THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1952

A FAVOR FOR TRUMAN?

DON'T ever discount the political acumen of Harry S. Truman. The Russell affair may show that the President is about two heads in front of other political strategists.

There's good reason to believe President Truman would like to see Governor Stevenson of Illinois take his place. The two men see eye to eye on many issues, both foreign and domestic. If the President feels his office is in good hands he would like to take Bess back to Independence, or return to the Senate.

But without Southern support election of the Democratic nominee is doubtful. So a few months ago he casually let it be known that Stevenson seemed a good man. The Governor visited the President. But Mr. Truman did not antagonize the Southerners against Stevenson by praising the Governor too much. No, the President just sat back and let the press and politicians build up capable Mr. Stevenson.

Meanwhile, by not announcing his own intentions, the President gave the impression that he might run again. To thwart such a possibility the Southerners induced Senator Russell to declare his candidacy. However, Governor Stevenson seems accessible to the Russell supporters, who realize their man has little chance of getting the nomination. Maybe Governor Stevenson, if elected, would "out-Truman" the incumbent, but his name is not Truman, which is the important thing to most of the rebels.

Then the President may be "forced" to back Adlai Stevenson—which he's probably figured on doing all along.

Maybe our diagnosis is all wrong, but it sounds logical. The Russell camp might have done the President a favor.

CROSSING PARTY LINES

NO ONE has ever accused Senators Clyde Hoey and Willis Smith of being subservient lackeys of the White House. And, if we have correctly judged public opinion hereabouts, they are probably storing up treasures with Tar Heel voters by their opposition to certain Administration-sponsored measures.

Nonetheless, one gets an interesting insight into the lack of party responsibility in the American political system by examining the records of Senators Smith and Hoey, as compiled by *Congressional Quarterly* and printed elsewhere in this edition.

The Washington fact-finding service analyzed 48 roll call votes lost by the Democrats because party members jumped the fence, and 51 roll call votes lost by the GOP because Republicans crossed party lines. On these 48 test votes lost by the normal Democratic majority, Senator Hoey voted against his party 58 per cent of the time, while Senator Smith voted against his party 73 per cent of the time.

Other details of their record, including their votes on ten issues considered as "key" votes by *Congressional Quarterly*, will be found in the news story referred to above.

The significance, if we interpret the record rightly, is that party labels, party platforms, and the pledges of Presidential and Congressional candidates mean little. We do not have the party discipline to which the British have long been accustomed.

Maybe our way is better. But it's confusing as all get out, and a fellow never knows, when he marks his ballot, what party is going to do which and why.

NOT BAD OFF

BACK in the thirties many farmers didn't even have shirts. They went on relief. They rode in "Hoover carts". Their wives wore "Hoover aprons" and flour sack panties.

Now some farmers are well off. They pay high taxes. Out in California the Farm Bureau is asking every farmer in the state to send a shirt to Washington as a protest against high taxes.

Well, when people can afford to give the shirt off their back to Uncle Sammie, they must not be hurting much.

COME BACK TO THE FARM, CONGRESSMAN

ONE DUTY of Congressmen is the translation of diplomatic dissertations into plain talk for the home folks. They often do this by colorful metaphor. Thus the diplomats' "institution of affirmative measures" might become "grabbing the bull by the horns".

Southern solons have contributed some of the most picturesque phrases. Many of them, however, spent a considerable portion of time between boyhood on the farm and Congress reading the law and studying the classics. The result of this diverse learning is reflected in their speech. Some of them don't hesitate to mix a metaphor and encompass the learning of the ages in one sweeping phrase.

For example, last week Representative Richards of South Carolina was so impressed with Secretary Acheson's report on the Lisbon Conference that he declared Mr. Acheson "had taken time by the forelock and brought home the bacon".

We gather, then, that Mr. Acheson did not buy a pig in the poke. But, it seems, Congressman Richards got the wrong sow by the ear when he threw in "time by the forelock". We have discovered that one Posidippus, a Greek poet, imagined the following colloquy between himself and a statue of Time.

"Why dost thy hair hang over thy face?

"For him who meets me to take me by the forelock".

Presumably Mr. Richards studied the Greeks after he left the parental Kershaw County farm to eat high on the hog as a lawyer and legislator. But, just to keep us folks back home from having to study Congressmen's speeches as much as diplomats' documents, we wish he'd go whole hog for one kind of metaphor at a time.

WE THOUGHT SO

THE term "greatest deliberative body in the world" has long been applied to the U. S. Senate. Especially by Senators.

Students have searched nineteenth century Senate debates for any use of the phrase. But, says Robert C. Albright of *The Washington Post*, 'twas all in vain.

Recently the Senate Librarian was browsing through John Morley's biography of Gladstone, great British statesman of the last century.

There he found that Arthur Balfour referred to Gladstone as "the greatest member of the greatest deliberative assembly that the world has ever seen".

So the term refers to the House of Commons, not the Senate.

We always—especially recently—thought the Senators were exaggerating.

LET'S GET UP A TEMPERATURE

A LITTLE incident which took place recently in the office of North Carolina's Rep. Robert Doughton illustrates the fate which often befalls worthwhile legislation.

A reporter asked venerable Uncle Bob about the status of a couple of bills on governmental reorganization that have been before his Ways & Means Committee for some months. Mr. Doughton, an able and conscientious committee chairman, couldn't recall what happened to them, so called a committee aide who, after checking, informed him that the Congressman who introduced both bills had not asked for a hearing on them, or pressed for action in any way.

Representative Doughton then told the reporter how hundreds of bills come to his committee, and that he tried to give serious study to those in which Congressmen express particular interest. Some bills—apparently including those he was questioned about—are introduced perfunctorily by a Congressman who doesn't follow through.

The sponsor of those two bills, Uncle Bob reckoned, must not have had much "temperature" about them.

It requires a lot of temperature to pass legislation, and in this respect we'd like to point out how the President could engender quite a bit of heat on the subject of governmental reorganization, a subject which leaves many people cold.

As this newspaper has repeated ad tedium, some pretty good bills on the subject of reorganization have been kicking around Congress for a long time, bills which incorporate the recommendations of the bipartisan Hoover Commission. About half of these recommendations are still unenacted. The primary responsibility for action on them rests with Congress.

But somewhere around the White House are buried some 50 reorganization *plans* which in most cases are companion measures to the reorganization *bills* before Congress. Here's the difference between the bills and plans.

A bill has to go through the pitfall-packed process of the Congressional committee system. It may be pigeonholed, delayed, voted down or watered down, in either house, without even reaching either floor, where it may encounter the same difficulties.

But if the same piece of legislation originates from the President's office as a reorganization plan it is not subject to amendment, and unless it is voted down within 60 days by the House or Senate it becomes law. The Bureau of Internal Revenue reorganization plan now before the Senate is an example of such a plan.

Because reorganization has bogged down in Congress, it is up to President Truman to push these plans vigorously. Some of the President's advisers are reportedly mulling over this angle, and we hope they and the President decide to get going on it in high gear. If the President gets hot on reorganization, the Democratic leaders on Capitol Hill will warm up to the subject.

As Uncle Bob might say, "Let's get up a temperature".

Getz Crenshaw, advertising man, spotted this sign on an auto on a used-car lot on Third near Beale: "Music and Stove, $150." Getz thought that was a new and refreshing way of saying the car had a radio and a heater.—*Memphis Press-Scimitar.*

We thought the President of France had a soft job, but the way he has to find a new government every few weeks he's probably one of the busiest men over there.

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 Editor. The News reserves the right to condense.

A Land Grab?

SWANNANOA

Editors, THE NEWS:

SOMETIMES it frightens me when I have such thoughts. People will think I'm a witch. But when I look into my little crystal ball and see this picture, I just have to tell it to someone, so here you are:

The ball shows a group of politicians of Western North Carolina, some financial speculators, some highly placed with the newspapers, some pseudo-sportsmen, with a plush hunting and fishing lodge in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, with private dominion over thousands of these acres of forest and stream and Fontana Lake, all handed to them by an act of Congress and taken from all the people as a last act of a Congressman in the form of a going-out-of-office present.

Do you see this picture as clearly as I do? The image in the crystal ball is shifting, so look sharply.

—WARREN WILSON.

The Man For The Job

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

THERE has been much criticism of the way the Eisenhower clubs are functioning. One columnist has contrasted the amateur politics of the General's supporters with the "smooth running machinery" of the Taft organization. It is true that the majority of those working for Eisenhower's nomination are not seasoned politicians. Admittedly, private citizens do not have the "know-how" of entrenched political machines.

This fact, in itself, is encouraging. The future of America cannot be so precarious as many predict when there are still so many sincere, patriotic, and hard working citizens who care enough for the future of their country to carry on a campaign to save it. Whether Eisenhower is nominated for President at the Republican national convention or not, his supporters have done a great service.

They are combating the apathy, the thoughtlessness, and the "Let George do it" attitude of the American voter — an attitude which has grown to alarming proportions since the second term of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. They are trying to give Government back to the people. They are striving to show that political bosses and machines are NOT invincible. They are trying to prove that the stranglehold of the corrupt elements in the Democratic party under Harry S. Truman CAN be broken.

As long as there are public-spirited citizens who devote their time, their money and their energy to this cause, the United States is in no danger of moral or economic collapse.

The time has come for reform. The time has come to sweep out the trash of corruption and moral laxity in our government. The man for the job is Eisenhower — as the duly elected voice of the American people.

There is no one else big enough for the job.

Senator Taft is an able and sincere man. But can he unite the Republican Party, along with the Democrats, and win the favor of the Independents? I think not.

As Sen. Frank Carlson of Kansas has pointed out, the objections to placing a military leader in the highest post in the land are irrelevant today. In the grave situation in which we find ourselves in this modern world, diplomacy cannot be divorced from military strategy and military decisions. Can Senator Taft make these decisions wisely and well? Does he understand the troublous and difficult situation in Europe as General Eisenhower understands it? Has he, through long, first-hand experience been an active participant or inspiring leader in recurring crises abroad?

This is our chance to make democracy work. This is our chance to choose the right man for the job. It is no time to squabble over personal and party differences.

The Republican Party has a duty to perform for the citizens of the United States of America. It must forget its selfish and shortsighted aims and work for the best interests of all. It is disastrous to back the wrong man for the sake of political expediency.

THE MAN FOR THE JOB IS EISENHOWER. And although the "smooth running machinery" of the Taft organization may temporarily defeat the Eisenhower supporters through long experience at political maneuvering, the people will vindicate the choice of "Ike" Eisenhower for President at the polls in November.

— RHEA EWALD VIETOR

NATO Discussion Needed

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Editors, THE NEWS:

I HAVE read the editorial from The Charlotte News entitled, "Let's Start Another Great Debate", with interest and appreciation.

It is unquestionably true that we do not have a well defined policy with reference to the North Atlantic community and just how far we intend to go in connection with a solution of its problems, or in the overall determination of what our attitude is to be with reference to the proposed Atlantic Union.

I think that this is a matter of such vital importance that it would call for a very full discussion and consideration before we make any commitments in advance of those already embodied in our North Atlantic Treaty or Agreement.

I am not prepared to say at this time just how far I think our nation should become involved, but I am definitely opposed to going all the way with the World Government idea, because I am unwilling to yield to any World Government the power to levy taxes on the American people. However, I am sincerely anxious to go as far as we reasonably can to work out a peaceful solution of the problems which confront us and the balance of the world and which center largely in the North Atlantic area.

I thoroughly agree with you about the benefits of public expressions and analysis of NATO and its related problems, and I think there should be a very full and complete discussion and analysis of the whole situation before any further commitments are made by our nation.

—CLYDE R. HOEY,
U. S. Senator.

Quote, Unquote

In the old days a good citizen worried about paying the national debt, but nowadays he wonders how to pronounce it.—Ellaville (Ga.) Sun.

Southern Republicans Have 'Tiny, Exclusive' (Taft) Clubs

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

DESPITE Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's enormous and acknowledged popularity in the South, the great majority of the South's 182 delegate votes will probably go to Sen. Robert A. Taft. Here is a significant and rather mysterious political phenomenon, which badly needs explaining.

One place to look for the explanation is right here in Washington, D. C. For Washington, besides being the national capital, is also the biggest of southern cities. And the process which will almost certainly send six Taft delegates from Washington to the Chicago convention is exactly like that in a whole series of southern cities.

Washington's Republican Party, like Republican organizations almost everywhere else in the South, is a tiny, exclusive club, kept tiny and exclusive by a three-man dynasty which has ruled the club for going on 32 years. The dynasty consists of three lawyers, Edward F. Colladay, who has been in the driver's seat since the early twenties, James C. Wilkes, Party chairman in 1948, and Joseph McGarraghy, a law partner of Wilkes, who has now taken over the chairmanship.

This tight little triumvirate has its counterpart all over the South. And virtually all southern Republican bosses follow a simple, cardinal rule — the fewer Republicans the better. This makes for ease of control, and what is more, for fat slices of the patronage pie when the great day of Republican national victory comes. How well the Washington triumvirate has followed this rule is suggested by the fact that in 1948, less than 500 Republicans out of Washington's politically conscious population of more than 800,000 registered at the single designated polling place.

MACHINE INSURANCE

This low registration, which is achieved partly by exceedingly inconspicuous and dully worded pre-polling advertising, is itself insurance against the machine's losing its grip. But there is plenty of re-insurance. In order to have any voice, a Washington Republican must first prove he is a Republican, and register. He must then attend a meeting in his precinct; one of 43 which elects delegates to a local convention. This local convention in turn elects delegates to the national convention.

It is no simple matter to prove you are a Republican in Washington. One of the criteria of orthodox Republicanism, laid down by an organization leader here, is the question, "Has he ever given money to the Party?" Those considered unreliable by the organization can be quite simply screened out" in this way.

And this is by no means all. The precinct leaders are easily kept in an obedient frame of mind, since the organization has shift precincts about as the boss wishes. And the docile precinct captains are provided with "official enrollment sheets," which they carry in their pockets, and use to register at will voters' considered reliable. In 1948, there were more than 1,400 so registered, three times as many as registered at the designated polling place.

The precinct leaders also display a certain reticence about the date and location of the precinct meetings which elect delegates to the local convention. These meetings are ordinarily convivial but exceedingly private gatherings of a half dozen or so of the trusted faithful. And if the worst comes to the worst, and a serious revolt threatens, the organization can simply "go underground and elect convention delegates at private teas and dinner parties," as one Republican leader who tried to buck the machine in 1948 described the process.

AIRTIGHT SYSTEM

There is really no way to attack this airtight system. Delegates to the local convention elected at "rump" precinct meetings are simply tossed out on their ear by the organization-controlled credentials committee. Washington's Eisenhower backers tried a frontal assault, with a proposal for a well-advertised general primary, with a secret ballot. But Joseph McGarraghy stomped out of the meeting called to discuss this proposal, exclaiming angrily that the whole idea was "perfectly ridiculous." The walkout was accompanied by cries of "Triumph!" and "Stalk," but there was really nothing anyone could do.

And the 192 southern delegates, delivered by overwhelmingly Taft-minded southern "regulars" using the techniques described above, may very well determine the identity of the next American President. This curious phenomenon of southern Republicanism thus has great meaning, and it will be examined in a further report in this space.

Let's Pass Or Kill UMT; It's Been Argued Too Long

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

IT SEEMS to me that the subject of Universal Military Training, by popular demand, should be settled now and for all time, and enough of this horsing around with it for pure, prima donna political purpose.

There is no useful point in sending the bill back to committee for "further study". There is no single aspect of compulsory military training that hasn't been thrashed to a bleeding pulp. Its goods and its bads have been chewed over by every windbag in both houses of Congress. Its potentials have been explored by the pressure groups and the churches and the parents and everybody with the tiniest tin hatchet in search of a selfish edge.

There is no further purpose to small it as fascistic or communistic. Only an outright fool could find the proposition, which is the drafting for mandatory military training of all physically fit eighteen-year-olds, as anything but an expedient to extraordinary times. Whether the expedient is vital or not contains the only kernel of argument.

We still draft men and call back veterans of World War II. Our domestic economy is supposed to be on a semi-wartime basis. The bulk of our vast budget goes for war spending. Our life, by solid commitment, must be a military life until after Soviet Russia is met in either defeat or victory. Until the showdown the only hope of delay is in strength, or so the abler soothsayers tell us.

That being the case, the peacemakers may be blessed, but they are overmuch in the minority, and we might as well sit down and confess that we ARE a military state, in every sense of the word, and are apt to continue to be one. There is no sense to war and force and maybe not even to materialism, but we are playing a material game and they pay off on stuff rather than nonsense.

JOHN IS SOLDIER NOW

No matter whether it is right to take John for a soldier, one way or the other we have been talking him for just that. If UMT is wrong, the draft is wrong. A strong military America is wrong. Korea and the United Nations are wrong. The NATO agreements are wrong. Everything and everybody in our current way of life is wrong—dead wrong.

But if they aren't wrong, if this is the only way we can live, then we damn soon better get it systematized a little faster than the half-headed way we've been running it, or we can just go off and graze on stardust and forget about practicality.

The Universal Military Training principle, basically, if taxes are practical, and the defense of America is practical, and a big Army, Navy and Air Force are practical. None of it is ideal, maybe, but the way it's practical. It is certainly as practical as a last-chance draft, which changes monthly in demands and regulations.

Good or evil, necessary or not, it's time for the showdown vote in Congress. The only reason we haven't had it years earlier is that conscripting junior is political poison, and the valiant souls who represent us in Washington do not always court displeasure in an election year. Representative Kilday of Texas said the other day: "Let's pass it or kill it. If there was ever a proposition that was thoroughly studied, this one has been."

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

S. C. Men Unpopular In Puerto Rico

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO

THE U. S. Senate has now heard charges from three different Senators that Puerto Rico's Georgetown University-educated Governor Luis Munoz Marin is dictator of that land. The accusing Senators are Brewster of Maine, Butler of Maryland, both Republicans, and Johnston of South Carolina, a Democrat.

Their charges illustrate a new technique in what is supposed to be the most illustrious legislative body in the world—the U. S. Senate. For what the public doesn't realize when it listens to these speeches is that the man behind them is a South Carolina contractor who owes $1 million in back taxes to the Puerto Rican Government.

The Puerto Rican public does realize this, however, and reactions here have been highly prejudicial to the prestige of the U. S. Congress. Whereas Congress is supposed to set the highest moral and legislative standards for the Western Hemisphere, actually the speeches of these three Senators are regarded in Puerto Rico as little more than blackmail. In brief, if the Puerto Rican Government doesn't forgive $1 million in taxes owed by L. D. Long, South Carolina contractor, then the U. S. Senate will investigate Puerto Rico.

At a time when we are trying to encourage clean government throughout Pan-America this does not go down well in the Caribbean.

Housing Projects

MEANWHILE, L. D. Long of Charleston, S. C., becomes one of the most famous characters in Puerto Rico. It is doubtful whether Franklin D. Roosevelt or Harry S. Truman are better known, though their reputations here are more favorable.

L. D. Long is a likable, hustling contractor who has put up more FHA housing projects in Puerto Rico than any other man in history—housing that was badly needed though opinions differ regarding its durability.

Long and his family have been staunch supporters and contributors to the campaigns of Sen. Johnston, and, aside from his current proposal to probe alleged tyranny in Puerto Rico, has been a hard-working and conscientious Senator.

Shortly after he began operations in Puerto Rico, Long started to apply northern political techniques to the island and dropped in on Munoz Marin, then a candidate for governor, with a large wad of greenbacks bulging from his pockets totaling $25,000. These he offered to Munoz as a campaign contribution for the popular Democratic Party.

Munoz declined.

"Our campaigns do not cost that much," he said. "Besides, if I accepted that much money from one man the voters might hold it against me and I would be defeated."

Long, however, insisted. Finally Munoz told him to take the money to the secretary of the Popular Democratic Party, get a receipt, and they would use the money if they needed it. If not, it would be returned. Long did so. At the end of the campaign—which incidentally elected a native, Munoz, for the first time in Puerto Rico's history—the money was returned.

Tax Trouble

THE trouble over Long's taxes arose when former Governor Jesus Pinero, a Washington appointee, told Long that his petition for tax exemption would be favorably considered. Ex-Governor Pinero has now gone to work for Long. But even so the ex-governor does not state that Long was promised tax exemption but rather that his petition would be considered favorably.

Since then the question of Long's taxes have gone before the U. S. District Court and the U. S. Court of Appeals in Boston. Each decided against him. Though these first appeals were taken to U. S. courts, Long has now gone back to try his hand in the Puerto Rican courts, where the case now stands.

Whether he is right or wrong, Long certainly has been given every right of judicial appeal not usually available in a dictatorship, which he and his Senate friends how claim exists in Puerto Rico.

Meanwhile he has gone over the heads of the courts as dictators sometimes do to try his case in the U. S. Senate—which has left a decidedly bad taste in Puerto Rico.

Furthermore, he has employed certain other techniques not considered good practice in democracies to promote FHA housing in the island.

These techniques recently caused the Federal Housing Administration in Washington to fire its FHA representative in Puerto Rico, Frederick D'A. Carpenter.