

The President And His Critics

IN TODAY'S PEOPLE'S PLATFORM, there is a serious letter which merits a serious answer.

The writer, a close observer of the national scene, charges that THE NEWS has been "too easy" on President Eisenhower since he took office, and especially so in the McCarthy affair.

In the general sense, we would certainly plead guilty to having been sympathetic to President Eisenhower. This list of reasons is not conclusive, but it gives a general idea.

In the first place, any new President deserves at least a year to become accustomed to the feel of the traces of that office. Since Mr. Eisenhower was not a professional politician, the need was greater. In spite of his lack of training in the school of politics, he has, on the whole, made a fine record.

He has brought forth, after careful deliberation, a positive and progressive program of legislation. He has conducted the office of the Presidency with dignity. He has shown a good deal of force and imagination in foreign policy. He has tried, and in most cases has been successful, to appoint good men to public office. He has encouraged bipartisanship, and has leaned over backwards since taking office to avoid distorting or misrepresenting the record of previous administrations.

Too easy on Ike? Any fair-minded person who weighs the President's good points against his weaknesses can hardly fall to give him a good score.

The actions of Sen. McCarthy, President Eisenhower in a serious dilemma. It has become obvious to most observers, as it has long been obvious to us, that McCarthy's real objective is not the pursuit of Communists, but rather the exploitation of America's real con-

cern over possible subversion for his own benefit. McCarthy lusts for power. He hungers for control of the Republican Party and, through it, of the nation. Hence in his actions there is more than a direct challenge to President Eisenhower's position as President and head of the party; there is a direct challenge to the very basic American processes and traditions that, so far, have protected us from rule by demagoguery or dictatorship.

How best could the President meet this challenge? By wallowing in the gutter with McCarthy, as former President Truman sometimes did with his irresponsible critics? By trying to intrude upon the constitutional prerogatives of the U. S. Senate and discipline one of its members?

We think not. There may have been concessions to McCarthy — "appeasement," if you wish — because of the desperately thin GOP control of the House and Senate, a political handicap for President Eisenhower that his critics continue to ignore. But we are fully convinced that the President was just as unpalatable to President Eisenhower as they were to us, and that slowly and surely the President's dignified yet forceful insistence upon basic American principles is building a calmer atmosphere in which a larger number of McCarthy's finally decide the issue. McCarthyism, as beginning to see the Wisconsin senator in the cruel light of truth.

It would have given us momentary satisfaction if President Eisenhower, at his recent press conference, had slammed McCarthy around with good old earthy Army language. But greater values, not the least is the prestige and dignity of the Presidential office, would have been lost.

In sum, President Eisenhower would have pleased millions of Americans by McCarthy's final decision. We think McCarthy is, or is our reasoned opinion that the strategy he has adopted, while not so spectacular, will be more productive of the desired results. If events prove us wrong, we shall admit it quite readily.

Too Many Trips To The Polls

ON APRIL 20 city and county voters will pass on the issuance of \$500,000 in bonds for the county home.

On May 4, city voters will pass on the proposed two-cent tax levy for support of the two community colleges, Charlotte and Carver.

And May 29 is the state-wide primary. The run-off will be held four weeks later.

There is no good reason why at least the two special elections could not have been scheduled for the same day. There are good reasons why they should be concurrent, the best one being that it would save at least \$5,000 in election costs.

Too, if they were held concurrently, the elections board, busy enough preparing for the primary and the run-off, would have one less chore, and voters would be more inclined to make the effort.

In the 11 months between November, 1952, and October, 1953, six elections were conducted in Mecklenburg, not counting the Sharon school district elec-

tion and the countywide reregistration in August. All that, and the prospect of four more elections before midsummer, is enough to cool the ardor of the most contentious voter and election official.

There seems to be two main reasons for this costly and sometimes unnecessary frequency of elections:

1. Election plans proceed independently, with no one making a real attempt to correlate them.

2. Backers of a particular project sometimes fear it would be put in jeopardy if voted on at the same time another proposal is submitted. For example, advocates of the community college levy think they have a more popular cause than the county home bond issue. They don't want the two tied together.

That may be good "politics," but it's poor economy. More to be feared, we suspect, is a public attitude hostile to all special elections growing out of the sheer irritation at having to trot to the polls every couple of weeks, and impatience with election officials for not keeping a tighter string on the public purse.

It's Hard To Live Up To The Ideal

MILITARY regulations prescribe that a captured soldier shall give his captors only his name, rank and serial number. Many U. S. prisoners in Korea went far beyond that. Some who were not tortured, divulged confidential information, signed when they wanted them to sign, or even renounced their country and decided to live with their captors. On the other hand, some did not capitulate even though they were tortured and starved.

This Korean experience suggests that both military regulations and public attitude toward prisoners who capitulate want reexamination.

The reason for the regulations is obvious. If prisoners only identify themselves, the captors will have sufficient information to enable them to notify the Red Cross or some other agency of the prisoners' capture. Additional information, although the prisoner may deem it harmless, may enable skilled interrogators to piece together troop disposition, the arrival of new units. Or it may provide leads regarding the prisoners' home life that will enable the captors to upset the prisoner emotionally, thus further reducing his resistance. However, some of the prisoners went beyond what the regulations decreed and confounded the enemy by furnishing him misleading information. They talked freely, sometimes profanely with their captors, and their acts seemingly strengthened their resolve to take punishment stoically.

Certainly the testimony of Maj. Gen. William Dean in the current Schwabach hearing suggests that the regulation may be unduly harsh, and that some persons may have too hastily condemned some of the prisoners who capitulated. Gen. Dean, a Medal of Honor winner, said that he lacked "the intelligence or strength" to tell the enemy nothing but his name, rank and serial number. Although he was not tortured, he once attempted suicide. He was fearful that, under interrogation (one session lasted 69 hours) he would divulge confidential information.

"If I ever go to the front lines again," he said, "I intend to carry a pill that I can take before they capture me."

Nevertheless, when asked specifically whether he believed it realistic to expect that captured officers abide by the existing regulations he replied that he did, even though he didn't live up to it himself. "It's the ideal we should strive for," he said.

Torture is an old art, and the Communists probably have not improved on it much. But during recent wars techniques of psychological warfare have been refined, and the Communists have no peer in its use against prisoners. Sometimes the gentle treatment worked better than the brutal one did. The men who broke may have been heroes had they not been subjected to subtle techniques which they were ill-equipped to combat. Certainly if men with Gen. Dean's and Col. Schwabach's long military training and records of bravery under fire did not live up to the ideal, lesser men who likewise failed should not be hastily condemned.



INTERPLANET
"I swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, but I doubt if anybody'll recognize it."

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.

Time To Wake Up To McCarthyism

Charlotte
Editors, The News:
IT IS now time that the people of this country wake up and realize the situation that Sen. Joseph McCarthy has put the American people in — not only in our own eyes, but in the eyes of the world.

The United States was born from the vision of men and women who longed for the personal freedom of the individual, the freedom of private life, job security, and the right of the feeling of security in American citizenship.

The eminent Sen. McCarthy is slowly but surely using fear to destroy these ideals. We as citizens should not encourage or applaud the senator's mire and mud, but speak up now for our personal and hereditary rights before it is too late and before other power-loving people take the same advantage of these rights.

Of course we should be alert to the threats of communism, but we should be in favor of the American example of fair play instead of McCarthy's method, in protecting the individual.

— MRS. J. E. HOBBS

We're Still Too Easy On President

Pinehurst
IN YOUR EDITORIAL "Lenon's Solution For McCarthy Problem" you say: "This points up the basic fallacy in the arguments of those who would have President Eisenhower grapple with Joe McCarthy in the mire and mud of the 'mire and muck' politics. Although a strong President can bring a good deal of respect and sure to bear on a recalcitrant senator, he cannot directly discipline him."

Upon first reading one might agree with your conclusions, but in an analysis of the basic discipline, McCarthy's method, in protecting the individual, is not complete agreement? Let's see:

I had known the chickens which Mr. Eisenhower hatched in 1952 are coming home to roost. In the campaign Mr. Eisenhower was to make an address in McCarthy's home state of Wisconsin. It has been stated that in the address Mr. Eisenhower was pre-

pared to praise and defend George C. Marshall to whom, more than any other person, he owes most of the honors that have come to him, including the presidency. Sen. McCarthy, so it is said, persuaded Mr. Eisenhower to delete all mention of General Marshall, thereby racking up victory No. 1 for the senator.

Of even more importance is the gradual showing of the design of the pattern being worn by McCarthy. You briefly and ably touched upon this in your editorial, "A Dangerous Sacrifice of Principle" — when you said: "The analogy between McCarthy today and Hitler 21 years ago is closer than it may seem at first glance. So, too, regretfully, is the analogy in this regard between Eisenhower and von Hindenburg."

In ordinary times there would be no disagreement with you about the "fallacy" of the senator's griping in "mire and muck," nor that the president cannot "discipline" a senator. But these are not ordinary times, particularly when by all evidence we have reason to believe the Senator is trying to take over control of a political party of which the President, Mr. Eisenhower if you please, is supposed to be the titular head. Without dipping into "mire and muck" why cannot a "strong President" make a forthright statement of total disagreement with all of McCarthy's methods? Such a statement as Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Truman made in reference to a certain senator when they said "he is not my kind of a Democrat."

The answer Mr. Eisenhower has been badly advised that to do this would destroy the unity of the Republican Party, split it apart and thus lose control of Congress in the 1954 elections. Just what is at stake in this dispute — the success of a political party or the safety of our country? Answering this last Saturday night Mr. Stevenson said "had the Eisenhower administration chosen to act in defense of itself and of the nation must govern, it changed to have had the greatest respect for the support of all but a tiny and deluded minority of our people."

And, like a lot of other people, he was headed, by you: "Editors Too Easy On Ike." It would seem that your editorial which is the basis of this letter and your most optimistic editorial of Mar. 4, "The President Rose To The Occasion," are a letter to become "editors" being "Too Easy On Ike."

In all fairness and justice I ask

you "what are words without deeds?" — ELMER M. SIMKINS
'Atlantic Charter' Never Existed
Pittsboro
FREQUENT references have been made lately to the Atlantic Charter as a noble document of high and noble principles signed by the heads of the two great branches of the English speaking peoples. I am not adept at the debunking business, and in this instance I reluctantly state that there never has been such a document signed by Roosevelt and Churchill. It was the result of a vividly imaginative mind of a Democratic Senator, who, after the election in 1944, details of the Teheran Conference, at which the little nations were dumped, began to leak out, and Mr. Roosevelt was asked the point-blank question as to what had become of the Atlantic Charter. This was at the 1954 conference on Dec. 20, 1944. Mr. Roosevelt replied that there never was such a document signed by him and Mr. Churchill. On the walls of the National Museum there was a beautifully framed and illuminated document which the Atlantic Charter, several hundred thousand copies of which had been published as authentic, but when an inquisitive reporter based to the museum to check the document, he was met by the keeper with the statement that the Atlantic Charter had just been removed at the instance of the Office of War Information.

So, like the Polish massacre, charged to the Germans, we later find that it was a fake, that the Russians did it, but we had to suppress the truth until long after the war was over in order not to compromise an ally. We used the little nations and the doctrine of self-determination until such a time as we had constructed our dealings with Russia, and then, as with the "Atlantic Charter," we took it off the walls as not a part of the struggle or objective thereof, for which millions had died and died.

— JOHN W. HESTER

Merry-Go-Round Drew Pearson's

WASHINGTON
THE other day I flew down to Mexico City to interview Bill O'Dwyer, sometimes called the most mysterious man of American politics.

The former mayor of New York City had not granted an interview since he retired as U. S. ambassador to Mexico. He is, at least temporarily, to live there, rather than return to the United States.

I had known of Bill O'Dwyer when the State Department described him as the most popular and effective ambassador since Joseph Daniels. I had known him personally when he was in charge of Roosevelt's committee to help Jewish refugees escape the prison camps and soap factories of Adolf Hitler. I had also known him when, as a brigadier general in the Army, he had helped rebuild Italy.

And one very cold December day I had driven up Broadway with him when the historic canvases of lower Manhattan welcomed the Friendship Train with the traditional shower of ticker tape.

And, like a lot of other people, I wondered why he did not come back to New York.

O'Dwyer Plans To Return To New York

has been a marriage that more cruelly and sensationally was on the rocks. At first it was just the opposite. Sloan was the toast of Mexico; later her flirtations were the talk of Mexico.

At the very height of this gossip when he needed a wife most, Ambassador O'Dwyer flew back to New York on his own volition — to testify before the Kefauver committee. There he was grilled by Rudolph Halley, the man who it later developed, aspired to become mayor of New York, and was using the Kefauver committee as a springboard. O'Dwyer was suffering from pneumonia at the time and his temperature was 101, though his doctor didn't know this until later.

A specifically O'Dwyer was grilled about James J. Moran, his deputy fire commissioner who later went to jail for perjury and extortion. Moran had been close to O'Dwyer, though not a bit closer than J. Russell Sprague and N. Y. Secretary of State Curran and some of the other men who housed Tom Dewey up the political ladder and who have been exposed as having their hands in the race-track industry.

N. Y. City Grift
When I asked O'Dwyer about some of these things, he said he still could not remember the name of the man who trusted him. "As far as Dewey is concerned," he added, "you have to judge him on his accomplishments, not the man around him. The head of any state

or city can't always know everything that's going on around him, and you can't hold Dewey responsible for what some of his friends did."

Disgraced graft in New York City politics. O'Dwyer was in contracts — building contracts. That's the case not only in New York City but any city. The contractors will swear around your office. If you give them a chance, ready to take it.

"But I handled Bob Moses in the job of continuing building contracts, and not a five-cent piece went wrong out of more than a billion dollars."

In that connection, it's important to note that O'Dwyer built more schools than any other mayor in New York City's history — even more than Fiorello La Guardia. He made a crusade of his building program.

I asked O'Dwyer about the problem of race-track gambling and a proposal of his which had caused headaches and criticisms.

"People will gamble," he said, "they will gamble in New York or any other place. And I thought that since they were bound to gamble, why not make it legal and take it away from the underworld. By that I mean, put it under state control. When I proposed this, I got a storm of criticism. But since then I notice that today some of the newspapers have come round to that point of view."

Nixon Will Try To Restore GOP Program's Perspective

By DORIS FLEESON
WASHINGTON
VICE PRESIDENT NIXON'S assignment in answer to Adlai Stevenson is to make the Eisenhower program the issue in the fall elections.

The chances are he will not even mention the name of Sen. McCarthy.

Even Democrats admit the Eisenhower program makes appealing subject matter. They expect the vice president to ring the changes effectively on the Korean truce, the reduced deficit and the cuts in taxes, the new look in the military, the expansion of social security to cover more people and raise the benefits, the proposal to re-insure private health insurance plans.

All of this may not happen exactly as scheduled but at this point nobody can say it won't happen. The Vice President, in fact, can make a real contribution toward public determination to see it happen.

There is no question that the White House welcomes the chance to strive for a fresh perspective on the Administration. For all their refusal to meet the McCarthy issue head-on, they are heartily sick of the senator from Wisconsin and none more so than the President.

Responsible senators quote him using the uncut verbiage used to express his contempt. They have marveled at the fact that since he apparently feels so good about himself, he can contain himself so well when confronted with the issue in public.

His best guess is that he has decided he ought to take the advice of someone he thinks shrewder than he is politically. Their

Making Communism A Crime Would Solve Many Problems

By ROBERT C. RUARK
WELLINGTON, N. Z.
I HAVE BEEN strangely unmoved by the anathematized howls against the proposed legislation to make communism illegal and membership in the party punishable. Perhaps the death penalty, as recommended by Alan Shivers, governor of Texas, is a touch harsh. But, if you will think back, you just electrocuted the Rosenberg for being atom scientist who was theft of atom secrets with an aim to destroying the United States.

Communism today bears very little resemblance to the communism of my college days, when every third pseudo-intellectual was a Communist, although the technically was being of atom secrets with an aim to destroying the United States.

Communism today bears very little resemblance to the communism of my college days, when every third pseudo-intellectual was a Communist, although the technically was being of atom secrets with an aim to destroying the United States.

Communism today bears very little resemblance to the communism of my college days, when every third pseudo-intellectual was a Communist, although the technically was being of atom secrets with an aim to destroying the United States.

Communism today bears very little resemblance to the communism of my college days, when every third pseudo-intellectual was a Communist, although the technically was being of atom secrets with an aim to destroying the United States.

Communism today bears very little resemblance to the communism of my college days, when every third pseudo-intellectual was a Communist, although the technically was being of atom secrets with an aim to destroying the United States.

Quote, Unquote

President Eisenhower says the United States needs to gain the respect of the people. Then may be we'll be able to borrow money. — Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press.

Mexican Accalm

In Mexico City they crowd around Bill O'Dwyer in restaurants or in the American Club in the city center. He's so popular that it's embarrassing to the new ambassador, Francis White.

Sitting with O'Dwyer in the office where he practices law with a Mexican partner, you can understand why he enjoys Mexico and why he does not go back to New York until he gets good and ready.

There's not only the heartache connected with the wife who walked out when the going was tough, but there are other sentimental reasons.

Most Irishmen are sentimental, and Bill O'Dwyer perhaps is more so than most. Born in Ireland, migrating to Brooklyn where he became a cop, a disbarred attorney, a judge, and one of the most popular mayors in recent history, O'Dwyer was heartbroken when the city for which he had built hospitals, schools, hospitals and housing turned against him.

In a few short days the papers which had been eulogizing him were castigating him — over one man, Moran.

Overnight his years of service were forgotten. He had broken up the worst crime ring in New York history — Murder, Inc. He had convicted killer responsible for 70 murders. Yet the city condemned him because one of the newsmen in his administration had turned sour.