THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1952

Nothing Exceeds Like Excess

BLOW YOUR BUGLE, IKE

GALE HOLDER, state Republican chairman in Indiana, is quoted as saying that "until Bob Taft blows the bugle, a lot of us aren't going to fight in the army."

Yesterday, after breakfast with General Eisenhower, Bob Taft blew his bugle. He said that he and General Eisenhower are in substantial agreement on all issues. He said that differences between them on foreign policy are "merely differences of degree". As he sees it, "there is and has been one great fundamental issue between the Republican Party and the New Deal, or Fair Deal, or Stevenson Deal. It is the issue of liberty against the "creeping' socialism in every domestic field". *He* is satisfied that this, too, is the general's philosophy. And, said Bob Taft in his prepared statement:

"I have never changed my intention expressed in Chicago. Of course, I have not intended to abandon in any way the principles I have fought for, the past 14 years, or abandon those countless friends who supported me in the pre-convention campaign."

We will not, at this time, repeat the principles which Bob Taft has fought for since 1938, principles which he has not abandoned in any way, principles many of which General Eisenhower does not share. Nor will we dwell upon reasons why "liberty vs. socialism" is not the issue in this campaign. Rather, we will say this. It is time, high time, that General Eisenhower blow *his* bugle, that he shake off the Old Guard barnacles who have been closing in on him during this past week, that he be himself and speak for himself. This he must do if he is to continue to lead the progressive Republicans and independents and many Democrats who are concerned with the trend of his campaign.

Obviously, General Eisenhower was tormented by the gestures he made to party unity this week, and by the actions and statements of the reactionaries who are now at least giving lip service to him. This has been noticeable to many of the reporters who accompanied him on his Midwestern tour. The Jenner episode is an example. The Indiana Senator followed the general, puppy-like, grabbing his arm and holding it up, when photographers approached, despite Eisenhower's obvious embarrassment, even anger. As Edward Folliard of *The Washington Post* wrote, Eisenhower "didn't say it was unpleasant, at least he didn't say so publicly, but he didn't have to. It was written on his face and could be detected in his actions."

General Eisenhower has gone more than his half of the way toward uniting the party. He is publicly saying that if he is elected he expects Senator Taft to be "one of the greatest figures in that administration", that his views and counsel will be very welcome. He is telling Taft supporters that he does not expect them to transfer their loyalty from the Senator to him. He has assured all GOP candidates his support. It was reliably reported recently that the Senator has told of the conditions he, Taft, would insist upon before he would agree to campaign energetically for the general. Three of these conditions:

That the general must not appoint any of several Republicans as Secretary of State.

That the general must promise to appoint a number of Taftites to high positions.

That the general must put these assurances in writing.

In answer to a reporter's question yesterday Senator Taft said, "I asked for no commitments in writing." Obviously, General Eisenhower could not make any such commitments and maintain his independence and integrity. We don't think he made these commitments to Senator Taft yesterday. But Senator Taft has now come out from their conference, grinning from ear to ear, promising vigorous support of the general—and the Senator said he has not abandoned his aged principles. Yet he said that he and the general are in substantial agreement.

You've made your gesture to the mossbacks, general. Now it is time to assert your independence, to let them know you're boss, to reassure millions of anxious Americans that you have not abandoned your principles, and to voice these principles frankly from now on. For right now it appears that you are a "captive candidate".

MY, MY, SUCH BRAVE LEGISLATORS

MUCH, much faster than is generally realized in this country, Western Europe is becoming one nation. Hereafter, the United States will deal not with six individual nations, but with the European Coal and Steel Community in all matters relating to these materials. This week Europe's first sovereign supranational assembly came into being. It will work out a draft treaty establishing a European federal political community.

It has long been the position of the United States to look favorably upon European unification, to exhort, even to goad Europeans to break down the barriers of nationalism and become one nation. Europe is doing this, swiftly. So swiftly, in fact, that the United States government and American citizens have been left behind, with no considered opinion as to what our relationship would be with this nation a-borning, in which we have such a heavy investment.

The extent of this country's lack of preparedness is well illustrated by the comments of legislators at the Inter-parliamentary Union Conference in Bern, Switzerland. Our correspondents, Peg and Pierre Streit, in a column on this page today tell how the American delegation could not agree to a resolution proposed and passed at Bern, because of the inclusion of that bad old word, "sovereignty".

The resolution recommended that "each delegation shall undertake, in its own country, to work for the adoption of constitutional laws with a view to rendering participation in international collaboration most effective." If collaboration between nations possessing democratic regimes is to have its full effect, continued the resolution, "it will require certain sacrifices and certain compensations through a partial relinquishment of sovereignty."

That resolution faces the facts. Of course there must be some relinquishment of sovereignty, some central direction, if a free-world organization capable of withstanding well-organized, centrally-directed communism is to be developed. In truth we are now abandoning our sovereignty to boards and committees over which the citizen has no control.

But our legislators were fearful. They thought they might be "misunderstood" back home. "It's that word sovereignty", said one Senator, "if the words 'power' or 'virtue' had been used instead, there would have been no problem."

Some of the U. S. delegation, men like Senators Douglas of Illinois and Kefauver of Tennessee, Reps. Gore of Tennessee and Boggs of Louisiana, did not agree. It remained for Senator Kefauver to heartily endorse the progress being made toward Western Europe federation and urge that some attention be given to the U. S. relationship to the new Europe, and to political machinery for NATO.

We are putting lots of eggs in the European basket. Billions of U. S. tax dollars have been spent there. We cannot adequately help direct the future of this investment if Europe and America do not have considerable political ties.

Yet, our legislators are afraid of even discussing or passing resolutions about "sovereignty". Sovereignty, and this whole question of our relationship with Europe, cry for discussion in this country by all thoughtful persons including Presidential candidates.

From The Richmond Times-Dispatch

FOR MEN WHO AREN'T HANDY

"IT'S NICE to have a man around the house," according to the popular song of a few years back. It's especially nice if he is handy with tools and can finish up the attic, lay concrete walkways or handle other jobs which less-skillful householders have to call on professional workmen to perform.

A man whose mechanical aptitude is nil will look with envy at the next-door neighbor who has just saved considerable money by reroofing his house himself. Down the street another of those males who "can't do anything around the house" has turned out a workmanlike repapering job and is busy adding a room to the rear of his home.

So the mechanically inept gentleman mentioned above feels that he will be disgraced if he has to call on a professional just to screen in the side porch. Lacking the tools, talent and temperament required for a good job, he himself often makes a complete mess of such an undertaking when he undertakes it at all, and, more important, gets himself banged up in the process.

Nothing can be more perverse than an inanimate object, and some jackleg handyman seem to bring out this perverseness to a maddening degree. Ladders topple over for no apparent reason, nails sit up straight in the floor waiting to be stepped on, hammers strike thumbs regardless of where they are aimed, and loose boards jump up and smack the distraught amateur repairman in the face.

Bedeviled "unhandymen" must have read with interest the story on the Real Estate Page of Sunday's *Times-Dispatch* dealing with the fact that men who make their living in work associated with house construction and repair also are sometimes plagued by obstinate hammers, balky ladders and unruly boards.

A study of 1,000 accidents which happened to such men revealed that 154 workers were injured while using hand tools working with nails and glass; 132 received eye injuries caused by splinters of stones, splinters, cement and cement dust, and 10 were hit on the head by dropped tools or hurt by falling materials or falling ladders. The rest of the 1,000 had a variety of mishaps, including straining themselves while lifting, falling through holes in floors and stepping on nails, glass, tools and loose lumber.

The long-suffering man who is all thumbs regrets, of course, the individual misfortunes encountered by professionals, but he can't help feeling inner satisfaction in knowing that even skilled craftsmen sometimes find tools and building materials unmanageable beyond all reason.

In simple words America is a place where a fellow can write anything that comes into his head and if it is not obscene or libelous he can put it on a press and print himself a newspaper. This you cannot do anywhere else in the world.—*The Carolina Israelite.*

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.

Two Devout, Moral Candidates

GREENSBORO

Editors, THE NEWS:

THE controversy over the religious affiliation of the Presidential candidates is interesting but irrelevant. That both men are of high moral caliber and sincerely religious their records and utterances leave no doubt.

Recent studies have shown that there is no correlation between religious affiliation and morality. In fact, the percentage of non-church members and Jews imprisoned for felonies is lower than that of orthodox Christians. This is not to say that Christian churches are not a good influence or that honest Christians are not moral people, but does prove that non-church members can be and are just as moral as those who attend church regularly.

True, this country was founded on "Christian" ideals, as one of your correspondents states, but not on any particular theological premise. The basic ideals of our nation are the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood and dignity of man—notions to which Christians do not hold a patent.

The founders of our great parties were not affiliated with orthodox, Christian churches. Abraham Lincoln belonged to no church. He once stated that when a church member swept over its doors the simple and sole aim of love for God and one's fellow man, then he would join that church. Dwight Eisenhower, too, belongs to no church.

Thomas Jefferson belonged to no church, but stated several times his preference for the Unitarian faith, a faith with just such requirements as Lincoln later prescribed. Adlai Stevenson is a Unitarian.

Harry Truman is a Baptist.

Your readers, whatever faith they may profess, can rest assured that our nation will have strong, devout moral leadership under either Dwight Eisenhower or Adlai Stevenson.

—R. TAYLOR WALHE.

Bury 'Em On Sunday

CHARLOTTE

Editors THE NEWS:

REGARDING this proposal (of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Minister's Association that Sunday burials be discouraged) I never went fishing, hunting or with a gang just plain raising hell on Sunday in my life. I was never drunk in my life.

Doctors have to deliver babies on Sunday. That's God's work, when they are born on Sunday. When a person dies that's also God's work, and it is not a sin to bury the dead on Sunday. Stores, eating places, filling stations operate on Sunday. Transportation has to move on Sunday. How about the undertaker? He has to receive the dead on Sunday and embalm them. That's no pleasant job, but it has to be done regardless of the time of day or night.

Many times a person's funeral is held on Sunday so that their relatives and friends from other towns and states can attend on the week ends. Death hits us and we know not when. If it comes on Friday or on Saturday, Sunday is the time to have the burial.

So, good brothers, I do not believe the people as a whole will agree with you. I hope these fine gentlemen preaching the Word of God will withdraw this resolution and forget it. To the writer it just doesn't make sense.

—WM. C. McINTIRE.

Dissenters, Non-Conformists Silenced

MONROE

Editors, THE NEWS:

IN the quietness of the star-spangled night and the dawn's early glow, the hideous shadow of Fascism hovers over the sleeping American republic ready to devour it in the name of national security. The ghost of Buchenwald prowls about the American republic to smite her democratic heart with the death-dealing witches' brew of the Third Reich.

The witch we fought so hard to rid the world of we have resurrected, and are converting ourselves in its image. Through fear, confusion, and distorted truth, the people of a nation of the proud and the free are fast becoming mental slaves and moral cowards. From the builders of Buchenwald we have learned how to silence the voices of dissenters and the non-conformists.

At Tule Lake, Calif.; Wickenburg, Ariz.; El Reno, Okla.; Avon Park, Fla.; and Allentown, Pa., the American government is erecting concentration camps for political prisoners. The time may not be far removed when the term subversive may become so broad until the thin line of demarcation between subversive and nonconformist fades into the maze of hysteria and confusion and the democratic heritage of a great people fades into the dark oblivion of eternity.

Unless the American people awaken from their untimely sleep and put an end to the hell-bent trend of Fascism and militarism, the case of Myron Howard Ross may become the case of millions of patriotic Americans caught in the web of "thought control" without recourse to a fair trial before an objective and just judicial body governed by constitutional law.

Freedom of speech and thought is an American heritage that the nonconformists of Lexington and Concord bequeathed a nation of individualists and radicals.

—ROBERT F. WILLIAMS.

'Sovereignty' Issue Scares U.S. Legislators At Bern

By PIERRE and PEG STREIT
Special To The News

BERN, Switzerland

THE dogged efforts of a handful of European countries to build a United States of Europe got a big hand from the elected legislators of 35 countries who met here recently for the 61st annual Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

With the Schuman coal-steel plan behind them and with plans for a common European Army awaiting ratification, the members of parliament from France, Germany, Italy and the three Benelux countries came to the Conference looking for a vote of confidence and seeking advice.

It was largely at their instigation that this venerable institution placed the controversial question of limiting state sovereignties on its agenda. The Inter-Parliamentary Union, founded in 1889 and one of the oldest peace organizations in the world, is a kind of club composed of people whose business it is to make laws and represent constituents.

While its powers are limited to making recommendations and proposals the Union's unique feature lies in the fact that it affords a forum for unofficial exchanges of ideas. Each legislator attending the Conference is uninstructed by the government and is primarily a spokesman for himself.

The Europeans at the Conference again were looking ahead. They wanted to know what should come first, economic or political union. They answered their own question, declaring that the time had come to give Europe a federal structure like the United States and Switzerland. They were not worried about abandoning sovereignty — but rather, the way in which it was being abandoned to "boards" and "high authorities" of technicians living in a supranational no man's land.

Here at last it was evident that the Europeans were coming around to the idea of political federation. What they wanted was encouragement and support. This placed a good number of the American delegation in a ticklish position: they wanted to give European federation their blessing but not at the risk of giving the impression that the United States should also abandon some of its sovereignty.

The resolution on limitation of state sovereignty on which the Union was asked to vote recommended that: "Each delegation shall undertake, in its own country, to work for the adaptation of constitutional laws with a view to rendering participation in international collaboration most effective, both from the political, economic and the cultural points of view."

The resolution further stated that if collaboration between nations possessing democratic regimes "is to have its full effect it will require certain sacrifices and certain compensations through a partial relinquishment of sovereignty" and that "the constitution of joint authorities, to which certain powers would be delegated should therefore be encouraged, each country nevertheless retaining the greatest number of the prerogatives of sovereignty."

MISUNDERSTANDING FEARED

The American delegation split on the vote. The majority group felt, with Senator Green, that "the way the resolution was worded might lead to a misunderstanding back home." A minority, including such Senators as Estes Kefauver (D-Tenn.) Paul Douglas (D-Ill.), Representative Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) and Representative Hale Boggs (D-La.) thought that the United States delegation's support of the resolution would give the Europeans the encouragement they were seeking.

After a heated caucus the delegation attempted to have the whole issue postponed. When this move was defeated, primarily by the European nations, the American delegation met again and decided to abstain from voting. The reason cited for this move was that the resolution needed further study.

Privately, however, many of the delegates admitted that the resolution endorsed limitation of sovereignty which they said was "dynamite back home." "It's that word sovereignty," one of the Senators admitted, "if the words 'power' or 'virtue' had been used instead, there would have been no problem."

Despite the abstention of the U. S. delegation, the resolution on limitation of state sovereignties which was passed by all the supporting Europe's present attempts at federation, was passed by an overwhelming vote of 219 to 6.

McCarthy Victory Rejuvenates The Old Guard, Burdens Ike

By JOSEPH ALSOP

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind.

THESE words are written in the aftermath of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's triumphant visit to always happy invasion of Indianapolis. Two things happened here. For the first time since his return from Europe, Eisenhower recaptured all of his old power to please and stir an audience. And he also distasteful ly embraced Sen. William E. Jenner, who has described Gen. George C. Marshall, the father of Eisenhower's greatness, as a "living lie" and a "front man for traitors."

These were great events, which are said to have assured an Eisenhower victory in Indiana in November. Yet even last night, as the first Wisconsin primary returns came in, these events in Indiana were already over-shadowed by Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy's sweeping victory. It is not too much to say that the Eisenhower high command was appalled by the completeness of McCarthy's sweep.

And well they might be. For his sole speech of the primary campaign, McCarthy publicly showed his contempt for Eisenhower by sneering at "well meaning persons" who deplore "character assassination" and "witch-hunting" — the very phrases used by Eisenhower himself.

In the same speech, McCarthy also implied that he, and he virtually alone, would carry the Republican party to victory this year, with a typical McCarthy-style onslaught on Adlai E. Stevenson as his weapon. After winning by such wide margins in Wisconsin, McCarthy is now free to intervene in the national campaign in just the manner he has already hinted at.

But there are other factors which must also be considered. Here in Indiana, for instance, the local Republican organization, though solidly and violently pro-Taft, gave a warm welcome to General Eisenhower for the sake of Senator Jenner. Jenner himself, wanting Eisenhower's aid in his campaign for re-election, went to Chicago to promise the general that he would show principle, and would follow Eisenhower's policies in the Senate. While Eisenhower was here, Jenner kept a positive death-grip on the general's coattails. And when Jenner ran home from Wisconsin, the mood changed.

"This was what Bill really needed," was a typical comment of one of Jenner's delighted henchmen. "McCarthy will put Bill over now." In other words Jenner's dependence on Eisenhower is thought to have been greatly reduced, without lessening Eisenhower's dependence on the local Republican organization.

In short, although General Eisenhower scored a remarkable hit in Indianapolis, he has not quite solved his Indiana problem, and the problem has been made worse by the McCarthy victory.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Highlights Of Lamar Caudle's Testimony

WASHINGTON

LAMAR Caudle, the assistant attorney general who was fired by President Truman during the tax probe, made a far better impression on the Chelf Committee in executive session than when facing the klieg lights and microphones of the King Committee.

Congressmen got the impression that Caudle's overall record as tax prosecutor was much better than judged by his incoherent testimony before the King Committee.

Though the recent sessions were off-the-record in closed-door meetings, here are the highlights of his testimony:

1. He put the finger on two former Justice Department associates, Peyton Ford and Herbert Bergson, for warming up future law clients while still in the Justice Department.

2. Defended his old boss, Attorney General Tom Clark, now on the Supreme Court.

3. Indicated it was probably President Truman's fault that James E. Finnegan, the Collector of Internal Revenue in St. Louis, was not fired. Caudle tried to help fire him.

4. Reported that Matt Connelly, a White House secretary, had asked him to delay one tax-fraud case against Irving Sachs of St. Louis.

5. Dramatically recited many tax cases that he had prosecuted despite lagging U. S. attorneys, among them cases against big-shot gamblers Sam Beard and Emmitt Waring of Washington, and Vaughan Cannon of Asheville, N. C.

Off-Again-On-Again Finnegan

MOST dramatic of Caudle's testimony was given in reply to Congressional questions about the Finnegan case in St. Louis where U. S. Judge George Moore of St. Louis testified that the Justice Department, through Ellis Slack, tried to sidetrack a grand jury.

"Drake Watson (U. S. attorney in St. Louis) telephoned me," testified Caudle, "and said, 'we've got a judge out here who isn't satisfied with the way we're handling tax cases before the grand jury. Can't you send someone out to help?'

"I told Drake," continued Caudle, "'all my men are busy here. We've got too many cases to try ourselves, and you know how understaffed we are as a result of Congress. I don't see how I can spare anyone.'

"But finally I sent him Ellis Slack. Later I got a call from Ellis in St. Louis that the judge would be perfectly happy with the way tax cases were being handled if Finnegan resigned.

"He'll have to resign right away,' Ellis told me. 'This judge means business. It won't do any good if he resigns next week; it's got to be right away.'

"That's out of my bailiwick,' I told Ellis," continued Caudle, "'Finnegan's in the Treasury and I'm in Justice.' But I promised to see what I could do.

"So I phoned Bill Boyle (then chairman of the Democratic Committee) and located him in Hollywood, Fla., with Nate Lichtblau. I told him he ought to get Finnegan out right away.

"Then I called Schoeneman (Commissioner of Internal Revenue), and I called Charley Oliphant," Caudle told the committee. "I wasn't able to get John Snyder (Secretary of the Treasury) but I did get Ed Foley (Undersecretary of the Treasury)."

Old Truman Friend

HOWEVER, nothing happened. Finnegan was not fired.

Caudle added that he had heard the White House refused to accept Finnegan's resignation because of an old personal vendetta between President Truman and Judge Moore. The two were old enemies, and apparently the President was not going to let Judge Moore tell him how to run the government.

Later, Caudle told the Chelf Committee, he was called to the office of Senator Williams of Delaware who has been probing tax irregularities. With him were Ellis Slack, Turner Smith, in charge of fraud prosecutions of the Justice Department's tax division, and Drake Watson, U. S. attorney in St. Louis.

"We walked down the hall to the Senator's office," Caudle testified, "and I 'clare to goodness, I looked over my shoulder and there was Drake Watson about a city block behind us. His knees were wobbling, his face was ashen and his eyes were little black dots sunk in his head. We had to wait outside the Senator's office for him to catch up.

"When we got inside, Senator Williams was very courteous. But sitting beside him was Senator Kem of Missouri, who stood up, pointed his finger at Drake Watson, and took out after him something terrible.

"'Do you know,' he said, 'that a judge has accused you of not properly conducting your office?'

'Too Kind' Caudle

SENATOR Kem was so rough," continued Caudle, "that I wrote a note and handed it to Senator Williams to please tone Senator Kem down, because Drake Watson was a sick man.

"It was only a short time after that that Drake died," said Caudle, "and I declare I truly believe that incident shortened his life."

Caudle also told how some time later he had looked at the morning paper and read a statement by his chief, Attorney General Howard McGrath, denying that Judge Moore had phoned him complaining about the handling of the St. Louis grand jury.

"When I read that in the paper," Caudle said, "I remarked to my wife: 'the Attorney General's made a mistake. He's forgotten. Because Judge Moore did phone him.'

"So I rushed down to the office and up to Howard McGrath's room, but he had just gone out. So I rushed down to the front door and caught him and told him about his mistake.

"Howard thanked me, and said he just had so much on his mind he had forgotten about the judge's call. So he went right back upstairs, called Judge Moore and said: 'Judge, I want to apologize to you personally, and in a minute I'm going to apologize to you publicly.'"

The Congressmen listened to Caudle at great length. They came to the conclusion that perhaps influence did not count as much with him as the fact that the milk of human kindness ran heavy in Lamar Caudle's heart.