THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1952

THE TRUMAN WHISTLE STOP FORMULA

PRESIDENT HARRY TRUMAN'S formula for whistle stop campaigning proved successful in 1948, so he's trying it out again. Yesterday the Fargo, N. D., opening speech revealed these basic techniques:

1. Poke fun, sarcasm, and ridicule at the Republican Party.

2. Criticize the "one-party press".

3. Charge the GOP with appealing to the emotions of the people and using slogans, generalities, scare words, lies and propaganda; then do precisely the same thing.

4. Defend the Administration's record as near-perfect, and gloss over its failures.

5. Portray yourself as a friend of the common man and an enemy of the lobbies and special interests.

6. Belittle the GOP candidates and praise the Democrats.

7. Cuss Wall Street.

8. Invent a new catch-slogan and hammer away at it. In 1948, it was the "do-nothing Congress"; this year it's "look out, neighbor!"

9. Hit 'em in the pocketbook. "Vote for candidates who have your welfare at heart—vote for yourselves".

10. Repeat the performance at every stop.

Whether the formula will work again in 1952 is uncertain. In any event, the crowds seem to eat it up, further proof that the American people still prefer an old-fashioned slugfest to a calm debate on the issues.

WILL YOUR TAXES BE CUT NEXT YEAR?

IT MAY HELP some at this stage of the game to examine the prospects for an early Federal tax reduction in the cold light of the international situation.

As of today, some 85 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government is going to pay for past and future wars. A sizable portion of this—interest on the national debt and veterans benefits—is fixed by law and will not be reduced by the next Congress. The rest goes for keeping up our defense establishment, rearmament, and foreign aid to our allies.

It may be true, as General Eisenhower said in Baltimore last week, that unification has not produced all the economies it is capable of producing. In any operation as large as the defense program, especially one undertaken under the pressure of speed, there is bound to be a great deal of waste and inefficiency. A close scrutiny of defense spending followed by tight-fisted administration will certainly produce some savings.

Furthermore, there may well be reductions in the Mutual Security appropriations in the next year or two from the $6.5 billion voted in 1952.

At best, however, there is unlikely to be any spectacular reduction in Federal taxes in the next year unless there is a decision by Congress and the new Administration to slow up the defense program.

Two leading U. S. business publications, *Business News and Fortune*, have recently polled U. S. business leaders to get their opinions on the state of the national economy. Both report virtually the same conclusion: that defense spending is the dominant factor in the economy, that it will continue at its present high level for another year, and that no substantial reductions in taxes can be expected in the immediate future.

A truce in the Korean War, a genuine move toward peace by Soviet Russia, or greater arms production by our allies would alter the situation. The problem of today's high taxes, however, was not of our own making, and its solution is not entirely in our hands.

AN ANSWER

ELSEWHERE on today's editorial page is a letter from James E. Curry, a Washington attorney, answering a recent column by Drew Pearson about the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Mr. Curry contends that Pearson treated him unfairly.

THE NEWS does not have access to all the facts in the matter, but in full justice to Mr. Curry prints his long letter in full.

IKE'S SURPRISING SWITCH ON UMT

"AS long as I speak from any platform I can get I will insist under present conditions on universal military training. Universal military training is one of the great pillars in the security structure this country must have."

Thus spoke General Eisenhower on June 27, 1947. General Eisenhower subsequently repeated his belief in the necessity of UMT. As late as last March he said it is a necessity "so long as any major threat to peace remains in the world".

Meanwhile, Senator Taft was saying that UMT should be delayed "as long as the draft now is taking most young men for two years' active duty." The difference between Taft and Eisenhower on UMT was the biggest issue in the South Dakota primary June 3.

Last Thursday night at Baltimore, in a prepared speech, General Eisenhower suddenly, without explanation, changed his position. He did so with the following words:

"It seems clear that so long as we are forced to employ the draft, because of actual combat requirements, we cannot at the same time establish any form of training for our young men. To attempt this would create more difficulty and injustice than now exists."

Thus the General and the Senator now seem to be in agreement—in Senator Taft's corner—on this military matter.

This change disturbs us for two reasons. In the first place, we believe and have often declared UMT is an integral part of the answer to the "famine or feast" defense policy which General Eisenhower scored in his Baltimore address. UMT would provide a trained reserve in case of all-out war, which in this era would not permit us the luxury of months of training. General Eisenhower prefaced his Baltimore remarks on UMT by saying "We must never again be caught in the position of sending untrained recruits to the battlefield", and UMT certainly seems to be the remedy for that situation. Furthermore, such training would eliminate the necessity for the callback of battle-weary reservists, as was necessary in even the Korean War, a limited operation.

Secondly, whether or not Senator Taft and his advisers caused the General to change his position, his reversal seems to be a submission to the Taft viewpoint—and this not in the field of domestic policy, where the general has already deferred to the Taft school in many instances, but in the military field in which the General has vast knowledge and a previously different conviction on the subject.

Dyed-in-the-wool Republicans may be happy that the general has reversed his position on UMT. But many, many independent voters are concerned by what seems to be concession after concession by General Eisenhower to the Old Guard, and they are perhaps wondering what the battle in Chicago was all about.

HOW TO SPOT GHOSTS

WITH the establishment recently of a course in ghost writing at a Washington university, the science of putting words in other people's mouths has reached a new high—or a new low. Ghost writing of course is not strictly a 20th century product. Once the French novelist, Dumas, asked his son if he'd read the latest Dumas book. The boy reportedly replied: "Non, *papa*—*avez-vous?*"

But the ghost has truly entered his element during these latter days, and has already figured in the Presidential campaign, with the observation by Governor Stevenson that if the General "wrote what he said, he had not read what I said." And he's face it—the ghosts will not be laid in the foreseeable future. Thus a few hints on detection of the wispy creatures may be helpful to our readers.

Cosmopolitan suggests a fine way of detecting the hand of the eerie apparition, by telling of a New York mayor who never looked at his ghosted speeches beforehand. A funny story written into his oration made the mayor laugh so uproariously that he was barely able to finish the speech. With Adlai's deadpan delivery and the Republican law of gravity featured in this campaign it is unlikely that either Presidential candidate will make this error, if or when they lean on ghosts, but watch for this symptom in lesser politicians.

Then there is the immediate retraction, which always indicates a lurking ghost. It is of course permissible and commonplace for a candidate to contradict himself completely, even in the same speech. But when he reverses himself in succeeding sentences, that's your clue. Like the orator in the 1948 campaign, who stopped suddenly after finishing an especially bombastic sentence he had not previously read. "Ladies and gentlemen," he said, "I completely disagree with my last statement."

Although we never heard, we imagine he also gave up the ghost.

Opera is where a man gets stabbed in the back and instead of bleeding, he sings.—*Carlsbad (N. M.) Current-Argus.*

Nothing can stop work in a small town like the arrival of a new joke.—*Ellisville (Ga.) Sun.*

Seismologists are stumped at reasons for a flurry of temblors. Could it be the good earth is the sensitive type, recoiling from all these pledges to save it?—*St. Louis Globe-Democrat.*

What with inflation and all, those store-boughten vegetables now cost almost as much as the ones reared in our home-garden.—*Nashville Banner.*

As we understand it, the function of the price administrator is to report price increases as soon as he hears about them.—*Ellisville (Ga.) Sun.*

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.

Good Job On Ike

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

YOU people did a superb job of covering, and I do mean "covering", Ike and Mamie's visit. No subscriber could ask for better. And the pictures were grand.

DOT KNOX.

Use UNC Planners

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

IN reference to your recent editorial, "Insurance for Taxpayers", in which the suggestion was made that the superintendent of the county schools retain outside consultants for a survey of the needs of the county schools, I would like to raise these questions.

Is it necessary to call in outside consultants when we have a very able group of planners at the School of City and Regional Planning at Chapel Hill who are well-qualified to prepare a survey of the county schools?

Have the editors studied the proposed work agenda which the school has scheduled for a county planning study to determine if a school survey is included?

The name of this consulting firm was not mentioned in the editorial, but I suspect from the cautious reference made that this firm is outside the state. If such is the case, I would like to make a suggestion to the editors: Go visit the School of City and Regional Planning at the University of North Carolina and see for yourselves what a fine job they are doing to make comprehensive planning available in this state.

E. S. DRAPER JR.

Co-Operation For Ike Visit

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

IN view of the tremendously successful welcome accorded Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in Charlotte Friday, I would like to express, as chairman of the Republican Party in this state, my warm appreciation to every person, group, and agency which contributed in any way toward promoting so enthusiastic and so significant a program.

The tireless and weeks-long efforts of all Citizens for Eisenhower were of inestimable value. Without the attention they gave to hundreds of details, the Presidential nominee's visit to the Queen City would not have been nearly the event it was.

I also would like to thank most heartily the local Republican Party organization, Mayor Victor Shaw and all other city officials for their co-operation; the Charlotte newspapers and radio stations, the local television outlet; the hundreds of regular and reserve policemen and firemen who so courteously and efficiently guided traffic and attended to other details; to Alex S. Hanes Jr., and his Arrangements Committee, which guided and administered the entire event; and to the musical organizations from this and other cities.

My thanks go also to the Charlotte business men who opened their stores and offices late so that employees might attend the meeting in Memorial Stadium, and other business men who allowed their employees time from their duties to watch the parade down Trade St. I am likewise grateful to the superintendent of city schools and to his faculty members and the school students themselves, for their co-operation.

Also to be commended is the Southern Railway group which aided so materially, the custodians at Memorial Stadium, those who furnished private automobiles and trucks; the people of the surrounding communities for their interest and attendance; and the public in general for unstinting co-operation in every regard.

JAMES M. BALEY JR.

Why No Anthem At Football Game?

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

HAVING attended quite a few football games in Memorial Stadium in the past, I noticed something was missing a week ago Saturday. The national anthem was not played before the Central-Tech game started. Why?

Charlotte Central was the home club, and their band was not present. It seems Charlotte Tech should have taken the initiative and played our national song.

Perhaps due to graduation or because of a new school year they were not advanced enough in music to do so. But surely there could have been at least a recording played.

I hope someone can clear this up for me and others. With all the plans to be made in the future for games, let's not leave out the national anthem.

DAVID ELMS

Reply To Pearson

Speaking For Indians

WASHINGTON

THE Charlotte News published an unexemplimentary article about me, in the form of a story by Drew Pearson, entitled "Indian Lawyers Pull Shady Deals. "Indian Commissioner Dillon Myer and Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman are trying to justify the use of an antiquated law under which they claim the arbitrary power to prevent Indians from using their own tribal funds to pay lawyers they choose by them.

This in turn is part and parcel of a campaign to destroy the developing movement among American Indians for real "home rule" under which not only their tribal attorneys but all their tribal officials and tribal business would be taken more and more out from under Government control.

Pearson says that it is merely a lawyer's "technique" to claim that the Indians are "abused, downtrodden, and unfairly dealt with by Uncle Sam." Most Indian leaders have voiced similar sentiments. The Sioux and Assiniboine Indians called upon Drew Pearson to look into the Department's "mistreatment of Indians" in Montana. Mr. Pearson did not acknowledge their telegram.

There may be lawyers who have made fortunes out of representing Indian tribes, but I am not one of them. I have enjoyed only an opportunity to be of service to a prosecuted minority. I have given that service at tremendous personal sacrifice.

Pearson's claim that I have a "near monopoly" of Indian law business is ridiculous.

However, I am handling some important Indian cases. For instance, I have the claims of the Paiute and Apache Indians for damages arising out of depredations against them by white civil and military officials during the last century. These claims will be successful if Commissioner Myer's friend, Sen. Clinton Anderson (who refers to them as "drain on the Treasury"), Sen. Pat McCarran of Nevada and others do not succeed in "investigating me out of business."

My fees in these cases cannot ever be unreasonable. They will be controlled by Government officials or by the courts. Most of these Government officials are antagonistic to me, because of my strenuous prosecution of the claims. Therefore, there is little or no possibility of my receiving exorbitant fees.

Thus far, these Indians have paid me nothing for claims work. Even the expenses are advanced by me and my associates.

The depredations and attempted depredations upon Indian rights are not all a part of past history. In recent years, I have fought successfully various attempts to "pluck" the lands and water rights of Indians and turn them over to private interests.

Pearson says that the Indian law business has become very profitable. Perhaps it has to those lawyers who "go along" with the dictatorship of the department. But I have opposed that dictatorship, and through its control over Indians funds the Government has seen to it that my income is drastically limited. Now, by using to the limit the obsolete law which gives such control, the bureau is planning to put me out of business altogether.

Pearson mentions a fee from an Alaska Tribe that he says was "Twice the amount of the tribe's annual income." This sounds exorbitant, but Pearson does not mention the actual amount of the fee. It was the munificent sum of $600! Myer's statement, quoted by Pearson, is a gross misrepresentation of fact.

Pearson quotes Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska. Gruening was one of the main sponsors of an unconstitutional bill, which I personally thwarted, to grab the lands of Alaska natives for the paper-pulp and the fisheries monopolies. Gruening quoted me as admitting that our legal theory of Indian ownership was "the bunk". Pearson quotes Gruening's charges but omits mention of my denial.

I have fought without ceasing for years for the enforcement of these rights. They are not "bunk" because it was on the basis of them that I blocked Gruening's attempted land grab.

It was Governor Gruening, not I, who referred to the Indians' white friends as "sob sisters". The charge that I "cursed the white man" is ridiculous. As Pearson reports, I did urge the Indians to take legal steps against the Government. That was my duty as their lawyer. One of the Senate committeemen told me that I should have permitted this unconstitutional law to be enforced without resistance. If I did any such thing, I would then have deserved to be run out of business.

But it is not for dereliction of duty that I am now being persecuted. It is for faithful performance of my sworn obligation as a lawyer. This persecution is being carried on (through their allies in the Government and in the press) by the very financial, industrial and political interests that want to pick the Indians' pockets.

One, William Firethunder, states that the National Congress of American Indians (of which Justice N. B. Johnson of Oklahoma is president) held out "free legal aid built to entice membership in the organization and to "feather the nest" of the undersigned. These charges should be brought, if at all, before the Bar Association here. Judge Johnson and I can defend ourselves adequately. Actually, the contract to which Firethunder refers was negotiated not by me, but by Felix S. Cohen.

I have tried to defend people who cannot defend themselves and who cannot pay adequately for their defense. Uncle Sam is supposed to be their guardian but he has been an unfaithful one. The solicitor of the department even insists publicly on the right of the Government to use its power of guardianship to advance its own interests.

Pearson points out that "increased defense demands" for oil, timber, uranium, etc., have quadrupled the value of Indian property and rendered the Indians "very much worth plucking." Indian people who are in such danger need their own legal advisers, the same as private corporations or white citizens who have valuable assets. These lawyers should be chosen by the clients themselves and should be responsible only to them, not to the politicians who, up to now, have shown every willingness to permit the "plucking", nay even to assist in it.

As Pearson says, "Justice for Indians Comes High". Uncle Sam owes to the Indians and to his conscience an obligation that will be hard to repay. If it is ever to be repaid, then politicians, newspapermen and others who control and influence our Government must pay more attention to human rights and less to the vested privileges of the wealthy few who would like to "pluck" the Indian in the same way that he was plucked in the last century.

I expect that I, as a single "mouthpiece" of the Indian, can and will be destroyed. But the voice of the national conscience will not thereby be permanently stilled.

—JAMES E. CURRY.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Nixon Aides Were Plenty Mad At Ike

WASHINGTON

THE Eisenhower-Nixon talk was an extremely healthy thing from the point of view of Republican harmony, because signs of bad blood had been developing between the two top GOP running-mates.

Newspapermen covering the Nixon trip either ignored it or played it down. Nixon's aides were building up Ike Eisenhower for even entertaining the thought that he be dropped from the ticket. That was why Nixon deliberately ignored the General's telegram requesting him to see him "at once."

Instead, the potential next Vice-President of the United States flew not to the Eisenhower train but to Missoula, Mont. And when newsmen queried the Nixon entourage in Los Angeles as to why he wasn't going to see Ike immediately, Nixon's press secretary James Bassett bluntly replied: "We are going to Montana."

Nixon's strategy was first to show that he was not a boy candidate to be pushed around; second, to let public sentiment build up in favor of keeping him on the ticket.

Furthermore, it was no accident that Nixon asked his listeners to send telegrams to the Republican National Committee, not to the General. He knew its members, most of them professionals, would be much more sympathetic. Also Nixon's staff made it all too clear to the newspapermen around them that they bitterly resented the General's telegram from Cleveland that "my personal decision will be based on a personal conclusion."

Personal Meeting

PRESS Secretary Bassett has been one of the most zealous Nixon aides, and was one of those who virtually took the telephone away from his chief in Portland, Ore., to tell Senator Seaton of Nebraska aboard the Eisenhower train that Ike advisers should get some backbone. This was why Bassett was brought into the picture when the two candidates finally met at Wheeling.

Originally it was arranged for Eisenhower and Nixon to meet in rooms 782 and 794 in Wheeling's McClure Hotel. Mrs. Eisenhower and her elderly mother, Mrs. Doud, were down the hall in rooms 790-792, while the security guard was in room 780 next to the General. However, when the two candidates learned of the crowds outside the hotel, the two men went to the special train instead.

There they talked for an hour. They did not, however, discuss the $18,000 expense fund which had set the politics of the nation almost on its ear. Not a word was said about it. Their main decision was to concentrate the campaigns on what they decided to call the "big three"—Korea, Communism and corruption.

Republican surveys have shown that these three issues have made the biggest impact on the voters, of which the most important is Korea.

Better Press Relations

ONLY way in which the $18,000 fund was touched upon indirectly was because Eisenhower had been provoked at Nixon for not clearing his first statement. He urged closer press co-operation. And since Ike had an early whistle-stop appearance, Senator Seaton of Nebraska paternally insisted that Nixon go to bed.

After this, Bassett and Jim Hagerty, an old campaigner under Governor Dewey, joined the conference.

Bassett, puffing a big cigar, made the compartment resemble the Blackstone Hotel's famous smoke-filled room. Finally candidate Nixon asked Bassett for a cigar, leaned back and smoked what he said was the first cigar of his campaign. He was feeling a lot better.

Note—There have been other cases where the President and Vice-President, though members of the same party, clashed. Most dramatic was the case of Calvin Coolidge and Vice-President Charley Dawes. Dawes was even suspected of arriving late for an important tie vote in the Senate in order to thwart his chief in the White House.

Professional Politicians?—Not A One At Stevenson's HQ

By STEWART ALSOP

SPRINGFIELD, Ill.

THE MORE ONE sees of the Stevenson campaign headquarters here in Springfield, the more peculiar the whole set-up seems. Where, the visitor asks himself, are the cigar-smoking, infinitely knowledgeable citizens of Irish descent, who always abound in a Democratic political headquarters? Where are the "minorities representatives," the labor advisers, the farm specialists? Where are the glossy public relations experts? Where, finally, are the professional politicians, the men who really know how to win elections?

Instead of these conventional characters in the political drama, the visitor finds a small group of energetic people who have, for the most part, never had anything whatsoever to do with practical politics. These people work very hard — it is considered here shamefully sluggish to work less than 18 hours. Even so, the Stevenson headquarters has a little the air of a congenial house party, made up of pleasant people who have known each other for a long time.

BOLD MOVE

Both this unconventional character of the Stevenson headquarters and the location of theheadquarters here in Springfield, of course, reflect a bold and carefully calculated decision by Stevenson himself. He wanted, first, to divorce his campaign from "the mess in Washington". And he wanted, second, to give his campaign an unbossed and unpolitical coloration.

There are certain obvious disadvantages in this course Stevenson has adopted. In the first place, the relations between Springfield and the Democratic National Committee in Washington are both tenuous and distinctly strained. A good many Stevenson staffers here are inclined to mutter that Democratic Chairman Stephen Mitchell has been one of Stevenson's most serious mistakes, and no doubt the attitude of Washington to Springfield is equally acid. This kind of fraction is inevitable, where authority is divided geographically and in other ways.

Even here in Springfield the lines of authority are blurred. It is not clear just who is running what. Stevenson's campaign manager, Wilson Wyatt, officially stands just below the candidate in the Springfield hierarchy. Actually, Wyatt concerns himself largely with the mechanics of the campaign, finance, scheduling, and the like. The man who really has the most influence here is Stevenson's administrative assistant and alter ego, Carl MacGowan. MacGowan seems destined for the role of a Colonel House or a Louis Howe in the next Administration, if Stevenson is elected.

Others in the Springfield inner circle include the Pulitzer Prize winning Clayton Fritchey, formerly of the White House; David Bell, also formerly of the White House; George Ball, a Washington lawyer and old friend of Stevenson's who is much to calm the troubled Stevenson spirit in the pre-convention era; and the brilliant historian, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., who has been attached as a "dangerous radical" although in fact he recognized the danger of Communist imperialism long before it was fashionable to do so.

ADLAI IS BOSS

These men and others have various rather vague special assignments, but their real function is to act as a corps of idea men. When Stevenson returns here periodically from his forays among the voters, he has long discussions with them, and reads the first drafts of speeches they have prepared for him, but, his aides all insist, Stevenson not only writes all the final draft of his speeches, but he makes all the important decisions — and some unimportant ones — himself.

Stevenson has thus dealt with the problems of divided authority by assuming all final authority himself. This does not mean that his staff here has no influence on his strategy. Indeed, his Springfield staff has with some difficulty persuaded Stevenson to change his mind on at least three important points: Repeal of Taft-Hartley, civil rights (on which Stevenson at first wanted to maintain a middle position) and, more recently, the disclosure of the details of his Illinois fund. But the fact remains that Stevenson is very much master in his own house.

The second problem arising out of Stevenson's decision to locate his campaign headquarters in Springfield and staff it with amateurs, remains unsolved, however. There is literally no one here, or in Washington for that matter, who really talks the language of the professional politician. Aside from Stevenson himself, there is no one with prestige, the authority, or the political background necessary to assuage the vanity of the professionals; to give them a sense of personal participation in the campaign; and to reassure them about their own future.

Stevenson's Stern Words Cut Through Usual Campaign Fog

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

IF YOU HAPPEN to notice in the air these days a sort of gray fog, it can be attributed only in part to the bonfires that burn every Fall. Part of it can be put down to campaign oratory. It is a sort of by-product of a Presidential year; the sleazy, gray, smelly fumes that spew out of the exhaust of the campaign motor.

It tends, this rich mixture of threat and promise, to become somewhat oppressive. About this time, nearly midway through what is some resemblance to an old-fashioned Iowa hog-calling contest, we tell ourselves that at least we are in the home stretch. We say it hopefully.

But even in the midst of this contest sometimes some true words are spoken, even brave words. Gov. Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic candidate, talked the other day at the graduation exercises at the Marine base at Quantico, Virginia. His son, Adlai Jr., was in that class.

Perhaps to our family what the candidate said on that occasion had a special meaning because one of our family is shortly going to Korea. He, too, is a young Marine officer, called back to active duty from his reserve status.

If he listened, which he doesn't, to some of the cheap words of slick-talking politicians, he would hear that this danger could be just whisked away by replacing one set of men in office with another set. He could hear that it was nothing more than the blunders, or worse, of a few men in Washington that brought on the danger; or even that the danger is non-existent, a political bogey.

Because we are so devoted to this young man, sharing in some small degree his pride, we welcomed these honest words from Stevenson:

"Certainly there have been failures and mistakes. The course of human history is a record, in tragic part, of things done which should not have been done, things not done which should have been done. Our own history is like the rest. But of one thing I, for myself, am certain and I think you also can be certain.

"It is not to make good the errors of the past that you are here, but to make good the promise of the future. The fighting in which we are now engaged in Korea is fighting undertaken in the name of the common collective security of the great majority of the nations of the world against the brutal aggressiveness of one or more of them. It is fighting which might, conceivably, have been avoided on that particular battlefield had we acted otherwise than we did—though, as to that, no man can surely say. But it is fighting which must inevitably have been faced somewhere in the world, so long as the Soviet Union pressed its purpose to subjugate the free peoples of the earth and so long as the United States and the free peoples of the earth retained their purpose to resist."

Those are stern words. They have a strange sound in this campaign season. They are in striking contrast to other kinds of campaigning intended to sell the best, the finest, the purest political soap — but that soap and the wicked world will be washed clean, the dangers just wiped away, the beautiful sparkle never to be dimmed again.