THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

60th Anniversary Year

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

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1948

The Privilege Of The Ballot

TODAY North Carolinians are casting their vote in the quadrennial renewal of democracy's most sacred ritual.

For the average Tar Heel voter it means an interruption in his daily routine—the performance of a small and seemingly insignificant task of citizenship. Like many of his fellow citizens, he finds it terribly simple to minimize the importance of the ballot.

But the people who keep up with such things could tell him, if he bothered to ask, that the votes cast by people who share his attitude are the deciding ballots in the great election decisions of the day. They could also tell him that his right to vote was no privilege easily won. Little more than 100 years ago he would likely never have been called on to vote at all. During most of the early years of our history suffrage was considered the prerogative only of the landed gentry, and it was not until relatively recent times that it became a citizenship privilege of the masses. Universal suffrage did not spring into existence overnight; it came after long years of mellowing attitudes, remolded folkways and blood spilled on battlefields.

• • • •

NORTH CAROLINA'S Constitution of 1776 granted her citizens their first right of suffrage, but it was a limited right. Freemen might vote for members of the House of Representatives and landholders for members of the Senate. These bodies together chose the Governor and all other State officials as well as the national Presidential electors.

It was not until 60 years later — after Jacksonian democracy swept the land — that North Carolina decided to amend her suffrage laws. In a special election that year freemen got the privilege of electing their Governor. This was an important development in the extension of the voting franchise.

In 1857 a constitutional amendment abolished property owning as a qualification for electing Senators; thus, for the first time all white freemen had the full privilege of the ballot. A fratricidal war extended that right to all citizens regardless of race. The State Constitution adopted in 1868 (substantially the same one we have today) permitted popular election of all State and County officials, judicial as well as executive.

In 1900 a further amendment placed some limitation on the voting privileges granted following the Civil War; it required an educational test as a prerequisite for voting. That stipulation continues in existence today.

Suffrage rights have been little changed since 1900 save for the Woman's Suffrage Amendment adopted in 1919 and the abolition of the poll tax as a voting requisite the following year. In 1929 on the recommendation of Governor O. Max Gardner, North Carolina adopted the Australian (or secret) ballot system.

• • • •

THAT, in brief, tells the story of North Carolina's ever-broadening right of suffrage through 162 years of self-government. The voting privilege is probably more significant today than it ever was in our history. There are strong forces abroad in the world which would cancel that significance if they possibly could.

Few things besides laziness, lack of interest or a prison term stand between any person 21 years old and the ballot box in North Carolina. Democracy's greatest ritual should be indulged in proudly and gratefully today.

Stay South, Young Man

DRIVE along North Carolina's good wide highways these chilly blue Autumn days and you will see a dozen Souths. You will see the Old South of the plantation manor on whose porch a goateed and spindly old colonel might sip his bourbon. You will see the backwoods South of children shoeless in November and gaunt women scrubbing scraps of cloth in the backyard's black pot. You will see Small Town South with its Main Street stretching through a couple of blocks of small brick buildings, each with a gallused proprietor standing out front. You will see the Industrial South in the sprawling textile plants which give forth the whirr of thousands of spindles.

But you will see most of all the South of the New Agriculture, the South of soil conservation, the South of once-hated "book farming". You will see spick-and-span farms like that of the Brothers Kelly, whose acres THE NEWS helped to improve in last month's "Miracle Conservation Field Day", green farms with neat white fences and big, chock-full barns and siloes.

And you may see the yield of these farms —a prosperous farmer in a shiny new automobile, a happy farm wife in town to shop, or a group of healthy, shouting children who play as they wait for the school bus at the side of the road.

These children, as much as cotton, corn and wheat, are the products of the New Agriculture; these children, shiny-faced and well-clothed, are the fruit of North Carolina's long fight for sensible agricultural practices.

• • • •

THIS month, in the *Atlantic Monthly* magazine, one of the nation's leading agriculturists — Louis Bromfield — tells the world about the South's accomplishment, about what intelligence, thrift and hard work has wrought in North Carolina.

Mr. Bromfield, novelist, squire of Malabar Farm and enthusiastic prophet of a new era in American agriculture, calls the South's prosperous farms "the symbol of man's conquest over his own carelessness, ignorance and greed." He calls the South "The New Frontier", offering opportunities as great as the First Frontier of virgin soil.

"Go South, Young Man!" Mr. Bromfield advises, south to a waking land where a whole country is in the process of being made over. Made over not only in agriculture, he adds, but in the field of business, both large and small, in industry, processing, servicing and in many other fields.

But Mr. Bromfield, being the son and grandson of Ohio farmers and an Ohio farmer himself, is principally interested in farming, in methods of improving the soil—getting the most out of the earth and yet not murdering it in the process. He revels in the fact that the agricultural income in North Carolina has increased from about 200 million dollars to about 800 million dollars in the past five years, citing as causes for this amazing achievement "better and more balanced agriculture, through increases in technology, mechanization, the growth of the dairy livestock industries, and most of all . . . soil conservation, good land use, and the gradual abandonment or reform of the old vicious system of single-crop tobacco and cotton agriculture."

He points out, however, that "the blight of a wretched agriculture" still remains "over vast areas of the Deep South" and points to the untapped wealth in such fields as the dairy and beef-feeding industry, a field in which, he believes, the South could outstrip the now dominant Middle West.

• • • •

HE reminds ambitious young men all over the nation that "there are millions of acres of potentially high production agricultural land waiting to be put back into circulation, whole vast and orderly forests to be developed, and great opportunities to be found in the burgeoning industries."

"To go South," he concludes, "and grow up with the New Frontier can be and will be an exciting experience and a profitable one as well."

Few will be surprised if Bromfield's advice sends thousands of young men pouring into the South but it will be painfully ironic for those of us who have year after year urged the South's young men to *stay* in the South and who have year after year waved sad farewells to those who have gone North and West to what they had been led to believe were greener pastures. To see this migration shift would prove our point but it would not repair the damage done to the South by the much-needed young men who gave in to the lure of immediate profit.

"Go South, Young Man"? Is not the wiser counsel: *Stay* South, Young Man!

• • • •

NORTH CAROLINIANS will read with interest Mr. Bromfield's fine compliment to the progressive spirit of this state. He wrote:

> Of all the Southern states, and for that matter all the forty-eight, no state has shown more progress within the past generation than North Carolina. The progress is not alone economic. Few states have made so rapid an industrial development, and no Southern state has advanced with such speed toward the achievement of the vital industrial-agricultural balance so important to the stabilized prosperity of any region. It was not long ago that the same poverty and shabbiness which has largely characterized the Deep South since defeat was almost everywhere in evidence in North Carolina. Today the shabby look has largely gone. The farms appear prosperous and well cared for in most areas, and the shabby cabin slums on the fringes of the towns are on their way out. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has become one of the most vigorous cultural centers of the nation.
>
> It is, I think, indisputably true that culture, social advance, and civilization in general are to a large extent tied to economics, to living standards, and to productivity. So are ignorance, prejudice, and intolerance. Education plays its role, beyond question, but education too is dependent on a stable, fairly prosperous and balanced economy. North Carolina is a case in proof, for as a state it has made remarkable progress away from the old superstitions and the prejudices which in the past handicapped and at times paralyzed the Deep South.

Down at the chancery court Judge Stricker was trying to get at the bottom of a marital row that had brought both husband and wife before the tribunal asking for divorce. Finally the wife came up with this explanation: "It all started when we couldn't agree on how we'd spend the money if we made a winning at the bingo game." — *Jackson (Miss.) Daily News.*

New York store advertises the first family-sized television set for "less than $250" —$249.95 plus $55 installation, plus $1.50 Federal excise tax. — *Little Rock Arkansas Gazette.*

The Communists, being atheists, preach also that there is no hell. They do not indicate an answer to the question of where, if that be true, peace has gone. — *Nashville (Tenn.) Banner.*

'You Fellows Making Any Progress?'

People's Platform

Failure Of Chest To Reach Goal

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

POOR old Queen Charlotte has been in heavy travail these past few days. The annual Community Chest campaign has sputtered to an ignominious finale—alackaday! It had been hoped at the time of her accouchement that the blessed event would be accomplished normally within the allotted time and that all would be merry and bright until next year. Probably very few suspected that delivery would have to be made by Caesarian section and that the little stranger would be stillborn. But so the sober dispatch of the press avers and one is moved to hang one's head in grief and shame. And it is a crying shame that Charlotte, metropolis of the Carolinas and one of the wealthiest cities in the Southeast, cannot promptly dig down in its well-lined wallet and pony up the very reasonable sum adopted as a minimum for the efficient conduct of the 21 deserving welfare agencies which share in the Community Chest. One hesitates to venture a guess as to just where the responsibility lies. Probably the most plausible one is that all segments of our society—from high to low, have in them numerous grasping nickel nursers who would skin a flea for its hide and tallow. Some of these purblind skinflints, in an attempt to justify their wretched parsimony, offer all manner of specious reasons. One hears such cracks as "Overhead and administration costs are too high," or, "I don't believe in organized charity." To such as they I would merely suggest that competent administration always comes high, and as for charity, "organized" or any other sort, the fact remains that in these parlous times organized charity is about all we have left.

One is tempted to paraphrase that warm-hearted Irish wit Oliver Goldsmith in re the current impasse, and say:

> "Fair Charlotte, wealthiest village of the plain,
> Where pelf and plenty cheer the laboring swain,
> Where golden gain heaps up the marts of trade,
> And some of Dixie's tightest wads have strayed."

Old Queen Charlotte can shell out a-plenty for the faceless millions of Europe, she can ante up fancy sums for the support of foreign missions, she can and does support commercialized sport in a big way, she can pour millions each year into the ABC coffers, BUT she has an attack of the botts and falls flat on her face when it comes to lending a helping hand to the poor, the miserable, and the needy right here at home.

Despite the present dismal state of affairs one must doff one's fedora to the unselfish men and women who have given so freely of their time and energies to try to make the campaign a success. They have my sincere respect and admiration and they deserve that of every thinking citizen.

According to a recent brochure issued by the local Chamber of Commerce, Charlotte now has 175 churches which would seem to be something of an oversupply. One is honestly moved to wonder just what purpose they serve. Obviously, it cannot be maintained that they are having much luck in inculcating in their parishioners the ancient tenets of Christian living. Christianity, unless I have forgotten Holy Writ completely, embraces some very pointed and emphatic obligations with respect to charity and the succor of the poor. Maybe it might be advisable to close about three-fourths of them and open a like number of respectable taverns in their stead. It is easily a 3 to 2 bet that you would find in the latter something more of the things of the human spirit and certainly more generosity and genial kindliness than can be found in most of the local basilicas. After all, in the presence of civic failure to measure up to a basic Christian principle, what purposes do our local churches serve except as springboards for commercial or personal preferment or as focal points for the Sunday parade of female fashion? Let's permit old Omar of Naishapur to handle the summation:

> "And this I know: whether the one True Light
> Kindle to Love, or Wrath—consume me quite,
> One flash of it within the Tavern caught
> Better than in the Temple lost outright."

—ROBERT E. TAYLOR.

Emory Not On Quota Basis

GASTONIA

Editors, THE NEWS:

I THANK you sincerely for the splendid editorial on the state dental college. I refer to the one which appeared in your paper on Wednesday, Oct. 27. I believe this article contains more "meat" than any similar article that I have seen.

Allow me to call attention to one error which is of minor nature but which should be recognized in fairness to Emory. The Emory School of Dentistry does not operate on a quota basis. It does not have a quota even for the State of Georgia. However, the number of North Carolina boys who are able to matriculate there is small.

Again I thank you for your splendid support of this worthy cause, and I solicit your continued efforts.

—DR. A. C. CURRENT,
Chairman, Public Relations Committee, North Carolina Dental Society.

Football Via Short Wave

CONCORD

Editors, THE NEWS:

ABOUT football broadcasts Mr. H. P. F. (People's Platform, Oct. 28) is right. Saturday afternoon broadcasts of ball games should not be all North Carolina as has been the case for the past few weeks.

Saturday, Oct. 23, I used short wave and had a "nice afternoon". I got Cornell and Army, and then switched to Michigan, both exciting with Bill Stern and Ted Husing.

All the world did not go to Southern colleges, but most of the USA has a special interest in the Army, Navy, Princeton, Cornell and Columbia, Ohio, and many other Northern colleges.

—JESSIE M. BOYD, R.N.

A Pleasure, Ma'm

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

ON behalf of the Temple Israel and the Temple Israel Sisterhood, I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to you and your staff for your co-operation in making it possible for us to publicize the activities of our Temple through the medium of the photography and the news items that have appeared in your paper.

If we can be of any service to you at any time, please don't hesitate to call on us.

—MRS. MANNING J. SIEGEL,
President, Temple Israel Sisterhood.

Joseph And Stewart Alsop

Notably Unexciting

WASHINGTON

EVERY one is glad that the campaign is over, mainly because the campaign has been a bore. It is strange that it should have been a bore—this contest in a time of crisis for the most powerful office in the world. Yet it has been a bore. It is important to try to understand why.

One reason is that the front-runner, Governor Thomas E. Dewey, has waged a notably unexciting campaign. In part this has been by design. But in part it has resulted from the quality of the man himself.

A speech by Dewey is a curious experience to the listener. His speeches have been, on the whole, fine speeches, admirably written. Moreover, Dewey's timing, the rise and fall of his voice, his gestures, are almost perfect. To hear such a man in such times as these should be a moving experience. Yet it is not. There is something oddly disappointing about the experience, something mechanical, over-rehearsed, a trifle chilling.

This suggests Dewey's gravest weakness, a weakness which is also a fact of very great political importance. For all that Dewey is the odds-on favorite for the Presidency, he still lacks the quality (which such men as Franklin Roosevelt, Wendell Willkie and Al Smith so notably had) which fires the imagination and captures the personal loyalty of masses of the voters. A very high proportion of Dewey votes will really be anti-Truman votes.

CHANGE IMPERATIVE

If Dewey is to become the kind of President he clearly wants and intends to be, this must be changed. In the troubled years which lie ahead, the job of the Presidency will not be confined to oiling the creaking wheels of government, important as this task may be. The next President will have to make decisions—such as the rearmament of Western Europe—which will be immensely unpopular with a great many immensely important people, including a large proportion of the Republican leadership. And he will have to make these decisions stick, in the face of bitter opposition in Congress and out.

To do this more will be needed than competence, more than the genius for political organization which Dewey and his staff have consistently displayed. It will require first that the vaguely progressive words which Dewey has been speaking in this campaign be transformed into concrete progressive actions, over the strident opposition of a considerable proportion of Dewey's party. And this in turn will require a loyal mass following, of voters convinced not only that Dewey has their interests at heart, but also that he has a heart.

It will, in a word, be essential that Dewey achieve some human and intangible quality which, despite his manifest virtues, he still lacks. Yet one thing is true Dewey has grown in personal stature in recent years as much as any man in public life. And the Presidency forces growth on a man, as surely as growth is forced on plants in a hothouse.

TRUMAN TRAGEDY

The tragedy of Truman is simply that, despite the best of intentions, his capacity for growth is sharply limited, and the voters have sensed as much. This too has contributed to the tedium of this dull campaign, for it has all but completely robbed Truman of a chance of re-election, and has thus destroyed the suspense of the contest.

Yet in another way, the fashion in which Truman has made his fight is both interesting and politically significant. He has tried desperately to appeal, as his predecessor knew so well how to do, to the emotions of the voters. And what is meaningful is the obvious fact that in this attempt he has been moving consistently further and further to the left. In his public statements he has now taken a stand well to the left of Franklin Roosevelt, and very far, one suspects, to the left of himself.

The attempt has largely failed. Nobody has really believed the dire Presidential warnings about the wicked plots of the "gluttons of privilege," largely because the voters have suspected that Truman has not really believed himself, or indeed, entirely understood what he has been saying.

James Marlow

Elector In Spotlight

By JAMES MARLOW

WASHINGTON—(AP)—Keep your eye on the electoral votes when the election returns start rolling in tonight.

There are 531 electoral votes divided up among the states. The candidate who gets a majority of them—266—wins.

Why those 531 electoral votes? Because they equal the total number of people the 48 states have in Congress: 96 Senators and 435 House members.

Each state is entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the number of people it has in Congress. For example:

There are 47 New York State people in Congress: The two Senators and 45 House members.

There the Republicans have a slate of 47 electors. So have the Democrats.

Say Republican Thomas E. Dewey gets 3,000,000 votes in New York, and Democrat Harry S. Truman gets 2,999,999.

Then Dewey, although receiving only one more popular vote than Truman, gets all of New York's 47 electoral votes. Truman gets none.

Does that mean the 2,999,999 popular votes for Truman wouldn't be included in the total national popular vote to elect him? That's right.

But wait. Suppose in Illinois Truman gets 3,000,000 popular votes and Dewey gets only 1,000,000. Then Truman gets Illinois' 28 electoral votes and Dewey's 1,000,000 popular votes don't count.

Yes, but in those two States Truman receives 5,999,999 popular votes to only 4,000,000 for Dewey, but Truman winds up with only 28 electoral votes while Dewey, because of his New York victory, has 47.

That's right. It means a candidate could get more popular votes and yet lose the election because his opponent carried states with the most electoral votes.

That has happened.

In 1888 Democrat Grover Cleveland got a bigger popular vote than Republican Benjamin Harrison. But Harrison carried the states with the bigger electoral vote and won.

ONLY TWELVE NEEDED

This year Truman, or Dewey, could make a sweep of 36 states and yet lose if his opponent carried only these twelve states:

California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Indiana, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Ohio, Texas and Wisconsin.

Why? Because those twelve states have 269 electoral votes, or three more than the 266 majority needed to win.

But suppose it happened that no single candidate got a majority of the electoral votes. What then?

The newly elected House of Representatives would choose the President from the three candidates receiving the greatest number of electoral votes.

In that case the total House vote would be 48, with each state—no matter how many members it has in the House—entitled to only one vote.

So far in this story the electoral vote has been explained as it usually happens. But this is an unusual election. A little different from those in the past.

The Democratic Party this year is split because of Truman's stand on greater civil rights for Negroes in the South.

Many Southern Democrats, who otherwise might have voted solidly for him, are angry at Truman. They have set up an organization of their own called the "States' Rights Democrats."

And they will vote for Governor J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina who is the States' Rights candidate for President. The result:

In Alabama Truman is not on the ballot at all. There the State Democratic Committee has pledged the Democratic electors to Thurmond.

In Florida the electors are split up among Truman electors and Thurmond electors and some electors who are not designated at all. Florida has eight electoral votes.

But the Southern mix-up in electors won't be important in today's election results unless:

1. Only the loss of electoral votes in the South were to cost Truman the election, since ordinarily the South votes solidly Democratic.

2. The whole election is so close that no one candidate gets a majority of the electoral votes. That would throw the election into the House.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Military Group Advocated A-Bomb Use

WASHINGTON

HERE is the inside story of some military political strategy which—so far as I know—has never been told, and, fortunately, did not take place.

Last Spring a little group of military men discussed the idea of taking advantage of Russian tension a couple of weeks before Election Day in such a way as to justify dropping the atomic bomb. Such a crisis, they argued, would serve two purposes: 1) get inevitable war over with in a hurry, and 2) re-elect President Truman.

Whether they ever put this up to Truman or exactly who blocked the idea, I do not know. I do know that it was seriously discussed, and justified on the ground that the longer we delayed a Russian showdown, the more likelihood that Russia would get the atomic bomb, after which a war would be disastrously long and fatal.

However, the most important part of the story is that not only did this idea not bear fruit, but that President Truman has been at odds even with his more moderate advisers about dropping the atomic bomb.

Truman's Distress

THE teletyped message which the President sent to Secretary of State Marshall in Paris regarding the proposed Vinson mission to Moscow gave interesting insight into this.

"I pray," Truman told his Secretary of State, "I may never again be confronted with the decision I had to make regarding Hiroshima."

When further arguing with Marshall over the Vinson mission, Truman also showed great mental distress that he should ever have to unleash the atomic bomb again. Marshall, himself a religious man, was impressed with Truman's Bible-trained conscience. The President seemed to be conjuring up a scene after death in which he, Truman, was being questioned by St. Peter at the gates of Heaven regarding the commandment, "Thou Shalt Not Kill."

The diplomat advisers around Marshall and perhaps Secretary Marshall himself regarded this Truman "sentimentalism" as dangerous for reasons which may be difficult for the non-diplomat to understand.

For the diplomats' chief bargaining power at Paris and Berlin has been the idea that we might drop the atomic bomb. Thus, if the idea permeated back to Moscow that Truman would not drop the bomb, and that he placed his reliance on the arguments and Kentucky philosophy of his good friend, Chief Justice Vinson, the diplomats' chief bargaining weapon would be destroyed.

It may seem involved, and it may seem cold-blooded, but this was one of the background reasons for Marshall's final veto of the Vinson mission. It was not that he wanted to drop the A-bomb, but rather that he wanted the Russians to think we might drop it.

So, no matter what his shortcomings as a statesman, history will probably conclude that Harry Truman was no warmonger but a humble though confused believer in the brotherhood of man.

Supporters And Deserters

NOW THAT the election tumult is about over, this column would like to draw a comparison between the political behavior of four people once extremely close to Franklin Roosevelt. They are Eleanor Roosevelt, Harold Ickes, Jesse Jones and Henry Wallace.

Winston Churchill used to say that it was only when the dark came down that the stars shone. And as the twilight settles on the great period of American history that was the Roosevelt Administration, it is significant to note who stands up to go down with the ship, and who scurries off to take his revenge or to curry favor with the Deweyites.

No two men ever received more benefits from Franklin Roosevelt than Jesse Jones and Henry Wallace.

Wallace was an obscure farm writer and seed grower in Iowa, editing a farm journal which teetered on the verge of bankruptcy, when FDR picked him up and put him in his Cabinet. Eight years later, a large segment of the Democratic Party winced and some openly rebelled when FDR insisted that Wallace be his Vice-Presidential running-mate.

Jesse Jones also was desperately out on the financial limb when he became the Democratic member of the Reconstruction Finance Corp. Suddenly, after pounding the pavements of Wall Street trying to borrow money to bail out his precarious enterprises, Jesse became the great Government moneylender. The financial powers had to come to him, not he to them.

Under Roosevelt he became the financial czar of America with the power to put his friends in command of airlines, railroads, insurance companies, utilities. No one ever accused Jesse of making loans to his own enterprises, but he accumulated enormous obligations of gratitude by his capacity to make loans to others.

And cold-blooded Jesse was not the kind of man who did not keep double-entry books of obligation in his own mind as he dispensed the millions that a Democratic administration gave him.

Principle In Defeat

IT WAS a queer quirk of fate that it was Jesse Jones and Henry Wallace who rowed so continually that FDR had to crack their heads together. Eventually he eased Wallace out of the Vice-Presidency and fired Jesse Jones, fired him because he suspected what has now been proved a fact—namely, that Jesse was quietly building up a Republican bloc in Texas.

Today, Jesse Jones, in his seventies, considered a cold-blooded opportunist by most of the people of Texas, has come out openly for the Republican Party. Today, his old adversary, Henry Wallace, is conspiring with the Commies to bring about the demise of those who made him.

And today, Harold Ickes, also in his seventies, has been riding the rails to Montana, making speeches, using up his strength to fight for a principle and a party he believes in, even though he knows it will be defeated.

No one ever fought harder to oppose Truman's renomination at Philadelphia than Harold Ickes, and, behind the scenes, so also did Mrs. Roosevelt. But once the decision was made, both decided to stay on the ship that had served them in victory and go down with it in defeat.

As Winston Churchill said, it is when the dark comes down that the stars shine.