NEWS*:
ON the feature page of Oct. 2 I read the article by Eric Brandeis. In this article Mr. Brandeis declares that it is a compulsion to both Eisenhower and the writer to use the word "damn" in their political speeches. He indicates that a man who does not use these words is a mouse rather than a lion.

I believe many good Christian people will re-

sent this kind of talk. I certainly do. To use profanity is not a sign of strength but a sign of weakness, for cursing only comes from the devil and the devil is always a slave to the devil. Those who do not use it are the stronger and not overcome by the devil. It might help Mr. Brandeis to remember that the father of our country, George Washington, did not use profanity and we declared that it was a shame for a man in the army to use it.

If this country needs anything, it needs men in places of leadership who are Christian. In my estimation, neither Eisenhower nor Stevenson is fit to lead us to be a better people. Talk about "damn" in Washington, I can't understand anything, we have a "mess" everywhere we look, with the country soaked in liquor. Looks like some candidate would come out against this terrible traffic. My prayer is that God will give us leaders that will respect God and not stoop to the low everyday trend of using profanity and taking a cheap shot.

R. J. ESSARY

Backs Littlejohn

Editors, *THE NEWS*:
WE in North Carolina are all anxious to see how the Nov. 4 election turns out. In five weeks we, the voters, will have enough to vote, can make our voices heard by voting.

There is another election that will be held on Oct. 15 in this election it will be decided whether the Union of Distributive Processors & Office Workers of America, Inc., will take over as bargaining agent for the employees of a certain business establishment here in Charlotte. It has already been in four other establishments.

Before you say "Who cares?" let me tell you a little about the DPWA. A Senate Committee has said that it is dominated by Communists. In New York, where this union originated, it made the same rash promise that it was making to unsuspecting employees here. Naturally, since they had no intention of keeping these promises, there was violence. They have only given him the ground, we, as ordinary citizens, will not be able to vote in this election, but we can make our voices heard by writing to Chief Littlejohn and our Representatives in Congress. We should let Chief Littlejohn know that we support him in his fight and that we are not too busy to do it. It is about time for more of us to start fighting for what we think is right even if we only write a letter.

MRS. PATRICIA ALEXANDER

We have one man in Charlotte who is fighting. That man is Chief Littlejohn. He is fighting a one-man battle in trying to keep this union out of Charlotte. He has appealed to Washington for help. They have only given him the ground, we, as ordinary citizens, will not be able to vote in this election, but we can make our voices heard by writing to Chief Littlejohn and our Representatives in Congress. We should let Chief Littlejohn know that we support him in his fight and that we are not too busy to do it. It is about time for more of us to start fighting for what we think is right even if we only write a letter.

MRS. PATRICIA ALEXANDER

Quote, Unquote

If you want people to slap you on the back, do something worthwhile, or get a bad sunburn.—Kingpost (Tenn.) Times.

Co-operation will solve many problems. Even freckles would be a nice tan if they could ever get together.—Dallas (Ga.) News.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

ABOARD PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S TRAIN
HARRY TRUMAN has been riding past country that he knows well, and it has been a merry-go-round. Outside his train window the all-time fields of Utah lay green and prosperous as he passed pick-up balers, and farmers who could not afford a year ago, leaving a trail of green wheat behind them. In California, a stack upon stack of wheat straw dotted the fields. At Provo, a new steel mill, built by the Government when private industry refused to take the risk, has brought new prosperity.

Water seems more plentiful this year, and in some areas it has been brought down from the mountains by dams and reclamation projects pioneered by the Truman or Roosevelt Administrations.

Yes, the Far West smiles on Harry Truman both politically and economically. It smiles, but it isn't too sure. It doesn't give him the noisy demonstrations that the crowds give Eisenhower, and the President in turn doesn't seem to give them the fire-and-brimstone, skin-emative oratory that Ike delivers from the rear platform. Sometimes he does, but he doesn't follow a general pattern.

However, though the crowds are big and the faces friendly you detect an undercurrent of Republicanism in these normally Democratic states. It's hard to put your finger on it, but it's there. It's there partly because the sun is smiling economically. There isn't any workers' and farmers' fear of secur-

ity. And in that respect, Harry Truman's reclamation, the new steel mill, the price supports perhaps may help defeat his own political defeat. Perhaps the only reason is the desire for a change. People aren't particularly swayed by oratorical bombast on either side, and many are at all enthusiastic about Eisenhower. And they know about him. They know except the he's a little big-brother. But above all they want a change.

Nixon Undercut Warren

REPUBLICAN leaders are not happy over the fact that California's popular Gov. Earl Warren welcomed President Truman when the President's train entered the state, and that he is inviting both Stevenson and Eisenhower to speak from the steps of the State Capitol.

However, Governor Warren is not only always elected by a large segment of Democratic votes, but he has no political enemies. He is the favorite of the State Capital.

It was Senator Nixon, a member of the California delegation, who bored from within at the Chicago convention in order to swing Warren's own delegation over to the Eisenhower side. Nixon's senior California colleague was taken on the mountain-top by Senator Taft and offered the full weight of the Taft delegation for President if Taft were elected. Nixon's own delegation, however, had to deliver the California delegation on the first ballot.

Seldom has a young man been so severely tested. But Senator Nixon remained loyal to his friend, Governor Warren.

'N'Carthy Book On Marshall Full Of Slurs About Ike

By MARQUIS CHILDS

IF General Eisenhower is to do his homework before his meeting with Wisconsin's Sen. Joe McCarthy, he may have read the paper-back edition of "America's Retreat From Victory. The Story of George Catlett Marshall." This is a long book, available in paperback for 50 cents, and it is full of slurs about the President.

McCarthy himself points out, in the book, that he is not actually calling for a Marshall a traitor. But anyone can make the deduction from the way in which McCarthy slurs the way in which the book is written that the author is actually calling for a Marshall a traitor.

In the McCarthy book nine references to Eisenhower are listed in the index. He refers to Eisenhower "who invariably sided with Marshall" in opposing the Italian invasion and thereby, in McCarthy's view, "helped to bring about the capture by the Reds. He speaks of Eisenhower as 'Marshall's firm supporter.'" He says that "Eisenhower proposed to Stalin" the line in Germany when the American army would be withdrawn. He also refers to Eisenhower as "a traitor" after consultation with Marshall.

In discussion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Eisenhower is made to appear as either a dupe or a victim. McCarthy refers to adoption of "the suicidal strategy of opposing American and British troops to the Russian on the undefended plains of Central Europe." That is the strategy for which Eisenhower is the enthusiastic advocate and instrument.

In the foreseeable future Eisenhower and McCarthy may clash. But McCarthy is a betting man. He might even carry to the country against Eisenhower in the White House on the eve of the presidential victory. That may sound fantastic, but then almost everything about McCarthy's rise to power is a fantasy.

In the foreseeable future Eisenhower and McCarthy may clash. But McCarthy is a betting man. He might even carry to the country against Eisenhower in the White House on the eve of the presidential victory. That may sound fantastic, but then almost everything about McCarthy's rise to power is a fantasy.

In the foreseeable future Eisenhower and McCarthy may clash. But McCarthy is a betting man. He might even carry to the country against Eisenhower in the White House on the eve of the presidential victory. That may sound fantastic, but then almost everything about McCarthy's rise to power is a fantasy.

JUDGING by reports that the Republican leader is at least pretending to feel the same concern for Harry S. Truman's campaigning that he was so mistakenly felt four years ago, judging by the President's observation, however, the Republican would be better off to take the advice of one of the California Democrats.

McCarthy will carry short, was the way this Democratic politico summed up his reaction to the President's remarks. McCarthy's political speech here in Oakland, ironically enough, Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, who has a distinct tendency to sell Harry short, is now very long on Harry short.

Exactly what must be said to pallid view Stevenson and his advisors formerly took of the President's whistle-stopping. This earlier view was so naive that it was reflected in the physical circumstances of the President's stoppage trip across the country. Truman is traveling with an allocation of National Democratic funds but sufficient to pay for his train. No appropriation has been provided for national radio or television coverage of his campaign. His broadcasts, such as that from Oakland, are being locally financed.

McCarthy's own efforts, in his odd body himself, has been to make the President himself, in his efforts to reach this city, Truman, being in San Francisco, he had a call put through to Springfield. Stevenson was produced in his own right, and admiration and gratitude to the President. He begged the President to visit San Francisco and to stay right on pouring it on the Republicans, until election day. He indicated that his efforts would be made to find additional cash, in order to put the President on the spot.

In short, Truman, who was once to be kept in the background, is now being given a great role in this puzzling campaign. It is a change of Democratic strategy is a piece of folly. But in the Oakland speech, as at the time of his arrival along Truman's route through the northwest, you could see why Stevenson and his aides no longer regard Truman as a major asset.

In the first place, the President has been changed by the change in his own situation. As a leader about to lay down his burden, he is casual, more relaxed, and much more eloquent. He does not make the same words. He no longer seems merely pugnacious. He is humorous and homesy. His timing is good. He can

Nixon, however, didn't. He cut Warren, got the Vice Presidency.

Off-Record Remark Hurt

ANOTHER reason why the Governor of California isn't overly happy about the GOP ticket is some remarks which Eisenhower made about him when visiting in San Francisco two years ago.

Governor Warren had the courage to take a firm stand against the witch-hunters on the Board of Regents of the University of California and against the faculty club that would deliver back into the entire life of every professor. Though his stand was unpopular, Warren backed by the Board of Regents and the faculty club that would deliver back into the entire life of every professor. Though his stand was unpopular, Warren backed by the Board of Regents and the faculty club that would deliver back into the entire life of every professor.

Naturally the remark got back to Warren. It is his knowledge of the remark that has hurt him to a friend, "that the General made his remark off the record so it would not be quoted in the East. For he and President Eisenhower were the first to take a public stand against loyalty oaths."