THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1952

EISENHOWER STATES HIS LABOR VIEWS

IN GENERAL EISENHOWER's speech to the AFL convention yesterday failed to spell out in specific detail his views on labor legislation, it nonetheless restated some fundamental principles that are often forgotten in the angry controversies in legislative halls.

Eisenhower knew he was invading enemy territory, expected his audience to be cool, if not hostile. Yet he made no effort to curry favor with the AFL delegates. "I have not come to bid or compete for your endorsement," he told them, and he promised that his views on labor matters would not change "regardless of the action taken by the A. F. of L. at this convention in the matter of endorsing a Presidential candidate."

On Taft-Hartley, Eisenhower was considerably less specific than was Governor Stevenson in his Labor Day address. He said he was opposed to repealing the law, but in favor of "realistic" amendments. He promised to oppose any amendments which "weaken the rights of working men and women" and outlined these principles that should be continued in the law: "the encouragement of collective bargaining; the right to strike; an advance notice before a strike is called; a requirement that both union and employers live up to their contracts; the assurance that members of unions get a regular report on their organization's finances". And he said he favored requiring employers as well as union officers to sign non-Communist oaths.

• • •

IN GENERAL, Eisenhower's remarks on Taft-Hartley appear to put him pretty close to Senator Taft, who also favors the retention and the revision of the law. He would not, as would Governor Stevenson, remove the political symbolism of Tart-Hartley by writing a new law under a new name.

Beyond that, Eisenhower spoke in the broadest possible terms about the place of organized labor in the American democracy. The atmosphere for labor-management peace will be better, he said, with a "government that can command the trust of both labor and employers. . . We do not have such a government now." He has no use for the "handful of reactionaries (who) harbor the ugly thought of breaking unions" or for those "who hold some vain and foolish dream of spinning the clock back to days when unorganized labor was a huddled, almost helpless mass".

He is firmly opposed to "arbitrary power over either labor or industry"; he believes "the right of men to leave their jobs is a test of freedom"; and he is confident that "most strikes can be avoided without violating the Constitution either by illegal seizure of property or by putting strikers into the Army". Further, Eisenhower feels that the mediation resources of the Federal Government have been neglected, that "preventive mediation", like preventive medicine, "could often anticipate the fever spots in our economy".

There was one conspicuous omission in the Eisenhower speech. He offered no formula for handling great strikes of a national emergency nature. He talked around the point, quoted Samuel Gompers as favoring "voluntaryism and against compulsion", denounced injunctions and seizures, and concluded with this paragraph, the meaning of which has not come to us after repeated readings:

"If, in a national emergency declared by Congress, government does move into a strike situation to secure a resumption of operations, it must at the same time stimulate, not stifle, collective bargaining. There is no other way to attack the dispute which underlies the strike."

TOWARD THE END of his address, Eisenhower touched upon a theme that is the very antithesis of the Truman Democratic Party policy but more in line with Governor Stevenson's views, i. e., the American laboring man is not a member of a class set apart from the rest of society, but a free man and a free citizen who should not be given "special treatment of any kind—either stern or patronizing". And he added: "To treat you as a special case is to deny the fullness of your dignity as American citizens".

In all probability, Eisenhower picked up very few votes from the AFL convention delegates. But the whole tone of his address was of a much higher level than some of the speeches heard earlier, notably that of Martin T. Lacey, president of the AFL Central Trades & Labor Council, who, discussing the sacred ballot in the crudest terms of labor's jargon, warned the delegates:

"If we are to present a united front to our enemies on the political field, there must be no political scabbery. The trade unionist who votes for a candidate who is not a dependable friend of labor is strike-breaking at the ballot box."

Among the nearly 8 million members of the AFL, however, Eisenhower may have made a greater impression. Many of them, far more than their leaders seem to think, will vote according to their own conscience in November, as indeed they should do.

MILESTONE

IN GREENSBORO this week, John Kenneth Lee, 26-year-old Negro, was admitted to the bar. The son of a Charlotte minister now dead, Lee was one of the first two Negro students to enroll at the University of North Carolina. He enrolled in June, 1951, from the N. C. College in Durham, where he had taken his preliminary courses while working in Winston-Salem, and supporting a wife and a child in Greensboro.

Those facts point up the accomplishments of Lee, the individual.

Even more significant is the fact that this quiet but fundamental change in the philosophy of graduate education in North Carolina took place smoothly and without incident. It belies the predictions of those who feared that the admission of Negroes to the University's graduate schools would wreck tradition and reap a harvest of agitation and bitterness.

Lee will be a better lawyer and a better citizen for having had access to the superior facilities and the broader cultural atmosphere of the University. His race, and indeed the whole state, will be served thereby.

A ONE-WAY TRACK IN MANCHURIA

ON THE FACE OF IT, the Chinese-Russian agreement announced this week is a setback to Red China, an admission of her dependence on and subservience to the Soviet Union. By the terms of the agreement the two nations will continue joint operation of Port Arthur in Manchuria until each has signed a peace treaty with Japan. In other words, Russia will stay in Port Arthur during the foreseeable future, instead of withdrawing by the end of this year, in accordance with the terms of the 1950 Sino-Russian agreement.

This prospect of continued Russian occupation will not be pleasant to Chinese familiar with the history of this port, long a bone of contention between the Eastern powers. The Russians maneuvered the Chinese out of the port in 1898. Japan got it in 1904, and Russia was dealt back into the picture at Yalta. The terms of the new agreement, too, couched in usual Communist parlance, do not save much face for the Chinese, who are forced to ask the Russians to stay on because of "conditions dangerous for peace and favorable for a repetition of Japanese aggression."

In return, the Russians merely promise to do what they already promised to do two years ago—hand over the Changchun Railway by the end of this year. One end of the railroad is in Sovietized Port Arthur—the other in Soviet territory—so if the Chinese do get the railroad back it may be only to shoulder by herself this burden of Soviet transportation.

The Chinese and Russian negotiators have been busy in Moscow for several weeks now, and this publicly-announced result of the negotiations is probably much less important than some of the deals kept secret. If they are of a pattern with the port and railway agreement, the Chinese are on a one-way track to complete satellite status.

WHY PENALIZE THE SAFE DRIVER?

WITH ALL the talk about "third round" and "fourth round" price and wage increases, it's time to again call attention to what in some places is the "seventh round" of increases since World War II. This is in the field of automobile insurance rates. This week N. C. Commissioner of Insurance Waldo C. Cheek forecast a probable rate increase in this state.

The frequency of serious accidents, in proportion to mileage driven, started climbing again last year. This year auto insurance rates have been hiked in 28 states, and increases are pending in other states. Up and up they go, with the careful driver inequitably carrying the load for the irresponsible persons who cause most of the accidents.

Last June we hopefully noted the suggestion of an insurance man that a system of "insurance classification" be adopted by the automobile insurance companies. Under his plan the rest of a car owner's policy is pegged to the infrequency, or absence, of involvement of his car in accidents which result in insurance payments.

A plan along these lines is now in the works in New York, to become effective Nov. 1. The driver who has had an accident resulting in payment on a bodily injury claim, within the past 18 months, pays an extra 10 per cent. If he's had more than one such accident, he pays 20 per cent extra. Thus, the insurance companies figure, about 13 per cent of New York's drivers will pay more. And—important to the safe driver—an over-all rate boost of 1.5 per cent will be avoided.

The New York insurance companies are on the right track. They would be on more solid ground if they rewarded safe drivers with decreases, rather than penalized poor drivers with increases. But they point out that to give a discount to good risks means pushing up the whole rate structure considerably, then rebating most of the increase later. And, understandably, they're afraid the public wouldn't stand for a big increase, even if most drivers would eventually get the increase, plus a little more, back.

Business Week, in looking over the auto insurance problem, observes that the "(insurance) industry is not very enthusiastic about any type of risk rating for auto liability, and probably won't put it in effect in any state where it isn't under pressure to do so." Well, let's put on the pressure in North Carolina.

'Hey—That's My Fountain Pen'

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.

Data On Unitarianism Available

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I HAVE been reading with a great deal of interest the letters which you have published regarding the religion of Adlai Stevenson. Might I remind your readers that there is a Unitarian Church in Charlotte which stands ready to furnish information concerning the Unitarian religion to anyone who requests it. A post card, letter or call stating the information desired will bring a prompt reply.

—REV. EDWARD A. CAHILL
Unitarian Church of Charlotte

High Taxes Defended

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

SO Mr. Sam Brown writes that he's getting tired of the mess in Washington. Sure we have to pay taxes to keep our government in operation. We send billions to foreign countries and so far, thank God, they've kept Russia from marching into Western Europe and conquering millions of people whose only wish is that they could have the living conditions that you so harshly complain about.

This money has still saved millions of casualties in Europe and Asia. If the Communists had gotten away in Korea, by this time all Asia would be under the Red flag.

Of course here in the U. S. you can really smear it on. You voice such an opinion in a Communist country and you would be against the wall in the morn. I think that should also happen to you for even thinking that Communism can't be worse.

More power to the thousands of tax collectors who sit all day drinking cokes and chatting with each other. At least they have gotten ahead and are able to sit around and drink cokes. They have devoted their life to government work and are entitled to a few leisure moments. I speak of the honest ones.

Mr. Brown, will you kindly explain how you pay income taxes on $200 a month while having four dependents? You had better refer to a tax table and see you pay no taxes. You have no squawk coming—you should be thankful for that much income. If you say you pay high taxes you are telling a fib, and if you don't like our taxation go somewhere where the government takes all and gives you what they want you to have.

I wish I were paying $200 a month taxes, or even giving the government a million dollars a month in taxes.

—DAN T. DUREN.

School Fees Resented

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

YOUR article on the high cost of school fees in Monday's edition fanned my smoldering resentment into an open flame.

Every September I fret and fume at having to pay these extra fees for our children's books. This year, with three children in school, we handed over approximately $18 on Thursday, Sept. 4.

A native of North Carolina, but educated in the North, I attended public schools with high scholastic ratings. Never a penny was paid for books or other supplies (except for the notebook paper and pencils) until high school, when exceedingly modest fees were charged for art and laboratory supplies. Nearly all northern schools also conduct a kindergarten as part of the school system; a service greatly missed by the many newcomers to this city.

The Charlotte News has been active on the public's behalf for many years. How about delving a little deeper into this subject? Why can't Charlotte and Mecklenburg, a wealthy city and county with taxes to match and ABC funds to boot, equal those "d——yankee" schools without extra tuition fees?

We're so up to date on traffic systems and surveys to build and place schools—perhaps we need a survey on how to spend our money to run them.

—B. T. GRIFFIN.

Quote, Unquote

Two crooked boxing managers were discussing a forthcoming fight. "At the end of the second round," said the first, "your man will hit mine and he will go down for the count."

"No, no," expostulated the second. "Not in the second round; in the seventh or eighth. We mustn't cheat the public."—**Montreal Star.**

A backward area is the one where there's no trouble in securing a vacant house or apartment.—**Rocky Mount (N. C.) Telegram.**

Ike—Unlike His Advisers—Has Touch Of Billy Sunday

By MARQUIS CHILDS

ABOARD EISENHOWER TRAIN

AS General Eisenhower speaks at stop after stop in the rich prairie country of Indiana and Illinois this reporter remembers another scene. It is Eisenhower's modest office at SHAPE headquarters outside Paris.

The time: late last November. The general was then wrestling from day to day with the question of whether to yield to the pleading of those who were bound that he should run for President. It was an unhappy time since, like all men accustomed to the sureties of a chain of command in which responsibility is appropriately parceled out from top to bottom, Eisenhower hates indecision.

In the quiet of that office at SHAPE he talked with great earnestness about how the American people must be told that there is nothing ahead but sacrifice. We must, he said, with something approaching religious fervor, give them what Billy Sunday gave them —a call to sacrifice, to surrender of self, to the simple varieties of the oldtime religion. Varieties of the old-time religion is a theme that goes deep with Eisenhower. It goes back to the experience of his childhood; to his conviction that his own sacrifice in plunging into the hurly-burly of politics must be for the purpose of helping Amer. ica to find the way back to the simple faith of a simpler era.

There could have been no more appropriate place to sound this theme. It was no accident that in New York he compared what he is undertaking to the crusade of Oliver Cromwell in England's 17th Century revolution as Cromwell went about the country cutting off the heads of the Cavaliers. In Ike is a puritanical strain that corresponds to the hardships and sacrifices of his own youth. Nowhere since his return from Paris has he spoken with greater intensity than at the dedication as a national shrine of the simple frame house in Abilene, Kansas, in which he grew up.

Of course, Eisenhower does not have his own way in this campaign. At the first stop he said revealingly:

"Since I have started in this new activity of mine I have found that I am no longer running campaigns. Campaigns are running me."

It would be simpler for Ike if there were just one set of people who wanted to run the campaign one way. But the dualism of the Republican Party is almost as evident on this train as it is elsewhere.

At the first stop Sen. William Jenner of Indiana, who is in a hard fight for re-election, boarded the train with Senator Homer Capehart and those running for top state offices. Eisenhower's appearances with Jenner in Indianapolis disturbed those among his advisers who feel Ike's best hope of victory and to govern after victory is to give extremists such as Jenner and Sen. Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin the silent treatment.

These same advisers say that Eisenhower himself was repelled by Jenner and by the necessity a week ago of embracing him on the same platform. They had sworn before the campaign train left New York for Indiana that Jenner would not get out on the back platform with Ike, and Ike himself was determined that he would not mention Jenner's name, and he stuck to that determination.

Nationally-Advertised Product (Ike) Selling Well In Midwest

By JOSEPH ALSOP

CHICAGO

THIS part of the country is supposed to be Taft territory. The Republican citizenry are said to bristle with hostility toward Dwight D. Eisenhower. The hard-working pollsters further assert that the Mid-West is where the Republican Party is weakest, except in the South, of course.

You will tell whether these theories are correct. Meanwhile, however, the shrewdness of the Republican investment in General Eisenhower is the fact that chiefly impresses this reporter at the conclusion of a fairly long Mid-Western survey.

There are two important reasons why Eisenhower is proving a sound Republican investment. First, he is, so to speak, a nationally advertised product, well-known to all, competing with a Democratic candidate who is not at all well-known to the mass of the people. Second, with the sole exception of a small minority of Sen. Robert A. Taft's bitter-ender admirers, Eisenhower is held in warm affection by all classes and groups. People liked him as a general. They are anxious to like him and to vote for him as a candidate.

They were a bit bothered by the fumbling uncertainty that marked his early appearances in his new political role. But as soon as he began to hit his stride on his southern tour, the product-acceptance, as the advertising people call it, started to soar again. The noise of the southerners' cheers for Ike encouraged great numbers of other people all over the country to join in the applause. The cheering has gone on, and has grown ever since.

No one can judge, of course, whether Eisenhower will be able to win the election just because "they like Ike," and because so many voters feel that "it's time for a change."

Yet these have been the main ingredients of Eisenhower's success to date. His farm speech stands alone, thus far, as his only reasonably specific, full-dress discussion of a major national issue. For the farm speech, Eisenhower leapt off the Republican platform and took his stand squarely on the Democratic farm plank. Senator Taft has laconically commented that, for the most part, he still prefers the Republican plank, favoring flexible farm parity instead of the high, fixed parities advocated by Eisenhower and the Democrats.

How much will this sort of thing hurt Eisenhower with the farmers, who are already so suspicious of Republican intentions? One does not know.

Again, when Eisenhower has ventured to be specific in his press conferences and question periods thrown in the mass of meetings, he sometimes cut the ground from under many of his own adherents.

For instance, Sen. William E. Jenner of Indiana, is building his whole campaign for re-election around violent attacks on the Korean War as a "war of the useless" and "meat-grinder" for "our boys." But Eisenhower has merely observed that earlier American blunders invited the Soviet aggression in Korea. He has supported President Truman's response to the Korean challenge. He has flatly refused to promise an easy or early end to the fighting, and has just as flatly rejected the MacArthur strategy of extending the fighting beyond the Korean border.

As of now, however, what stands out is the big advantage General Eisenhower is deriving from universal liking for him. In effect, Eisenhower has started a whole lap ahead of Adlai E. Stevenson in this rather short electoral race.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Republicans Need The Negro Vote

WASHINGTON

A CAREFUL Republican diagnosis of votes in 12 key states indicates that the Negro vote can probably swing the election either for or against Eisenhower. This may explain why the general recently stated that he might appoint a qualified Negro to his Cabinet.

The survey was made by experts in connection with the GOP advertising plan to use about $2 million worth of radio and TV spots during the last three weeks of the campaign in 40 counties of 12 key states.

This was behind General Eisenhower's taking time to make half a hundred radio and TV "spots" in a New York film studio last week immediately after his breakfast with Senator Taft. The spots consisted of questions asked of Eisenhower and his replies, and these will be played back to the public during the wind-up of the campaign in mid-October. Big advertisers friendly to the Republicans are being asked to relinquish their time spots for this purpose.

The survey which led to these recordings is extremely significant. It shows that, in 12 key states, a change of one or two per cent of the vote could swing the election either Republican or Democratic.

The secret GOP survey follows:

Progressive Vote Important

"EVERY one of these states with the exception of Pennsylvania (R) and Wisconsin (D) finished in an extremely close fashion in 1948. In the case of six of these states, credited to the Dewey column, the shift resulting from any Progressive vote would throw the states back to the Democrats.

"The fact that these states are concentrated geographically as they are, helps implement this plan (of saturating the air-waves with TV and radio spots). Steps taken in one state will not be confined to the state itself, but will overlap.

"A look at each state shows:

"**Connecticut**—Three strong Democratic areas centered around New Haven, New London and Hartford. A shift of two per cent in the vote of these areas would insure Republican victory. With Senator McMahon's death, a strong Republican Senatorial race will help, as will Governor Lodge's strength in the state.

"**Maryland**—Senator Tydings (D) got beaten here not so much because of Senator McCarthy's campaign, but because he lost the Negro wards in Baltimore (30 per cent of the city's vote). The same thing happened to Representative Sasscer (D) this Fall. Obviously the Negro vote is a big question here. Democratic strength is in Baltimore, across from Washington and in the Cumberland mining section.

"**New Jersey**—Went Republican in 1948 but not by an overwhelming margin. The Hudson County machine still functions, and, with the Taft-Driscoll split in the state, could cause trouble. The Negro vote is an important element here too. Democratic strength lies in Hudson County, Trenton, Camden and New Brunswick.

Slim N. Y. Margin

"NEW YORK—Went Republican by only 60,000 in 1948 while the Progressive vote was over 500,000. It is a truism in this state that, if the Republicans leave the city limits with more than a 200,000 handicap, they are in trouble. The Republicans must get every possible vote in Queens and Richmond, fight to take away independent votes in Manhattan and Bronx. In addition, they must buck the O'Connell machine in Albany, and Democratic strength in Utica, Rochester and Buffalo. The Negro and Jewish votes are vital, but FEPC endorsement alone is not the answer.

"**Pennsylvania**—Went Republican but not by a substantial margin in 1948. With the success of the Democrats in putting in Dilworth and Clark in Philadelphia, plus the decline of the Grundy machine, there will be a fight this time. Democratic strength is in Scranton, Philadelphia and the Pittsburgh area.

"**Ohio**—Taft was successful in cutting into the labor vote in Cuyahoga (Cleveland) and Mahoning (Youngstown) Counties in 1950. The Republicans must duplicate the feat again in '52 to win the state. They are helped by the fact that Charlie Taft may kick Lausche for governor, even though he was only endorsed by the Taft machine on the last day of the primary race, while Mike DiSalle is a weak candidate against John Bricker. Again the Negro vote in Cuyahoga is critical. A change in 3,600 votes in 1948 would have put the state in the Republican column.

"**Indiana**—Went Republican by a bare margin in 1948, and again a rising Negro vote is extremely important, as is the farm vote all over the state. The Gary labor vote is uncertain, probably will be more heavily Democratic this year as a result of the Truman withholding of Taft-Hartley in the steel strike.

"**Michigan**—Another state that the return of the Progressive vote could put in the Democratic column. Depression in the Detroit auto industry as well as a tight Senatorial and Gubernatorial race won't make the picture any easier. A very, very important Negro vote in Detroit, which Williams and Moody have of course catered to. Democratic strength is here, in Bay City and Flint, as well as Grand Rapids.

California Doubtful

"ILLINOIS—Here is one of the toughest for the Republicans to take. Stevenson's home state, which went barely Democratic in '48 must be taken. The concentration of Democratic strength is in Chicago, Decatur and East St. Louis. The key to taking the state is Chicago's Negro vote as well as getting as much of the downstate farm vote as possible.

"**Wisconsin**—Here is one many analysts figure belongs to the Republicans on the basis of 1940 and 1944 returns. Not so, since these votes were an expression of Wisconsin's pro-German, anti-British feeling. When this tapered off in 1948, the vote (including Progressive) was over 53 per cent Democratic. It is purely and simply a question of slugging it out on the various issues in the city of Milwaukee as well as in Green Bay and Madison.

"**Iowa**—This is the one that hurt, a farm state that went Democratic by 1 per cent. Democratic strength is all over the state, but will be found in nine major areas. Only a campaign assuring farmers of their over-all economic future as well as specific farm policies will take this state.

"**California**—Governor Warren has stated this will be a tough fight and he's right. Despite Warren's personal popularity in the state, it has steadily gone Democratic for the past six elections. Nixon doesn't seem too much stronger a candidate. California was barely Democratic in 1948 but there was a five per cent Progressive vote to contend with. Thus, unless heavy scrapping is done in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Alameda County and San Diego, the state will go to the Democrats. Here is one state where FEPC makes a strong appeal in certain sections and brings violent reaction in others. San Francisco, for example. Therefore, concentration of appeals is necessary in each local area.

"Thus, in these key 12 states, there are 40 strongly Democratic counties. By using the elements outlined in section 1 of this plan, these votes can be shifted from 1 to 3 per cent, the states and a November victory will end up in Eisenhower's hands."