THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1952

MUCH ADO ABOUT LITTLE

OUR morning contemporary on S. Tryon St. says it was in disagreement with a recent editorial in THE NEWS on "Emphasis In The News."

We are not quite sure what our friends found objectionable in the editorial, unless it was the fact that we quoted Roscoe Drummond, an experienced, responsible journalist who works for the experienced, responsible and pro-Eisenhower *Christian Science Monitor* as saying that many of the papers he had read on his campaign trips were showing "marked one-sidedness in covering the news of this campaign and slanting much of the news which it does cover" in favor of General Eisenhower.

The point of our editorial was that only a very small minority of the American press is guilty of such practices, but that so long as a single newspaper permits its editorial page opinion to shape its news coverage, it is endangering the freedom of the press which, in the final analysis, is the freedom of the people to get information about public affairs factually and objectively.

The Observer quotes an Associated Press "survey" of 100 papers to prove that the newspapers of the land are keeping the proper balance in covering the campaigns. Actually, there were 115 newspapers, 52 morning and 63 evening. It was not a "survey." It was a check of front pages for only one day—Friday, Oct. 16—a day chosen by the AP because all major candidates were in action. The AP analyzed front page position. It did not attempt to measure the strength or weakness of headline verbs and adjectives, the length of the stories on the front page, pictures, or any of the other variables that determine the impact of a newspaper's front page.

The Associated Press, an impartial news gathering and distributing organization, does not practice telling newspapers how they should display their news. Furthermore, it would be most awkard for it to do so, for the AP is owned by its member papers. Even so, we are glad to see The Observer accepting the AP's judgment on the fairness of news display. It was just the other day, we recall, that a member of the Observer organization was criticizing the AP for biased reporting on the campaign.

As we said before, the overwhelming majority of American newspapers have hard and fast rules about keeping editorial opinion out of the news columns. Most of them succeed in doing so, even in the very difficult circumstances of a national political campaign. If the AP check proves anything, it proves that. It does not refute, nor was it intended to refute, the charge of Drummond and other responsible journalists that some few U. S. newspapers fail to meet their own exacting standards.

There'll be time enough, after the campaign, for a committee of U. S. journalists to review campaign coverage. There is no reason at this point to take Drummond's comments as indicating the whole profession has abused its ethics, or to leap to the conclusion from a one-day spot check by the AP that there's not a scoundrel in the lot.

MACHINES WOULD SPEED VOTING HERE

WITH over 90,000 names on the registration books in Mecklenburg County, officials of the Board of Elections are going to have to take a close, hard look at electric voting machines, whether they like the idea or not.

If the Nov. 4 election produces the expected turnout, there will be long lines of waiting voters at some of the bigger precincts, and returns will be slow coming in. And because there may be a good deal of split ticket voting on the state-congressional ballot, there may be errors in the first tally.

The Mecklenburg election officials have been cool to the idea of voting machines since it was first advanced by the League of Women Voters some years ago. Yet the Institute of Government publication, "The Clearinghouse", reports in its current issue that High Point, which has machines, is thinking of utilizing them for a further streamlining of the voting-counting procedure there.

Currently High Point has 15 machines, one in each precinct. It has been proposed that only four voting places be used in the future, one for each ward. By concentrating more machines in a smaller number of voting places, some of the waiting in line would be eliminated and the tabulation process speeded up.

In the past, Mecklenburg has sought to meet the problem of growing registration by creating new precincts. This is an expensive process. It calls for more precinct officials, more supplies.

We believe that the board will find, upon thorough analysis, that election costs are skyrocketing, and that the continued expansion of the number of precincts will force costs even higher. Especially will this be true of elections with a small turn-out, for the law requires precinct officials to be on hand, even though no more than a few votes may be cast in each precinct.

Many up-to-date American communities have found voting machines the solution to fast, accurate voting. How much longer will it be before Mecklenburg officials get abreast of the times?

MARTIN L. CANNON

A QUIET, powerful influence for advancement of the Carolina textile economy was exerted by Martin L. Cannon Sr. Death ended Mr. Cannon's career, but many of the forces activated by this capable industrialist and financier will continue to be felt through ensuing years.

The unexpected death of Mr. Cannon at the age of 67 leaves the distinguished Charles A. Cannon of Kannapolis as the sole surviving son of the founder of the Cannon Mills.

Martin Cannon's funeral was held today at his Charlotte home. A considerable part of the large accumulation of wealth through his busy lifetime will continue to benefit worthy educational, religious, and cultural causes through the Martin L. Cannon Family Fund.

Despite his age, Mr. Cannon patriotically assumed during the World War II period the heavy responsibilities of directing Charlotte's large organization of civilian defense volunteers. This other co-operation with the nation's war effort was given while he maintained his many business affairs. Then, after the war was ended, Mr. Cannon largely relinquished his industrial tasks and sold much of his various holdings in the textile industry.

Retirement for Mr. Cannon was only partial, however. He maintained his many close business friendships with other leaders in Carolina operations by personal service on directorates of the American Trust Co. of Charlotte, Cannon Mills, and Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co. of Greensboro.

The many men who were privileged to associate closely with Mr. Cannon knew and admired him as a man who, through innate modesty, shunned public praise and personal publicity, yet deftly mingled kindness, sound judgment, and notable qualities of leadership with the typical courtesy of the Southern gentleman.

From The Syracuse Post-Standard

AN OPEN LETTER TO GEN. M'ARTHUR

General Douglas MacArthur,
The Waldorf-Astoria
New York City

Dear General MacArthur:

YOUR great name—one of the greatest names in American history—is being used as a shield by hate-mongers and bigots in the current political campaign.

Notorious hate-merchants have entered your name as a candidate for President in many states, including California, Washington, Texas and others. I do not know what their purpose is, but of two things we may be entirely sure—it is not good for America, and it is not good for you.

They are not your kind of Americans, General. Their appeal over the years has been based on hatred of man against man, and most especially on anti-Catholicism, anti-Semitism, and narrow prejudices of every sort. Now they are simply seeking to clothe themselves in your greatness, and to use your glorious name as a cover to their evil purposes. If they respected you and honored you, they would not use you thus.

Regardless of anything else in this political campaign, I respectfully urge that you dissociate yourself from them by a complete repudiation of them and their "campaign." This is a matter of righteousness and justice, and all the things for which you have always stood for to all good Americans.

It is entirely conceivable that the fractional vote in one of several states for you on their party ticket might cost that state, or even the election, to one candidate or the other.

It would be a shocking thing before all the world if it should be said of America that the purveyors of hatred and bigotry hold the balance of power in this nation. It would place in jeopardy your great name and reputation for all the ages.

General, as a man who loves, admires and respects you—as a man who was proud to fight, as a member of your staff, along with you from the steaming jungles of New Guinea through all of the campaign in the Philippines to the final victory, I most respectfully and urgently ask you to repudiate this evil band once and for all, and thus gain yet another shining respect in the eyes of all good Americans.

Faithfully,

RICHARD H. AMBERG,
Publisher, The Post-Standard.

This new idea of waiting for the full facts before rendering a decision not only would make it hard for the political commentator, but would practically ruin the sportscaster, who likes to give at least three explanations of every five-yard penalty.—*Kansas City Star.*

An honest Frenchman—or was it a British—or an Italian? Anyway, he was asked what he liked best about Americans. Said he: "Their money."—*Kingsport (Tenn.) Times.*

Ike's Warmth Shines Through --But Not Toward McCarthy

By STEWART ALSOP

WITH GEN. EISENHOWER'S CAMPAIGN PARTY.

LITTLE things sometimes have big meanings. This reporter, who has been watching General Eisenhower in the last lap of the campaign, therefore begs pardon for beginning with what probably seems like a little thing.

The locale was the black and forbidding coal-mining region of Pennsylvania, through which General Eisenhower was boldly campaigning as though there were no such person as John L. Lewis. The point of vantage was the photographer's truck—a kind of high speed tumbril which travels immediately ahead of the candidate's car, and affords a chilly but complete view of both candidate and crowds. Eisenhower was traversing the heavily Democratic, heavily unionized, grimly dingy suburbs of Pittsburgh.

On this "south side" of Pittsburgh, one had only to look ahead to see the indifference and even hostility of the people. They were silent. They were almost sullen, until Eisenhower's open car drew abreast of them.

Then, suddenly, there would be the general sitting up on the back of the rear seat, waving both arms in his odd, by-no-means-graceful familiar gesture. He almost visibly radiated his incandescent human warmth. Everything about him seemed to say, "I like these people." And soon, perhaps rather reluctantly, mainly decided they liked him, bursting into cheers and clapping him in the most unexpected and almost unintentional manner as his car passed by.

LIKE THE ROOSEVELTS

For a leader, this quality of warmth, which Eisenhower possesses in greater degree than any recent Presidential candidate except the two Roosevelts, is a vitally important quality. It is a quality that costs a lot—when there was no crowd the general would slump into his seat in terrible tiredness. But and man who has this quality and uses it wisely and well, can count on securing a strong national response in hard times when a strong response is needed.

The very fact that Eisenhower's warmth has shone out more and more strongly with each passing week of the campaign, can be taken to mean that he is more and more at ease among the complexities of civil leadership. For Eisenhower's bafflement at these complexities was what dimmed out his whole personality in the first unhappy period of seeming failure.

There are other such signs. Much has been made of General Eisenhower's so-called embrace of Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy. The idea has been propagated that if elected, the General will continue to countenance McCarthy and his methods. In fact, however, candidate Eisenhower has already given rather clear evidence to the contrary.

Massachusetts is a very close state, and McCarthy is thought to appeal strongly to the same large faction in Massachusetts that used to follow Father Coughlin in the New Deal years. Certain leading Massachusetts Republicans recently sought to nail down these valuable votes by bringing McCarthy into Boston to speak there in the campaign wind-up. Eisenhower personally spiked this plan by sending word that he would abandon his own final appearance in Boston rather than follow McCarthy there. By the same token, the General personally intervened to prevent a projected invitation to McCarthy to appear in Jersey City.

One can argue, and many people have argued very loudly and cogently, that General Eisenhower ought to have disowned Senator McCarthy outright and in public. Yet the facts above-noted are none the less vitally important, as forecasting General Eisenhower's future policy. He has not disowned McCarthy, because he and his staff thought it unnecessary and unwise to go so far. The country does not know that the general has meanwhile refused to use the Senator to gain advantage in two really crucial states, one of them notoriously close. But Senator McCarthy unquestionably knows it, and has certainly taken it as a declaration of war from Eisenhower. You do not declare war on a man whom you intend to tolerate.

Usually Imperturbable Dewey Is All Fired Up This Time

By MARQUIS CHILDS

NEW YORK

THE CLIMAX of this campaign is drama of an extraordinary kind. The personal fortunes, the pride and the prestige of so many of the actors are involved in the outcome. And the outcome appears to turn on intangibles, imponderables beyond the knowing of even veteran politicians.

For Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York, twice the nominee of his party, the climax is a dividing line. It is either the end or a new beginning of a public career that has gone far on calculating intellect divorced almost entirely from the emotions that sway most human beings.

Perhaps because he knows it is all or nothing—the full stop to his driving ambition or a new lease on hope—Dewey has been unable to keep his emotions out of this contest. The sequence of the Dewey drama is as follows:

Act I was the Republican convention. In Chicago it was Dewey and his close friend, Herbert Brownell, who, more than anyone else brought about General Eisenhower's nomination. Dewey is a brilliant bit of political engineering, the cool imperturable Dewey was indifferent to and may even have enjoyed the strong heart-burn him by Sen. Everett Dirksen, the Chicago Tribune's Senator from Illinois.

During Act II Dewey was offstage. There were the weeks beginning with Eisenhower's meeting with Sen. Robert A. Taft of Ohio and going on through the Midwest from Sen. William Jenner of Indiana to Sen. Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin when it seemed to Dewey that his victory in Chicago had been completely nullified.

IT WAS ROUGH

He has told close associates what an ordeal this was. It was a bitter and humiliating experience to be pushed into the wings and to wait with the growing conviction that the East, and particularly New York, had been sacrificed to the Midwest.

Dewey told Eisenhower just that at the beginning of Act III—that while he might have gained the farm states he had probably lost New York. Eisenhower had returned to the East to show in the great population centers what those around him say is the "real Ike." And Dewey, now at his side, was determined in this last phase to assert his role, front and center.

In at least two instances the calculating Dewey was either caught off balance or he deliberately unleashed the fury of long pent-up emotions. First at Troy and then at Buffalo he introduced Eisenhower with such a violent harangue as to make the general's pedestrian speech on inflation seem like a sad anticlimax.

In the violence of his attack on President Truman, Dewey seemed to step out of character. As the crowd wildly cheered he accused Governor Stevenson and Truman of making a deal whereby Stevenson would run for President and Truman would go out behind the barn to find the nominee for him. He said that Truman could not be believed under oath.

This may be put down to the frustration of those earlier weeks of waiting when Dewey was profoundly fearful the election was being lost. But it also can be related to an episode in the campaign of four years ago when Truman used the Nazi charge very much as he used it this time against Eisenhower. In his Chicago speech in 1948, perhaps the low point of that campaign, Truman sought to arouse the fear and suspicion of racial minorities by charging Dewey with sympathy for Nazi doctrines.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON

ONE thing worrying the GOP high command is that while capturing the White House they might lose the Senate. This is because only one-third of the Senate is up for election, and it happens that this year Republican Senators are chiefly affected, many in marginal states.

To win control of the Senate, the Republicans must pick up two new seats. Instead they are likely to lose six states, and pick up three—a net loss of three Senators.

Here is the box-score on the key races for the Senate:

New York—Sen. Irving Ives, Republican, frequent bolter to the GOP-Democratic liberals, will be re-elected.

Connecticut—With two Democratic seats at stake in Connecticut, the Republicans are likely to pick up at least one. Chief issue in Connecticut is "McCarthyism." Senator Benton having been the only Senator with the courage to ask for a Senate probe of McCarthy's unethical conduct, as a result McCarthy and friends have thrown everything except the kitchen sink into Connecticut to defeat Benton.

Maryland—Congressman Glenn Beall, Republican, is likely to defeat Democrat George Mahoney.

Michigan—Sen. Blair Moody, Democrat, is fighting an uphill race against Congressman Charles Potter, a legless veteran. Potter voted against everything Eisenhower was working for—defense funds, Mutual Security Aid to Europe. Moody championed the principles of the late Sen. Vandenberg. Nevertheless, sympathy for a legless veteran, plus the powerful support of both Ford and General Motors, is likely to defeat him.

Washington—Congressman "Scoop" Jackson, Democrat, is a probable winner over Sen. Cain, the Republican who played footsie with the real-estate lobby and the isolationist bloc.

Montana—Congressman Mike Mansfield is the favorite to defeat another isolationist Republican who was swept in with the 1946 landslide—Zales Ecton.

Indiana—Sen. William Jenner, one of the most controversial Senators in the campaign due to his attacks on General Marshall and Ike's subsequent endorsement, seems certain to lose to popular, middle-of-the-road Gov. Henry Schricker.

Missouri—Another GOP Senator of the Class of 1946, James Kem, is due to be mowed down by Stuart Symington, who cleaned up the RFC.

Nevada—Tom Mechling, the young newsman who defeated Sen. McCarran's law partner in the Democratic primary, now faces the open and bitter opposition of the most powerful man in Nevada—McCarran himself. This means that the Democratic machine is not actively behind him. However, such sympathy has been aroused for Mechling's lone battle that he may defeat GOP Sen. Malone. Nevadans know that Malone, whom McCarran now backs, previously was treated by him like dirt.

Massachusetts—Young Congressman John Kennedy, Democrat with a liberal voting record, is considered likely to defeat Sen. Henry Cabot Lodge, despite the powerful support given Lodge by Eisenhower.

New Mexico—Sen. Dennis Chavez, Democrat, has an understanding with Republican leaders whereby the state will probably go for Eisenhower, but simultaneously defeat the obnoxious Pat Hurley, now running against Chavez for the Senate.

Wyoming—Joe O'Mahoney, Democrat, a skilled and respected Senate veteran, is in the tough fight with GOP Gov. Barrett. The race is close, but O'Mahoney is expected to squeak through.

Utah—Sen. Arthur Watkins, Republican, is in a seesaw battle with Congressman Walter Granger, Democrat. Watkins has become desperate that he has imported a professional ex-Communist, Harvey Matusow, to attack Granger. Granger, however, has been a solid, hard-working Congressman and the attack may boomerang.

Ohio—Sen. John Bricker, voted No. 96 by Washington newsmen in contrast to Taft's rating of No. 1, is being pushed by Mike Disalle, the former price administrator. Hurting Bricker is the fact that rents are being raised all over Ohio, following his consistent voting with the real-estate lobby to remove rent controls. Bricker has also admitted receiving $69,000 from his law firm, while the firm in turn received $2,000,000 from the Pennsylvania Railroad. Bricker consistently voted against the St. Lawrence Seaway, though Ohio is a Great Lakes state.

Kentucky—The Republicans may pick up one seat in the close race between Sen. John S. Cooper, Republican, and Democratic Sen. Tom Underwood. Cooper is a Vandenberg Republican with a fine record.

West Virginia—Ex-Sen. Chappie Rivercomb, the Republican whom Gov. Dewey snubbed in 1948 because of his votes against minority groups, isn't given much chance to win against Democratic Sen. Harley Kilgore.

Delaware—A close race is developing between Sen. John Williams, Republican, and Lt. Gov. Alexis I. Du Pont Bayard. Though the Du Ponts usually back a Republican, in this case they are either keeping neutral or giving some quiet support to their Democratic cousin.

New Jersey—Sen. Alexander Smith, Republican, will probably win out over efficient Undersecretary of the Army Archibald Alexander, Democrat.

Should the above calculations be wrong, however, and should the Republicans win three new seats instead of dropping a net of three, they still have to worry about Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon, who recently bolted, and Bill Langer of North Dakota, who rode on Truman's train. Their two votes might be necessary in order to organize the Senate.

GOP Likely To Lose Strength In Senate

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.

Passive Attitude Not Enough

DAVIDSON

Editors, THE NEWS:

THE NEWS states that all of us "will profit if we follow the example of General Eisenhower and refuse to condone or emulate the unprincipled tactics of Sen. McCarthy." In dealing with a man like Sen. McCarthy, a passive "refusal to condone" is not enough. Hitler's rise to power was made possible by the fact that millions of self-respecting Germans thought they need do nothing more than "refuse to condone" his tactics.

The situation calls for a positive and active condemnation, not only of McCarthy's methods, but of the irresponsible and vicious amorality he represents. What McCarthy DOES follows directly from what he IS, and the two cannot be separated.

General Eisenhower's failure to recognize the threat inherent in McCarthyism, and his consequent naive assumption that he can endorse McCarthy's candidacy without giving encouragement to his "unprincipled tactics," have shaken the confidence of many independent voters who respect the General as a fine and able man. General Eisenhower can prove that he cares more for principle than for the Presidency by repudiating decisively and unquivocally a man with whom he has nothing in common but a party label.

—SAMUEL R. SPENCER JR.

Fatback & Patched Britches

ALBEMARLE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I HAVE four sons who have been in war, and not one of them is going to vote for Ike.

I am one of the thousands who remember the depression, and I never want to see another. It doesn't matter that a dollar was worth more then, for no one had any dollars. Mere people were underfed, underpaid, underprivileged, underhelped, underhopeful, underhappy, underhelpless, underhopeless, underhelpless, underhopeless, underhelpless, underhopeless