THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

TUESDAY, JULY 1, 1952

IT'S TIME FOR MR. TRUMAN TO ACT

ON APRIL 9, President Truman said: "If steel production stops, we will have to stop making the shells and bombs that are going directly to our soldiers at the front in Korea."

On May 3, Mr. Truman said: "I can only say, on the considered advice of the officials in charge of our defense program, that the safety of our troops fighting in Korea, and the safety of our nation in the present world crisis, depend on the uninterrupted production of steel."

On June 11, Mr. Truman said: "The fact is that we need steel, not just for immediate combat requirements, but also for equipping all our armed forces—and to help equip those of our allies . . . These needs are very urgent . . . Consequently, we are faced with the imperative need for getting most, if not all, of the nation's steel mills back into production very promptly."

The steel strike began four weeks ago Monday. A week later, Mr. Truman asked Congress to, authorize him to seize the steel industry again, or to direct him to use the labor injunction procedure of the Taft-Hartley Act. Both houses of Congress defeated bills authorizing seizure; both have passed bills "requesting" Mr. Truman to use Taft-Hartley.

The Supreme Court tagged Congress the responsible branch of government in the field of labor legislation. Rightly or wrongly, Congress has made its intentions clear.

Mr. Truman argued that the emergency justified seizure of the steel industry. The emergency is greater now, after four lost weeks of steel production, and justifies his taking the course authorized by Congress. His failure to act borders on criminal negligence.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR TV AND RADIO

OVERSHADOWED by the election campaign of which it is a part is an interesting and important battle for equal press coverage rights, being waged by television and radio.

In several recent instances the visual and audible media have not been accorded the privileges given newspapers and magazines. Their equipment is barred from the Supreme Court, Congress and some committee hearings. Some Taft supporters hope to exclude these newer media from the hearings on disputed delegates beginning today.

The issue is not simply a matter of freedom of the press. The right of privacy is involved, and we sympathize with witnesses before Congressional committees who are unnerved by the noises, glare and heat of the accouterments of today's complete journalists.

At least one newspaper reporter finds another fault with the intruding paraphernalia of his co-workers. Alistair Cooke, describing Eisenhower's Abilene press conference to *Manchester Guardian* readers, decried the "continuous electronic hullabaloo kept up by the television, newsreel and radio people and the disturbing forked lightning of the photographers".

"The General shouted into a bouquet of microphones, the reporters scribbled what they could, while the bulbs popped, the cameras whined and creaked, the newsreel crews hopped and roved all over the place."

Unfortunately, he said, this broke "the intimacy between the man and his audience."

Undoubtedly it did. But, as is attested by those who have witnessed this and other press conferences or Secretary of State Acheson's appearance on TV at San Francisco during the Japanese peace treaty conference, TV also does establish an intimacy between the man and his audience which the written or spoken word alone cannot do. A man's fine points and foibles are frankly portrayed by the candid camera.

That is as should be. The public officials and candidates for public office have a responsibility to the electorate which seems to outweigh that portion of their right of privacy which deals with conduct of public business. We suspect the pencil reporters and public officials can inure themselves to electronic nuisances just as they have become used to other sights and sounds of our civilization.

The shenanigans expected of Congressmen, should their sessions be televised and broadcast, may well be offset by increased legislative efficiency after the camera shows row after row of empty seats during an important vote, or the time-consuming non-electric voting. TV can generate an interest in public affairs which other media find difficult to do, and this could result in more interest in written, as well as viewed news.

And in all, we believe the proponents of extended TV and radio coverage have a valid case. Legislators, who must provide for many such extensions, should be as susceptible to public pressure on this issue as they are in other matters.

THE MAP TELLS THE STORY

SOUTHERN Democrats who continue to wail because they've been getting the back of the hand from Mr. Truman will profit by a close study of the election record map elsewhere on this page today. It shows, more vividly than words can tell, that the Democratic Party of Roosevelt and Truman is a national party, and that no longer can the South expect to control its councils and determine its policies.

In 1920, 1924, and 1928, the South was the bulwark of the Democratic Party. Most of the party's electoral votes came from the South. That, plus a two-thirds rule at the national convention, gave Dixie a strong voice in party affairs.

Roosevelt swept the nation in 1932 and again in 1936, and maintained most of his geographical strength in 1940 and 1944. The acid test came in 1948. The experts had counted Mr. Truman out, but he won his battle for re-election, even though four Southern states gave their electoral votes to the Dixiecrats. And, significantly, Truman lost only one state in the Far West, six in the Middle West, and a handful of New England states.

If it develops this year that the Democratic candidate or platform or both are unacceptable to the South, no good purpose will be served by further complaining. The Democratic Party of 1952 is a national party. It is firmly entrenched. While it would like to have the South's continued loyalty, it will not jeopardize its strength in other areas just to buy Dixie support.

BLUE REDS

THE FRENCH REDS may well feel blue these days, what with Government crackdowns, little success at the polls, and their boss in jail. But they may be more blue soon. Gendarmes have been instructed to "spray participants in any future demonstration with a penetrating blue dye, which they will find almost impossible to wash off."

We wonder now what effect this will have. Will true blue Reds scorn their uncolored comrades' With a died-in-the-wool Red, well-sprayed, turn purple? Or—horrors!—will they be mistaken, after a colorful demonstration, for the old Irish Fascist Blue Shirts? Perhaps the Bi-Color will become the flag of battle-tested French Communists, and "Blue Star", "New Blue Masses" added to the Communist vocabulary.

The end result, though, should be good. There is not room for much classification between parlor pink and radical Red, and the broadened spectrum may help illuminate the many nuances of French politics.

From The Asheville Citizen

P's, Q's And R's

"WE HAVE been greatly disturbed," says the *Greensboro Daily News*, drawing a deep breath, "by the special causes and particularist programs which have been dumped upon the schools, the strain and burden to which they subject school personnel, the inroads which they make upon school time, which after all is only 30-odd hours, or five-day week over a nine months period, and the effect which they have upon the basic assignment which the schools at least used to have."

In three words, so are we. Our Guilford contemporary finds itself unable to go along with the proposition made at an education seminar on Facts About Alcohol at Chapel Hill, that alcohol education ought to be a part of the public school curriculum.

The curriculum certainly is over-cluttered now. Little or none of the blame belongs with theories of progressive education. Rather, the fault lies with lay pressure groups.

Alcoholism of course is a disease. Men of distinction and other slick-papered germ carriers do enough, goodness knows, to educate for alcohol. But like other excesses, the excessive use of alcohol should be fought in the home. If not, then why not have in the schools courses combating the over-use of tobacco, sugar candy, green apples and the over-eating that produces heart strain?

If schoolmen don't resist the trend—in which resistance we are always willing and anxious to encourage them—the Three R's can be pushed clean out of the curriculum in favor of courses in doing things or not doing things which are better taught where hearth and home bear the fundamental responsibility. Indeed, there is some fear that the P's and Q's have made the R's as obsolete as McGuffey's wonderful readers.

Perhaps the kangaroo was a primitive, sketchy attempt on the part of the Nature (foreseeing a future need) to design a safe pedestrian.—*Asheville (N. C.) Citizen.*

The difference between an agriculturist and a farmer is usually the former has a station wagon.—*Rocky Mount (N. C.) Evening Telegram.*

Ruark Caught Himself A Fish So Now He's Hooked For Life

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW BRUNSWICK, Canada HEAVEN help us all, father has a new vice, and it seems likely to become worse than all the other time-wasters, money-wasters and work-wasters he has managed to pursue in a misspent life. To now I have always sneered at fishing. That was before I broke into the scaly pastime with a 20-pound Atlantic salmon on a fragile rod.

Just call me Izaak for short and Walton for long, because I been bit real bad. In past I been bit real bad by horses, dice, shotguns, anything that Abercrombie and Fitch peddles, and dogs. It seems likely now that my substance will be squandered on Hardy rods and exotically named salmon flies, and I will dwell forever in the north woods while wife and family starve.

A REAL EXPERIENCE

A man's first salmon is a heady thing. It is rather like being tied onto a tornado. Since the Restigouche River is stiff with determined salmon, I have ridden several whirlwinds lately. Any salmon over 10 pounds on a light rod is roughly like tackling a tiger with a 22, or so it seems when you've hung onto him.

One of the reasons I care for salmon, unsmoked, is that it does not take a great deal of talent to enter into a brawl with one. It is sort of like wandering into a Third Avenue bar on Friday night and making a series of anti-Irish remarks. There was a recent instance on the St. John River when a deaf and dumb amateur, using impromptu tackle, killed five salmon whilst seven completely equipped experts amassed a total of zero.

Already you will notice the snobbish touch creeping in. We use the word "kill" when speaking of salmon, instead of "caught," or "took," or "boated". In a day's time I speak learnedly of grilse and smolt — not smelt — and parrs, all of which denote age and size groups of fish recently met only in cans.

I am real glib, also, about salmon flies called such improbable names as Black Dose and Brown Dairy, which seem to be attractive to big fish, and will conform to custom on Jock Scotts and Silver Wilkinsons. But it is my private opinion that salmon will go for old cigarette butts and fragments of Kleenex, since at this time they do not strike from hunger. They strike from annoyance and ill temper. This is the only non-human creature I ever met with a disposition to equal mine.

The salmon liar is the greatest sporting liar I have yet met, in that he outdoes the quail liar, the girl liar, the liquor liar and the horseplaying liar. A bunch of us amateurs are up here with a professional fish-and-game writer named Ray Trullinger, who was the only man not to come in with a fish on the first day.

IT GOT AWAY

All the neophytes came in with a fish, but Mr. Trullinger came in with an improbable story about being involved with a large rock. He said the large rock lost him a fish which would have topped anything we fetched in by several pounds.

Since Mr. Trullinger did not even see the fish — he admitted later under Chinese torture of particular intensity — and since he did not even gaff a small sliver of rock, you may understand how his testimony was hooted down by the triumphant majority. At the moment we are thinking of setting him up as United Nations correspondent while giving his old job to Mr. William Philip Simms, the emeritus foreign editor. Mr. Simms is pure hell on salmon.

There is a peculiar viciousness about salmon fishing that is most appealing. People who catch salmon delight in burning the feet and soul of people who do not catch salmon. Poor Mr. Trullinger has not suffered so exquisitely since somebody put a live yearling bear in bed with him, in a spirit of camaraderie.

To prove how a fish degrades man, I will say this: The 20-pound salmon I caught did not weigh 20 pounds. He weighed 19 pounds. Well, eighteen pounds, anyhow, but I like to think I wore a lot of weight off him before we slung him into the canoe. You see?

Election Record

The maps show which states gave electoral votes to the several parties from 1920 through 1948.

'You See How The Americans Double-Cross Us?'

Tantrum Touched Off

Ives Report Worries Taft

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

SENATOR Robert A. Taft's biggest tantrum to date was touched off last week by his fellow Republican and long-time colleague, Senator Irving Ives. The trouble started with a report that Senator Ives did not want to run for re-election in New York on a Republican ticket headed by Senator Taft as Presidential nominee.

Senator Taft was extra touchy that morning, because the Gallup poll had just forecast that he would be badly beaten by almost any Democrat, whereas a by Democrat would be heavily defeated by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. At any rate, when reporters asked the Ohio Senator about the reluctance of Ives to run on the same ticket with him, he took off like a flushed partridge. He denounced Senator Ives, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and Dr. George Gallup for 30 minutes by the clock, without pausing for breath.

SENATOR IVES

Among other things, Senator Taft furiously attacked the report about Senator Ives as mere "Dewey propaganda." In this, at least, Senator Taft erred.

In the first place, Senator Ives' relationship with Governor Dewey can best be described as friendly but remote. Dewey did not want to run Ives for the Senatorship six years ago. Ives was nominated because of his personal and independent strength among New York Republicans. Both men still vividly recall these important facts. All the amenities are preserved, but neither the Governor nor the Senator makes propaganda for the other.

In the second place, Ives very definitely does not want to run on the same ticket with Senator Taft, for the extremely simple reason that he thinks he would be beaten. And this is true although, man for man, Ives is probably the strongest Senatorial candidate in either of the major parties in New York State. In fact, young Franklin Roosevelt is now resisting pressure to accept the Democratic Senatorial nomination, partly because he does not hanker to make the race against Ives.

Ives' Problem In A Nutshell

Ives has put his problem quickly and plainly to a great many of his friends. The minimum normal Democratic majority in New York is now around 500,000 votes by his estimate, in which almost all other experts concur. With Senator Taft as Republican Presidential nominee, Ives thinks that the upstate Republicans would come out to vote in larger numbers than usual. But he also thinks that the Democrats would vote absolutely solidly against Senator Taft. He is sure that many Eisenhower-minded Republicans would desert their party. And he is also sure that most of the crucial independent voters (scorned by Taft as mere mugwumps) would join the Democrats.

In these circumstances, Ives forecasts that the margin gained by Senator Taft among the orthodox upstate Republicans would amount to less than nothing, when balanced against his losses. In short, although extremely confident of his own standing in the state, Ives believes Taft would lose New York by such a heavy majority that he would bring down the rest of the Republican ticket in his own ruin.

"All you have to do is add," is the leitmotiv of Ives' talks with those close to him. "Our party just can't carry New York, or California, or a lot of other states we've got to carry for that matter, unless we pick a Presidential nominee who wil lbe strong with the independents and have some appeal to the many discontented Democrats. We can do it with Ike, but we can't do it with Bob Taft."

Hence Ives now definitely wants to bow out if Taft is the Republican standard bearer. His personal interests are all on the side of doing so, since a losing campaign will be a huge wasted investment of money and effort, and he can easily move from the Senate into a distinguished and profitable private job. It must be added, however, that party loyalty may overcome Ives' own desires and interests. With his personal strength in New York, Ives would help his party to retain its control of the State Senate, even though defeated himself. He has also told friends that if Governor Dewey and the other party leaders press him to run again for this reason, he "hardly knows what he will do."

Ives' Silence Speaks Volumes

SINCE these views of his began to be known, Ives has said nothing for quotation except a prim "no comment." This, in itself, speaks volumes. There is no doubt whatever that the foregoing is an accurate summary of the New York Senator's attitude and opinions.

Maybe Senator Taft is right and Senator Ives is wrong. Maybe Senator Taft is right and Dr. Gallup is wrong. Maybe Senator Taft can win nationally by the kind of campaign he waged in Ohio, although it would have been gross flattery to call his Ohio opponent a political zombie.

But it is still fairly meaningful that at least 90 per cent of Senator Taft's support comes from the rockbound Republican states and the Southern rotten boroughs, whereas the Republicans in the vital swing states all but unanimously oppose the Taft candidacy.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

GOP Tries To Trap Truman On Controls

WASHINGTON

IN Republican cloakrooms on Capitol Hill where they really let their hair down in hot weather, the GOP strategy on price control was discussed something like this:

"If we pass a weak price control bill, Truman will veto it. Then if prices rise, we can blame him for having no price controls at all.

"Or, if we pass a weak bill and Truman doesn't veto it, it will be impossible of enforcement and Truman will get the blame for not keeping prices down. So its heads we win, tails the Democrats lose."

This is a raw way of putting it, but in an election year, strategy can be pretty raw indeed. And this raw-boned strategy has influenced many GOP Congressmen, despite the following none-too-happy factors on the economic horizon:

1. Prices are now at an all-time high.

2. The dumping of a large amount of Government securities on the market will certainly lead to more inflation.

3. Business is experiencing a new upturn after being in the semi-doldrums for some time.

4. Defense orders, which haven't been placed in nearly as large a volume as the Pentagon would have you believe, are now reaching a peak. This is where controls create the greatest national saving.

Note—Though Republicans may be to blame for the present stymie on controls, the Administration wasted priceless time immediately after the Korean War started when it did not take advantage of a price control act handed it by Congress.

Pan American Airways Gravy

Certain Congressmen tried to camouflage it, but the House Interstate & Foreign Commerce Committee voted out an airline subsidy bill the other day that was exactly what Pan American Airways had ordered. The effect was the same as if the Congressmen had voted to shift $17,000,000 a year from the taxpayers' pockets to Pan Am's treasury.

The bill had been greased to slip through Congress early in June, as the result of a preliminary 16 to 1 vote. However, when this column exposed the amazing backstage wire pulling by the Pan Am lobby, it threw the committee into an uproar and delayed the bill for a few weeks. The publicity resulted in seven Congressmen switching their votes, but failed to stop the Pan Am subsidy which was adopted by a secret 14 to 8 vote.

Because of the bad publicity, the Congressmen took the precaution of doctoring up the bill with amendments, so it wouldn't resemble the original Pan Am bill too closely. But beneath the fancy language, it still means $17,000,000 to Pan American Airways.

The bill pretends to separate airmail pay from Government subsidy, but instead of basing mail pay on the cost plus a reasonable profit, the bill pegs the mail carrying charges at an inflated, arbitrary rate. Result is that Pan Am would draw an extra $17,000,000 a year, and the public would be deceived into thinking this was fair compensation for carrying the mails.

Pan Am's publicity experts have been putting out the story that they are entitled to the extra mail subsidy in order to pay for defense features that the airlines have been asked to build into 231 planes. The truth is, however, that the cost of defense modification is paid by an extra $70,000,000 direct from the Air Force. Not one cent for this comes out of air mail subsidies. No matter how you look at it, the inflated subsidies are still gravy. Instead of financing defense features in planes, these subsidies really contribute to the plush salaries paid to airline executives, the fancy parties thrown for Congressmen, and orchids given to lady passengers.

The Secret Vote

CHAIRMAN Robert Crosser, Ohio Democrat, was so concerned over the committee's earlier bad publicity received in this column, that he issued a strict warning against leaking out the secret vote. Nevertheless, here is how each member voted: those for Pan Am were: Democrats—Priest of Tennessee, Harris of Arkansas, Rogers of Florida, Stanley of Virginia, and Roberts of Alabama; Republicans—Hinshaw of California, Hall of New York, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale of Maine, Doliver of Iowa, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Chenoweth of Colorado, and Beamer of Indiana.

Those voting against Pan Am were: Democrats Klein of New York, Granahan of Pennsylvania, Williams of Mississippi, Thornberry of Texas, Heller of New York, and Moulder of Missouri; plus two Republicans, Wolverton of New Jersey and Heselton of Massachusetts.

Perverted Economy

ONE of the most amazing comments was made by Congressman Beamer, who votes for tremendous economy cuts that have no chance of passing. In answer to the argument that the Pan Am bill would cost the Government $29,000,000 extra a year ($17,000,000 going to Pan Am, the rest to other airlines), Beamer snorted: "I don't think $29,000,000 is much of a saving."

No matter how much they try to disguise the fact, the Congressmen knew they were voting against the taxpayers and for Pan Am. They may discover in November, however, that the taxpayers have more votes than Pan Am.