THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1952

WHY UNITED APPEAL DESERVES SUPPORT

TODAY, as the first United Appeal in Charlotte and Mecklenburg history gets underway, we would like to sum up, as briefly as possible, the value of the one-fund method of meeting local social welfare responsibilities.

To the donor, and he is a very important person, United Appeal will mean freedom from the irritation and annoyance of multiple solicitations, and it will enable him to budget his giving more wisely.

To the solicitor, and he is also a very important person, United Appeal will mean freedom from so many demands on his time. Instead of serving six, seven, eight times a year, he will be able to meet his obligation in one all-out effort and, hence, will do the job more enthusiastically.

To the nineteen participating organizations, United Appeal will mean freedom from senseless competition for the favor of donors, and it should assure them of ample funds for carrying out their highly essential work.

And to the community, United Appeal will mean freedom from any apprehension over duplication of services and unfair division of money. It will also insure the community that the social welfare needs of its less fortunate citizens will be met equitably and humanely.

United Appeal, then, offers a way to free everyone—donor, solicitor, agency, and community—from the confusion, exasperation, duplication, and uncertainty of unorganized fund raising.

United Appeal has come about in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County because the people believed it essential to bring order out of chaos if all agencies were not to suffer.

Many persons have participated in the leadership of the United Appeal movement. To name a few would be to deny others the credit due them.

But United Appeal will succeed only if it has the enthusiastic co-operation of all the people of the community.

Today marks the opening of the drive. The goal of $738,000 is a long distance away. It will be achieved, however, as indeed it must be achieved, if the people of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County show the same generosity that has always been their trademark.

FIREMEN DUE FAIRNESS, NOT FAVORITISM

APPARENTLY the Charlotte firemen want to have their cake and eat it, too.

Faced with the grim fact that their special retirement system is heading for bankruptcy, the only suggestion a spokesman for the fireman advanced was that the city (i. e., the taxpayers) increase its contribution from 5 per cent of the firemen's salary to 12½ per cent—and keep it at that level for an indefinite (i. e., permanent) period.

We doubt that the taxpayers of Charlotte will buy that idea, nor should they.

The facts are not in dispute. The firemen contribute 5 per cent of their pay to the retirement fund; the City matches that with another 5 per cent. Yet the benefits offered are so generous that nothing less than a total contribution of 17½ per cent will put the fund on a sound actuarial basis.

Unmindful of the plight of the taxpayer and unconcerned over the precedent it would set for other public employees, City and County, the firemen blithely suggest that the City increase its contribution to 12½ per cent, making the total of 17½ per cent.

We have another suggestion, or rather three suggestions:

1. Leave the salary contributions at the present level, and scale down the benefits until the fund is actuarially sound.

2. If the firemen want a fancier retirement plan than other City employees have, increase their contribution from 5 per cent to 12½ per cent and leave the City's at 5 per cent.

3. Abolish the special system, and put the firemen under the City's regular retirement program.

Neither of these alternatives will find favor among the firemen, who have a good thing, and know it, and don't want anyone to take it away.

The firemen plead special hazards. The lot of the policeman is hazardous, too.

The firemen argue that the actuarial report does not take into consideration extra income from special fund-raising events. Such funds have no place in a retirement system. They are neither predictable nor permanent. There is nothing to prevent the firemen from using extra funds as annual dividends to men on the retirement rolls.

The people want to be fair with the firemen, but they expect the firemen, in turn, to be fair with them.

And fairness means fairness. It does not mean favoritism.

EMPTY EGG BASKETS

ONE aspect of continued one-party predominance in either North or South, is pointed up by an analysis of Congressional committee chairmanships. *Congressional Quarterly* recently listed potential Democratic or Republican chairmen in the House of Representatives. A study of the list discloses that, if Republicans gain control of the House in the next Congress (this will require a net gain of 18 of the 435 seats) the distribution of chairmanships will be:

Six Central states will control 13 of the 19 committees.

Three Middle Atlantic states will control five.

A New England state will control one.

If, however, the Democrats retain control of the House:

Six Southern states will control nine of the 19 committees.

Three Middle Atlantic States will have four.

Three central states will have four.

One border state will have one.

One Western state will have one.

Thus, with the Democrats in power, the South will have almost half of the powerful chairmanships. If, however, the Republicans gain control, the South will have no chairmen at all, while the Midwest will take over about two-thirds of them.

Because Southern Democrats have controlled these key committees, they have been a powerful influence toward passage of legislation acceptable to the South. This of course is a standard, and weighty, argument of Southern Democrats.

An oft-overlooked argument on the other side is just as true. It is this—if and when the Republicans win control of the House, the South will be without representation among the chairmen simply because it hasn't produced real Republicans (that is, the kind who get elected.)

The South—and the rock-ribbed Republican areas up North—could profit from the advice of old Cervantes, who thought it "the part of a wise man to keep himself today for tomorrow, and not venture all his eggs in one basket."

VARIATIONS

ONE OF THE educational journals recently noted some of the unusual effects a teacher gets when she asks her pupils to write out the Pledge to the Flag.

Instead of "I pledge allegiance", she may get: "I pejur legions", "I plaig alegins", "I pledge a legion", "I pledge the Legen to the flag".

Instead of "to the Republic for which it stands", she sees: "to the Republicans", "to public for witches stand", "to the republic for Rich can stands."

"One nation indivisible" becomes "one country invisable", "one country inavisible", "one nason in a fesible".

And "liberty and justice" is written "with liberty and jesters", "off liberty just for all", "with liberty and jesta straws".

Well, the kiddoes shouldn't feel too bad. Their elders aren't much better. Although the man has been in the spotlight and his name in headlines for a decade, supporters of the Republican nominee for the Presidency, in their letters to this paper, spell his name Eisenhower, Eisenhour, Isenhower, Isenhour.

We actually got one Icinghour, and another Eisenhoewer.

From The Greensboro Daily News

'JUST PULLING A SCOTTY'

"KERR SCOTT'S name almost surely will long outlast memory of his administration," writes Bill Sharpe in his *State* magazine. Why? Bill puts it this way:

> In every nook and cranny of North Carolina, the paved secondary road is a "scott road." The designation at first was made half-humorously, perhaps sarcastically by some. But it now rises above any political bias or attitudinizing. The word has become an adjective, almost as simple and common and understandable as macadam, and it is used by anti-Scott people as naturally and easily as by pro-Scott folks.

Bill could have gone on to mention other words that entered the language by the same door. Remember bunk? That's short for Buncombe, and it came straight out of the Tar Heel hills. Or consider jello as used for all gelatin desserts and nucoa for all margarines, especially by women recipe writers. Manufacturers have a time with trade names anyway. They want to make them popular, but not too popular. If a trade name becomes accepted as a general term, it may lose its copyright privileges.

Thus the owner of "Deep Freeze" worries about careless use of that word, especially with "mink" and "mess". Victrola is another, but that belongs to another generation. At our house "turn off that victrola" still applies to the Motorola, Philco, Zenith, or what-have-you.

So when Bill Sharpe writes that "Mr. Umstead, and his successors, long will be building 'scott roads'," he may be right. In Alamance County, so the story goes, another similar term has been popular for years. In describing a certain type of behavior some folks still automatically say: "Why he's just pulling a scotty."

See what we mean?

Our previous contention that Senator Jenner of Indiana is one of those men with "20-20 hindsight" must be revised in the light of the revelation that he is drawing $179 disability pay from the Air Force for failing eyesight.

Ruml's $5 Contribution Plan Perhaps A Healthy Innovation

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

DESPITE THEIR very grave national significance, there are two facts which are rarely mentioned by any candidate, simply because it is in no candidate's interests to mention them. The first is that the Hatch act, with its unrealistic limitation on campaign expenditures, makes legal liars out of all major candidates. The second is that both major parties are now most dangerously dependent on large contributions from a tiny, wealthy minority of the total American electorate.

These facts suggest why a little noticed experiment by Beardsley Ruml, Democratic finance chairman and a brilliant idea man, may have a lasting effect on the future of American politics, whatever happens on Nov. 4. Ruml's idea, like most good ideas, was simple enough.

He caused to be printed some two million booklets, each containing five "certificates." These certificates, each with a polite handwritten thank you note from Adlai Stevenson printed on it, cost $5 apiece. The country, according to Ruml's idea, was to be blanketed with 10-man teams, each team member with a book of five certificates to sell. Ruml's notion was that many people would be willing to contribute to the Stevenson campaign, if this was made easy and convenient, and if the sum was small.

49 PER CENT RETURN SOUGHT

The results, Ruml says, have been spotty in places, but on the whole better than he dared hope. In retrospect, Ruml thinks he should have started earlier, and that he should have set aside more money for promotion. Even so, he still hopes for a "1.400 batting average". This would mean about $2.4 million for the Democratic war chest. It would also mean some 800,000 voters with a personal stake in the campaign. And under any circumstances, Ruml believes that he has already proved that "the thing can be done". If Ruml is right — if very large sums can indeed be collected from very small contributors — there is one way to indicate the importance of this development. This is to cast the mind back to the campaign of 1948, when the Democratic coffers were wholly empty, until Louis Johnson was called in to labor in the financial vineyards.

Johnson himself, who was disastrously rewarded with the Secretaryship of Defense for these labors, was one of Truman's more enduring troubles. But there have been others, less conspicuous, including some rather nauseating diplomatic appointments, and certain concessions to special interest groups which need not otherwise have been made.

If it were not for the Ruml five dollar scheme, Adlai Stevenson would face much the same dilemma as Truman faced in 1948. Collections from big contributors to the Democratic party have, to be sure, been higher than in that year but at the same time, campaign expenses have almost doubled, thanks in part to the hideous cost of national television hookups. Even the Eisenhower campaign managers have had their anxious moment. One of the things that worried them most, in the early days before Gen. Eisenhower's peace pact with Sen. Robert A. Taft, was that the former Taft supporters at first showed a tendency to keep their check books firmly closed.

The Ruml scheme is no cure for this unhealthy situation, simply because five dollar contributions cannot possibly cover the whole tremendous cost of a modern campaign. But, until a real cure is found—perhaps the limited underwriting of campaign expenditures by the Federal government—Ruml's method of tapping the small contributors may at least prove to be a long step in the right direction.

Our Congressmen, 'Right' Or 'Wrong', Get Report Cards

By CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

WASHINGTON

IN THE EYES of some national organizations there are Congressmen whose voting suits to a "T", and then there are those who hardly ever vote right.

Congressional Quarterly made a study of recent tabulations of eight national groups which rated Congressmen "right" or "wrong," depending on how the lawmakers voted on selected roll-call ballots. The tabulations were made by the groups to help show their members how to vote in November.

Six of the groups covered in the CQ survey—American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, International Association of Machinists, United Auto Workers, Americans for Democratic Action and Property Owners of America—marked all the votes of numerous Senators as either all "right" or all "wrong." For comparisons, CQ compiled "100 percenter" lists from the ratings, but included only Senators voting on at least half the roll calls rated by the group which were taken during the 82nd Congress.

"ECONOMY" VS "SPENDING"

The National Farmers Union, which rated only Congressmen from farm states, gave no one a perfect score of "rights," and it said only one Senator—Harry P. Cain (R-Wash.)—voted all "wrong" on the issues it selected. The Council of State Chambers of Commerce which rated Members on "economy" and "spending" votes, gave four Republicans perfect scores for "economy" and four Democrats 100 per cent scores for "spending."

The record of Sen. Herbert H. Lehman (D-N. Y.) met with the most approval in the group ratings charted by CQ. He voted 100 per cent "right" in the eyes of AFL, CIO, IAM, UAW and ADA. The Property Owners Association rated him as all "wrong", however.

Labeled "right" by AFL, CIO, IAM and ADA, Sens. Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) and James E. Murray (D-Mont.) were termed all "wrong" in their voting by POA and the Council of State Chambers, Sen. Clinton P. Anderson (D-N. M.) rated "rights" from CIO, IAM, UAW, ADA and Thomas C. Hennings (D-Mo.) was rated similarly by AFL, CIO, ADA and IAM. But both were all "wrong" when they voted on issues it selected, according to POA.

Republican Sens. Eugene D. Millikin (Colo.), Edward Martin (Pa.), Hugh Butler (Neb.) and Herman Welker (Idaho), voted all "wrong" according to AFL, IAM, CIO, UAW and ADA. The POA, conversely, rated Walker and Butler as all "right". Also rated as all "right" by the POA was Senator Wallace F. Bennett (R-Utah), who drew an all "wrong" evaluation from each of the labor groups, but not from the ADA.

HOUSE "100 PERCENTERS"

In rating members of the House, the Farmers Union and Council of State Chambers of Commerce put few Representatives in the all "right" or all "wrong" column. In compiling "100 per cent" lists—either rated all "right" or all "wrong" — CQ included only those members who voted on every roll call chosen by the rating organization.

The Farmers Union named only Rep. Roy W. Wier (D-Minn.) as being 100 per cent "right". There were no 100 per cent "wrongs" among legislators from the farm states on votes rated by the Farmers Union. The Council of State Chambers listed five as all "right" and only two as all "wrong". Both were Democrats — Eugene J. McCarthy (Minn.) and Wier.

Rep. Jacob K. Javits (R-NY) was the only House Republican to be judged 100 per cent "right" by four of the organizations CQ studied. These were CIO, IAM, UAW and ADA. But he was rated all "wrong" by POA.

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.

Reminded Of Two-Party Value

FOREST CITY

Editors, THE NEWS:

ON Oct. 15 you printed my letter stating that I was shocked because THE NEWS was supporting Ike.

The publisher of The News wrote me, explaining that THE NEWS certainly has no ill feeling toward me because of my opposition to General Eisenhower, and will defend my right to support and vote for whomever I please, adding that THE NEWS' political inclinations are expressed only on the editorial page and you make every effort to see that each candidate gets a completely fair treatment in the news columns.

The thing that hit home with me was this: We live in a free country. I believe in a democratic way of life. Sure we still have our vote and must use it. Even the People's Platform would be taken away under the Communists. Also the right to vote and right to speak as THE NEWS and I are doing in this election.

Thanks for reminding me of our two party system.

—MONROE HOLLAND

His Is A Protest Vote

PITTSBORO

Editors, THE NEWS:

THIS is my last submission before the general election. I wish to thank you for permitting me to clutter up your People's Platform space as you have, and also to thank your readers for their reactions to what I have said, some agreeing and some dissenting, to whom I have not had time to reply. I verily believe our people are thinking about the issues involved in the impending election which is all that I have hoped for. When the American people take time to think for themselves, I believe the country is safe. I do not think such has been true for a long time.

Now, I am registering a protest vote in the coming election. It's the best I can do. I am voting against a 20-year-record which, on the whole, has been but little better than a period of camouflaged anarchy. Pressure groups have been permitted to take over our government. I expected nothing worthy of Harry S. Truman, and I have in no wise been disappointed or surprised. The crime of modern, if not of all, history was committed in 1944 by the NF-Deal high command when they put Roosevelt under wraps long before the nominating convention and kept him so until after the election, when they knew that he was weakened by disease and mentally fatigued, if not sick, and further with knowledge of his pro-Russian attitude, but believing there was one more victory in his candidacy, they used him, and thereafter permitted him to attend the various peace conferences without the advice and co-operation of any prominent publicly chosen representative of the opposition party (yet we ask for two-party foreign policy—mockery!), but solely by advisors of his personal choice.

We lost the peace completely, though we expended 337 billion dollars and suffered approximately one million casualties in winning the war in the field. I am voting against that record with all the vehemence of an outraged soul.

—JOHN W. HESTER.

Vote Your Conscience

DERITA

Editors, THE NEWS:

THE following is a quotation from "What It Means to be a Catholic", a pamphlet by Most Rev. Apollinaris Baumgartner. I believe it should be read and followed by everyone, regardless of their religious beliefs.

"To be a Catholic means that we offer civil authorities the respect which is their due, for as says the Apostle Paul: 'Let everyone be subject to higher powers. For there is no power but from God.' (Romans 13. 1). We should observe the laws of the land; take our rightful place in the sun of government when this is given to us; exercise the right of suffrage according to the liberty which we have in such matters, and in so doing consider not our religious or fraternal or social affiliations but consult our conscience, which will lead us to cast our vote for him whom we believe will most justly fulfill the duties of office for the common good without prejudice and without discrimination."

If everyone voted, and voted according to his conscience rather than according to the dictates of any political party or any other group, this country and all of its citizens would be much better off.

—MARY LEE

Politics And Depressions

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I HAVE noticed a few letters in your paper from so-called Democrats mentioning a depression. Just for the record I wish from now on they would mention just which depression they are thinking of. Since they say they are Democrats, they must be talking about the 1929 depression when Mr. Hoover was President. I guess it is understandable that the Democrats do not mention the depression under Martin Van Buren, a Democrat, which lasted during his entire administration, from 1837 through 1841. James Buchanan, another Democrat, was President during the 1857 depression. The depression of 1893 was during Grover Cleveland's second term as President. Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor Stevenson's grandfather, was Vice-President. I am sure there is no doubt as to which party was in power then. For some reason the Democrats seem to have forgotten the depression of 1921-1922 after Woodrow Wilson. Naturally they would want to forget it. As a result of this depression 5,700,000 people were unemployed.

Republican War

KANNAPOLIS

Editors, THE NEWS:

OFTEN I read, or hear by word of mouth, that the United States has never gone to war under a Republican Administration.

In 1898 William McKinley was the Republican President. He asked the Congress of the United States to declare war on Spain, which it did.

In 1901 Theodore Roosevelt succeeded McKinley and immediately declared war on the Philippine Islands.

But I am getting ahead of the Republican wars. From 1861 to 1865 one of the most devastating wars that this country has ever participated in was fought under a Republican Administration. It was devastating because it was fought on our home soil. It was devastating because the northern Republicans deemed it necessary to subdue the South.

Henry Ford freed the mule and Herbert Hoover freed the working man; without pay. So what are Jenner of Indiana, McCarthy of Wisconsin, Taft of Ohio and Dewey of New York going to free us of? I'm only asking.

—ERNEST L. HARRIS.

P. S.: I was about to forget that there is a soldier running for President under the sponsorship of the above named officials. 'Scuse me.

Car Pools Help Housewives Vote

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

MY husband and I have not been residents of North Carolina the required length of time, but have made arrangements by absentee ballot to vote in the coming election.

In the state we have moved from, there was a car pool made up by the candidates running for offices to make sure that all those who wished to vote and did not have transportation to the polls, got it. They did not in any way try to influence the people in their choice of candidates.

This proved very helpful to housewifes who had small children which made it difficult to cast their votes, also to those who were handicapped by various ways.

I only wish to help get the people out to vote and this may be one of the reasons why many women who could vote neglect to do so.

—MRS. RAYMOND E. WELLS.

An Answer To Mrs. N. H.

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I wish to expound on the letter from Mrs. M. H. in your paper Oct. 16.

It is persons like Mrs. M. H. who give Truman and others the reasons to degrade the South in regards to the Negro. Even in her letter she writes that "It's too bad he has to go to the slums to get votes." What is wrong with the vote from the slums? Are they not citizens? Of course they are citizens, and they are the ones that should most definitely vote. Do she think the slummy communities would decrease if we would give more to our own country instead of giving to the Europeans, who will probably fight against our grandchildren in another bloody war.

If Mrs. M. H. will note the manner in which the ABC men conducted their raid on the white liquor issue, she will understand why there is reason to talk, write and pray for the Southerners. They arrested 72 Negroes for white liquor, when the liquor is distilled, negotiated, wholesaled and retailed by whites. It's most incredible to even imagine that they did not know that whites also are in the bootleg liquor business.

Again we note the officials arrested 30 couples for occupying rooms for immoral purposes, and again the Negro is the majority. There are approximately 40 or more hotels, rooming houses and tourist houses operated by whites, operated solely for whites. Are we to believe that these places do not lease rooms for the same purpose, or maybe they lease suites. Who knows? The bellhops and maids know, and they are mostly Negroes.

—MAE CLARK

Hits Deficit Financing

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

THE politicians cannot agree as to the cause of inflation that has hit the white-collar workers such a stunning blow. The Trumanites say price control legislation was blocked by a hostile Congress, but they will not admit that deficit spending has caused our money to lose its value. Unfortunately, many voters do not understand economics, and continue to vote for an ideology of borrowing and spending, as a road to prosperity.

The only sensible way to control inflation is for government and individual to operate on a balanced budget. President Truman has failed to recognize and use this great truth of economics, because he is a little man, and a great spender. His crowd will continue to spend unless we voters "grow up" and refuse to believe that old Santa Claus lives in Washington!

General Eisenhower has promised economy in government. We know he has done great things in the past, and we can trust him to do it again. I shall vote for Ike, and against the group who have cut my income in half with the inflationary prices they created.

—RUSSELL G. HOLDER

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Ike And Stevenson Cabinets, A La Pearson

WASHINGTON

HERE is a rough idea as to how the Cabinets of the two Presidential candidates will stack up if elected, First Eisenhower:

Secretary of State—Thomas E. Dewey. The Governor of New York went around the world to get up to date on foreign affairs, has been conferring with Acheson on foreign policy and has his heart set on this post. Since he was the best brain in putting across the General's nomination, he will probably get his reward.

Secretary of the Treasury—Winthrop Aldrich of the Chase National Bank. Brother-in-law of John D. Rockefeller and a power in GOP politics, Aldrich has been one of the key men behind Ike.

Secretary of Defense—Sen. Henry Cabot Lodge. The original Eisenhower campaign manager, Lodge faces likely defeat in his Massachusetts race for re-election. He served in the Army and on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Attorney General—Gov. Earl Warren of California.

Secretary of Agriculture—Sen. Frank Carlson of Kansas, now one of Eisenhower's closest advisers.

Secretary of the Interior—Gov. Dan Thornton of Colorado; helped lead the fight at Chicago for Eisenhower's nomination.

Secretary of Commerce—Sen. James Duff of Pennsylvania, one of the earliest Eisenhower supporters.

Secretary of Labor—Ex-Gov. Harold Stassen of Minnesota; wrote Eisenhower's Labor Day speech.

Postmaster General—Arthur Summerfield, now chairman of the Republican National Committee.

The Stevenson Line-Up

SECRETARY OF STATE—Averell Harriman, former ambassador to Great Britain and Mutual Security Administrator. Harriman's withdrawal from the race at Chicago insured Stevenson's nomination, and he could probably have the Important State Department post if he wanted it. If not, William Fulbright of Arkansas, one of the Senate's best brains on foreign affairs, would have second call.

Secretary of the Treasury—Dwight Palmer, head of the General Cable Co., one of the big businessmen vigorously behind Stevenson.

Secretary of Defense—Tom Finletter, a Wall Street attorney now Secretary for Air.

Attorney General—Senator Kefauver of Tennessee.

Secretary of Agriculture—Some Stevenson advisers have suggested Milton Eisenhower, brother of the general, who served with Stevenson in the Agriculture Department under Henry Wallace. Milton also served under Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson. A more likely possibility is Roy Turner, former governor of Oklahoma.

Secretary of the Interior—Oscar Chapman of Colorado or Sen. Joseph O'Mahoney of Wyoming.

Secretary of Commerce—Phil Wrigley, the chewing-gum king of Chicago, a Republican who has been a personal friend of Stevenson's.

Secretary of Labor—Wayne Morse, GOP Senator from Oregon.

Postmaster General—Stephen Mitchell, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Independent Auto Dealers

THE Ford Motor Company campaign to collect from every dealer for the Republican campaign fund is continuing throughout the nation but is having rough sledding with at least a few Democrats.

Most Democratic Ford dealers have kicked in for fear of incurring disfavor with Detroit. But in Cedar Falls and Hudson, Iowa, Henry Stoko and David Keith were exceptions.

Several days ago Emil Wheeler of the Wheeler Motor Company in Waterloo, one of the top Ford dealers in Iowa, telephoned David Keith of Hudson, together with other dealers, to inform them that a meeting had been held at Des Moines where it was decided the larger Ford dealers should pony up $1,000 each to the Republican National Committee and the smaller dealers $200.

Wheeler made it clear that this campaign contribution was related to the future allotments of Ford cars. In brief, a dealer who did not contribute might not get sufficient allotments in the future.

In Cedar Falls, however, the firm of Weisbord and Stoko split. Frank Weisbord is a Republican and paid $200, but Henry Stoko, a Democrat, refused. He said that Ford could go jump in the Mississippi River as far as he was concerned. Also, John Keith of Hudson replied, "You're not getting any money from me."

NOTE—In 1948, 18 Ford and General Motors dealers were convicted in Michigan for violation of the corrupt practices act when Arthur Summerfield, now chairman of the Republican National Committee, put across political assessments with auto dealers.

Buckshot Contributions

IT'S against the law to contribute over $5,000 to a political campaign, but the big-money boys have a neat way of getting around the legal limit. They scatter their contributions like buckshot.

For example, here is how the Rockefeller family has recently donated to Republican campaign funds.

John D. himself contributed $3,000 each to the Republican National Committee, GOP Senate Campaign Committee, GOP House Campaign Committee and United Republican Committee of New York—making a total of $12,000.

Each member of the family followed suit with duplicate contributions to the same committees—$12,000 apiece from his wife Martha and his sons, John D. III, Laurence, David, Winthrop and Nelson. Laurence's wife, Mary, also threw in an additional $1,000 check to the New York fund.