THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

THURSDAY, AUGUST 28, 1952

DULLES' SCORE: ONE HIT, ONE ERROR

JOHN FOSTER DULLES, who may inherit Dean Acheson's tough job if Eisenhower wins the November election, made a speech on foreign policy this week. Two points in the speech merit further discussion in the forthcoming campaign.

The first was Dulles theory that Soviet communism can "be disintegrated from within" by "passive resistance, slow-downs and non-co-operation". The United States, he said, should contribute to the cracking-up process by symbolizing freedom and by giving moral and material support to those who seek liberty.

General Eisenhower voiced the same idea when he told the American Legion that he would notify Russia that "never shall we desist in our aid to every man and woman of those shackled lands who seeks refuge with us, who keeps burning among his own people the flame of freedom, who is dedicated to the liberation of his fellows."

This is an appealing idea. It is positive. It expresses what should be, but what has not always been a guiding principle of U. S. foreign policy, i. e., the Anglo-Saxon traditions of men's equality and individual freedom are the truly revolutionary political ideas of our time, and we should be promoting them everywhere with missionary zeal.

Furthermore, it is a realistic idea. Our people are painfully aware of the stresses and strains within the free world, but we often forget that behind the Iron Curtain there must be even greater stresses and strains. One of these is clearly the disaffection of millions of people in the satellite nations. It may well be that the free world has agents within the satellite nations prying away at the cracks in the Soviet empire. Such operations would, of necessity, be highly secret.

But more than that is needed. The free world should make out a firm and unyielding moral position against accepting as a *fait accompli* the postwar seizures of power by Soviet communism. Even though as a practical matter it may be impossible or unwise to seek to drive Russia back behind its own borders, refusal to recognize past aggression will encourage the patriots of the satellite nations in their battle for freedom.

Dulles and Eisenhower have performed a valuable public service by focusing attention on this facet of our foreign policy.

Elsewhere in his speech, however, Dulles permitted his penchant for a telling phrase to prompt him to distortion of fact. Characterizing our foreign policy as "race discrimination on a global scale", Dulles said that non-Western and non-white peoples of Asia could not be treated as "second-class expendables" if the West wanted to survive in a free world.

The implication is that the initial concentration on Western Europe was dictated by a desire to favor European whites over non-European non-whites. Nothing could be further from the truth, and Mr. Dulles knows it.

The truth is that primary emphasis on the defense of Europe was dictated by a set of hard facts that no amount of wishful thinking could evade. Some of them:

1. The West needed to keep Europe's great natural resources, notably coal and iron, out of Russia's hands.

2. The West needed Europe's vast reservoir of skilled labor and its extensively-developed industries.

3. Because of geographic proximity, the loss of Europe would be a grave immediate threat to U. S. security.

4. Our hasty postwar demobilization left Russia with a vast military superiority. Because the ravages of World War II had left a military and economic vacuum in Europe, Russian power was a greater threat there.

5. Finally, our ability to help other nations is limited, as the Republicans have told us so often. Had aid been extended to the Far East on the same scale and at the same time as aid was extended to Europe, the national debt would be immeasurably greater than it is today.

We share Mr. Dulles' concern over what appears to be a relative neglect of the peoples of Asia. But he surely knows that the first requirement of a free people is the desire for liberty. The peoples of Western Europe have known liberty. Once having known it, they will be dissatisfied with anything else. Many of the peoples of Asia, on the other hand, have never known liberty. We can encourage them in their efforts toward that objective, but we cannot inoculate them with the doctrine of freedom.

It is this fact, taken in the context of the great world struggle, that validates Dulles' first point and shatters his second.

NO GREAT LOSS

CONGRESSMAN JOHN RANKIN of Mississippi shouldn't be getting any tickets from North Carolina cops next year. Last January he got one for a reckless dash through the state to Washington for the opening of Congress. But the voters of Mississippi have now decided to send another in his stead to Congress. That makes us happy, as well as safer.

As head of the Veterans' Affairs Committee he opposed constructive proposals for reorganization of the VA, put forward by the Hoover Commission. He ruled his committee with arbitrary arrogance and an eye for the veteran vote.

The next ranking Democratic member of the committee is Representative Allen of Louisiana, who did not seek re-election, leaving Rep. Olin E. Teague of Texas, who distinguished himself as chairman of a subcommittee investigating malpractices resulting from the G. I. Bill, as chairman of the committee if the Democrats win the House. Rep. Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts, a great friend of veteran organizations, will be chairman of the committee if the Republicans win a House majority.

Congressman Rankin has to his credit co-authorship of the bill setting up the TVA and support of reciprocal trade. He opposed the Marshall Plan, admission of displaced persons, the school lunch program. He was a Yankee-damning white supremacist of the old school. A recent example—his statement that "Averell Harriman seems to be running on the Communist platform . . . He would wipe out segregation in the public schools in the District of Columbia."

His defeat is comparable to that of Sen. Kenneth McKellar of Tennessee. Both were powerful committee chairmen who used their power arbitrarily. Both were defeated by Congressmen Thomas Abernethy defeating Rankin, their districts having been combined.) Their successors, while not having particularly distinguished records, should be able to improve upon the records of the men they defeated.

LAWS APPLY TO CITY OFFICIALS, TOO

WHEN the N. C. Supreme Court ruled that there must be more evidence than mere ownership of a car to convict a person of overtime parking, it posed a problem of plain honesty and fairness for municipal officials in this state.

The City Attorney for Raleigh, Paul Smith, met the problem head-on, and disposed of it this way:

"If I had to give the Council advice tonight, I'd say we shouldn't issue another warrant for overtime parking unless we have more evidence than mere ownership of a car. If you continue to issue tickets, some will pay up and some won't. I don't think it's fair to penalize those people who pay up."

Charlotte City Manager Henry Yancey and Police Chief Frank Littlejohn were not quite so forthright. They were quoted this week as saying that the Supreme Court's ruling will have no effect on Charlotte's enforcement of the parking law. They added that if a car owner chooses to contest the charge, then the City must rely on evidence that he was the driver. If the City cannot produce such evidence, the car owner goes free.

Strict adherence to the Supreme Court's ruling would obviously make more difficult the enforcement of parking regulations. But law is law, and it binds public officials as well as private citizens. If an officer of the City of Charlotte does not know the identity of the person who violates the parking regulation, he has no justification for assessing a fine against the owner of the automobile. It may be true in most cases that the owner is the offender, and that he will willingly pay the small fine. But it is not fair to the innocent owner to cause him go into court to prove his innocence.

As we see it, this is a question of right and wrong. Charlotte officials know what the Supreme Court has said about evidence in parking violations. The only right thing for them to do is to comply with the letter and spirit of that ruling until the 1953 General Assembly can write a new rule of evidence making car ownership per se assessable. Such compliance may be inconvenient, but it won't damage the public weal so much as would the deliberate flouting of the Supreme Court's ruling by responsible public officials.

From The Anderson (S. C.) Independent

EISENHOWER'S SWING THROUGH SOUTH

CANDIDATE EISENHOWER'S campaign managers have mapped a swing through Southern states for the general in an effort to pick up some electoral votes in the region.

A definite date has been set for the Georgia visit, but up to now it looks as if the general plans to skip South Carolina.

If he does skip South Carolina, we hope he doesn't send an emissary.

One of the last Yankee generals to come South and who was later a Republican President was a fellow by the name of Grant.

Grant didn't visit South Carolina, either, but he sent an emissary who also campaigned a bit in Georgia. Fellow by the name of Sherman.

Bill collectors in Detroit are calling themselves "adjusters of deinquent obligations", but the victims will continue to call 'em what they've always called 'em.—*Savannah Morning News.*

A reader suggests that what we need in the government is more pruning and less grafting.—*Carlsbad (N. M.) Current-Argus.*

'It's A Shame They Keep You Cooped Up Like That'

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.

Visitor Likes Charlotte

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I HAVE spent most of the Summer in Charlotte, the guest of my daughter who has been here about a year. Now I am returning to my home in Illinois, but before I leave I want you to know that I have enjoyed every day of my stay in your beautiful city.

I marvel at the magnificent trees and the lovely flowers. There has been something new and lovely to see every time I've gone out.

I have enjoyed the friendly courtesy of the people. Frequently, when waiting for a bus, a car has stopped and a pleasing woman's voice has said—"Are you going downtown? Will you ride with us," or "Will you come with me?"

And the bus drivers—one day while waiting for a bus I became so absorbed in watching a lively game of tennis I forgot the bus until I heard it stop, and as I hopped on the driver said—"You weren't looking but I thought you might be waiting for the bus." That kind of thoughtfulness made it possible for me to keep an appointment downtown.

Then a few days ago I was taking several packages to the Myers Park post office, one of them containing several books. I lost it somewhere along the way. To my surprise the package reached its destination. Some kind person with a real missionary spirit found it, paid for the postage and mailed it. I'd like to thank him or her personally. I think I'll drop the amount of the postage into a box for polio or cancer fund.

So—I shall look forward to coming back to Charlotte from Illinois in the not-too-distant future.

—MRS. ARTHUR BAYNE.

Stop Kicking Our Dogs Around

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I READ Mr. Braderman's letter in The News entitled, "Dog Lovers Rebuffed" and dated Aug. 19, with much interest.

Now, Mr. Braderman, let's not soft-pedal this thing about "destroying all dogs". If I remember correctly, and I believe that I do, you stated in your first letter that "all dogs should be destroyed." (Editors Note—Mr. Braderman proposed extermination of "all strays".)

As a matter of fact, it is the opinion of this writer that since it appeared to you that you were about to get in the dog house yourself (meaning that no one was coming to your defense in the newspaper) well, then, you decided that you had better write another letter in order to soft-pedal the issue and, therefore, did write this other letter on August 19th defending yourself. However, our good, fine Christian people are wise to you by now Mr. Braderman and they realize that you are nothing short of being a "dog hater!" Yes, I honestly feel that if you had your way you would simply destroy every dog in the nation.

Your speaking of the Sermon on the Mount and religious freedom—why I can't see a bit of religion or Christianity about what you propose to do to poor helpless dogs. The Great God of the universe, "Our Heavenly Father" from on high put dogs here for a good useful purpose, and make no mistake about it Mr. Braderman, or else there would be no dogs on this earth. And, in closing my letter to you, I'd like to add just a little more. So here it is:

When Gov. Tom Dewey of New York ran against the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in an attempt to defeat Mr. Roosevelt for the Presidency of these United States, Mr. Dewey ended up a beaten man. You see Mr. Braderman, Governor Dewey made a speech against President Roosevelt's little pal dog, named Fala. Our great, beloved President came right back a couple of nights later with his own speech in defense of his little dog friend entitled, "Stop Kicking My Dog Around" which proved to be a masterpiece. It was carried by the Associated Press and therefore reached pepple around the world.

Many people have told me that Governor Dewey might have won over President Roosevelt at that time, had the New York Governor not made the fatal mistake of making that speech against Mr. Roosevelt's dog. But as you and I both know, Mr. Roosevelt came out the winner. So my advice to you is very plain and simple: "Please stop kicking our dogs around."

—J. R. DEAN.

Legion Suspected?

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

HAS the American Legion's national headquarters taken any action against Fascist activity? The Legion, I received, perhaps two years ago, was that the Legion's Illinois Division sent out anti-Fascist material. But other than this the Legion had done nothing of this kind. I don't like it this way. It's "business reasons".

—B. H. EIDSON.

More Support For Dean

GASTONIA

Editors, THE NEWS:

WE could stand a little less of Ike and Stevenson — and a little more of Dean and Cherry. Thanks.

MARY ANN SMITH
SARAH E. WALKER

Eisenhower's Handicaps —Two Men's Appraisals

By JOSEPH ALSOP

NEW YORK

HARDENED political reporters, when listening to political speeches, have a probably foolish tendency to study the manner instead of weighing the matter. Ageing dramatic critics have the same trouble — they have already seen too many plays for their own good, and they tend to take the drama for granted and give their chief attention to the acting.

The fact remains that in politics, communication is the first requirement for success. You can have the best ideas and the most appealing program imaginable. But you will get nowhere if you cannot explain the ideas and put the program over. Judged in these bleak, practical terms, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's American Legion speech — the true opening gun in his battle for the Presidency — was a curiously mixed performance.

What one wanted to learn, of course, was whether Eisenhower had really hit his stride. Here was a man who could, in the old days, truly electrify an audience. Sometimes he would have something big and complicated to say. Sometimes he would be dealing only in the pleasing generalities, about country, home and mother, which army public relations officers love to put in the mouths of their masters. But whatever he had to say, General Eisenhower rarely failed to grip and dominate his audience.

SOME CHANGES

Candidate Eisenhower is not quite the same. He had done his own speech-writing for the American Legion meeting, and the advance copies showed that he had written a speech with meat and power in it. He strode onto the platform in the convention hall looking every inch the image that America has of him. His mere physical presence — his look of being a big man, at once strong and broad-gauge — brought the waiting legionnaires to their feet in a storm of cheers.

But when the cheering died and he began to speak, he somehow appeared shackled. He has never had the practiced political orator's trick of building up climaxes and drawing out applause. But now he almost seemed to throw his points away. It was an effort for him, one felt; it was a necessary duty rather than a pleasure, to be there and to tell his story. Occasionally he would lose himself, for a paragraph or two, in what he had to say; and you could feel the crowd beginning to respond and glow. But then he would look worried and ill at ease again; and the response would die away.

The speech was not a failure, by any means. It told its story of an America exposed to terrible perils; and it made its appeal, for an America strong and united, capable of defying any threat. It conveyed Eisenhower's innate largeness and simplicity. It was almost reassuring, just because it was so unartful. But none the less, the fact had to be faced — this speech did not grip or dominate or really electrify an audience that was visibly waiting and hoping to be swept off its feet.

One saw, of course, the reasons for Eisenhower's uneasiness on the platform. When he spoke in uniform, it was a brilliant but amateur performance — a mere interruption in a quite different career. But now he was suddenly a professional, with everything depending on how he performed.

POLITICS IS TRYING

Then, too, he was and is a man whose greatest power flows from his sincerity. Yet in these last weeks he has been pulled and hauled from dawn till dusk. He has been asked to make cheap compromises by every cheap Republican politician from Maine to California. He has been pleaded with continuously to indulge in the little tricks and petty, fraudulent appeals of the slick political operators. And this sudden exposure to the seamy side of politics must have made him doubt whether, after all, it was a strength to be sincere.

This doubt about the value of his own sincerity is, plainly, Dwight Eisenhower's real handicap as he begins his vital campaign. Yet the record of the last 10 days suggests that Eisenhower has the inner toughness that he needs so badly.

IT MAY be that this is just the unhappy lull before the battle. But certainly it is a season of lamentation and recrimination with a disurbing tendency — disturbing if there really is to be a battle with victory at the end—to hurl the recriminations at Candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This is not only unfair and unreasonable. It will prove self-defeating if it is continued.

His adherents in the Republican party, to say nothing of those who were all along opposed to his nomination are at this stage beginning to demand the impossible of him. Example No. 1 is the divided party of which he is the nominee. What they seem to expect him to do is to reconcile the irreconcilable.

No candidate could have done that. If Eisenhower's chief rival, Sen. Robert A. Taft, had been the nominee, the populous Eastern seaboard states would already have been written off. Senator Irving Ives (R-New York) had made it plain that he would not even run for re-election in the event of Taft's nomination at Chicago.

Eisenhower cannot weld the disparate geographical and ideological wings of the party together. What he can do is in his own right, as the leader who has played such a great part in the history of the past decade, go out to win the support of the independents and the dissident Democrats who want a new dispensation.

SIMPLE ANSWERS SOUGHT

Example No. 2 of recrimination hurling is more serious. Part of the mutter of discontent now beginning to break into the open is from those who want Ike to promise that he can solve the insoluble. He must come up with a simple formula for final victory in Korea, China, all of Asia. Or at the very least, he must beat over the head the administration that has not come up with this quick recipe.

But Eisenhower knows too much, as soldier and as statesman, about what has happened in the world and what is likely to happen. He has too much integrity to come up with a glib political formula that may catch votes.

Those in his own party who hate him are saying of course, that it was because he was a participant, a partner, in what happened that now makes it impossible for him to attack. This is a mean and narrow view. He was a participant. And because he played a part in the great crisis of the postwar years he knows how tough and difficult, how long and arduous and demanding, is the task before the American people if the free world is to be sustained against the onslaught of world communism.

That is what Eisenhower believes with all his heart and all his mind. It is what he undertook to say in his speech to the American Legion. The words read fairly well but somewhere between the writing and the delivery the force went out of them.

This reporter has seen Eisenhower in a number of different situations for a period of nearly 10 years—as commander in Europe in World War II, as Chief of Staff of the Army, as President of Columbia University, and finally in the harrassing and complicated role of supreme commander of NATO in France. One of his outstanding characteristics was his warm confidence; an assurance that communicated itself to those around him, inspiring and encouraging them. It was one of the qualities that made him a leader of men.

SEEMED DIFFERENT

That quality was missing in Madison Square Garden. This is not an easy thing to report but since it seemed to me to be a fact it must be reported—he seemed somehow like a different man. The words did not come out with the confidence and assurance of the past. He was hesitant, diffident, unsure of himself, before an audience that should naturally have been his.

It is to be hoped that the lamentation and recrimination have temporarily thrown Ike off his game, as he, a good golfer, might put it. One thing is sure. He was not prepared for the divisions and the dissensions in the Republican party by anything said to him by the stream of political visitors to SHAPE in the months before his home-coming.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Why I'm Running Against McCarthy

(While Drew Pearson is on a brief vacation, the Washington Merry-Go-Round is being written by several distinguished guest columnists, today's being Len Schmitt, attorney, Merrill, Wisconsin.)

By LEN SCHMITT

MERRILL, WIS.

WHEN I decided to make the run against Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy in the Wisconsin Republican primary election, several of my friends in northern Wisconsin asked me why. They were as much appalled by McCarthy's record and by what has come to be called McCarthyism as I was, but their attitude seemed to be that I was foolish to disrupt my rather comfortable life to enter a campaign against such a ruthless adversary as McCarthy. On the surface, this attitude made some sense.

During the years, I have built up a substantial law practice in Merrill, Wis., my home town. I have a comfortable life, including a fine Summer home on one of Wisconsin's beautiful lakes near Hayward. And on top of that, this particular year I was in a position to take it easy as far as my law practice was concerned. But I could not let those factors influence me, because this fight against McCarthy and what he stands for goes far deeper than the physical comfort of a middle-aged attorney named Len Schmitt.

Under normal circumstances in Wisconsin, McCarthy wouldn't have a chance for re-election. His personal record is such that Wisconsin voters, reared in the tradition of the honesty and integrity of old Bob La Follette, would repudiate him utterly if it weren't for another factor on which he is relying and which must be fought to the limit.

Consider the Senator's record. In 1943, when he was in military service, he made a $40,000 killing in the stock market, but he reported to the state tax authorities that had received no income from Wisconsin and thus believed he was not a resident of the state. He did not mention the $40,000 stock market profit. This did not come to light until some years later and McCarthy did not get away with this maneuver, but it is worth noting that the very next year he considered himself so much a resident of Wisconsin that he ran for the office of U. S. Senator and defeated.

Later, his record as a circuit court judge came to public attention, including such items as the granting of "quickie" divorces to clients living outside his circuit and represented by a Milwaukee law firm favorable to him, and the destruction of a court record in a case which went to the Supreme Court. The fact that he ran for the U. S. Senate while still a circuit court judge, despite a constitutional edict to the contrary, also was brought out and McCarthy was severely censured by the State Supreme Court.

As a Senator, McCarthy accepted $10,000 from the defunct Lustron Housing Corporation when he was serving on a committee investigating the RFC which held Lustron notes to the extent of $37 million. At that time Lustron was trying to get additional loans from the RFC. McCarthy accepted the $10,000 for a booklet on housing which consisted chiefly of Federal housing regulations.

Shady Financial Deals

McCARTHY'S tangled personal finances came to light, including a 572,000 loan by the Appleton State Bank which was secured, at one point, by a $20,000 note signed by a widely known Washington sugar lobbyist. McCarthy in the years 1946 to 1949, had an income of $86,000, but he paid no state income tax, claiming either interest or stock losses as deductions to offset the tax. In one year he claimed interest payments of $15,000 which if capitalized at four per cent would mean an indebtedness of $375,000.

McCarthy attempted to make political capital by distorting his war record. He claimed he carried 10 pounds of shrapnel in his body when, in fact, he never was wounded. He called himself "Tail Gunner Joe" when, in fact, he served as an intelligence officer. He claimed he enlisted as a private when, in fact, he shopped around for a commission.

Such a record would mean political sudden death in Wisconsin under normal circumstances, but McCarthy is trying to cover it up with his shotgun charges of Communism in government and elsewhere. Here we come to the factor I mentioned earlier. McCarthy has resorted to the technique used by the propagandists of the dictators in recent years—in Germany, Italy and Russia.

He is trying to create fear and hysteria in a people rightfully concerned about the danger of Communism to our way of life. He is attempting to create the impression that anyone who opposes McCarthy must be a Communist or a fellow traveler. His charges are so outrageous (witness the accusations against Gen. George Marshall) that people are inclined to say that the claims must be true—the Goebbels technique. McCarthy makes so many charges that few citizens can keep abreast and so they do not examine each charge carefully to find the fraud.

I guarantee to answer every question directed to me without equivocation. Though it is hard, tiring work I love every minute of it. The people of Wisconsin can have no doubt about where I stand and I'll stake my chances on the inherent common sense of the Wisconsin voter.