

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1952

FOR TAXPAYERS ONLY

SEN. HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia is known as the most persistent, the most energetic and the most insistent champion of economy in the U. S. Congress.

Year after year, the Virginian has waged a strenuous campaign to reduce Federal spending. And it is not his fault that he has gotten so little support from his colleagues.

Currently, Mr. Byrd is calling for a reduction of \$9 billion from President Truman's estimate of Federal spending in fiscal 1952-53.

The figure of \$9 billion is a nice, round figure. It sounds big. It is big. And we suspect that millions of harassed U. S. taxpayers are silently pulling for Senator Byrd as he shrapnels his prying knife.

But there is one unhappy little thought that we must inject here, though we hate to prick the illusion that many taxpayers may have built up. Senator Byrd's figure, if accepted by Congress, would reduce taxes on money, matter of fact, Uncle Sam would still wind up with a deficit in the next fiscal year, even though spending be reduced by \$9 billion.

The Budget Bureau's estimates of spending and revenue may not be accurate, but they're the best available.

The Bureau estimates spending at \$85.4 billion. Revenue at \$71 billion.

That would create a deficit of \$14.4 billion. If spending were reduced by \$9 billion, the deficit would still pile up a deficit of \$4.4 billion, provided no new taxes are voted.

The main difference between Mr. Truman's budget and Mr. Byrd's budget, then, is the size of the deficit envisioned. Both call for a deficit financing which would be inflationary.

Let's look at it from another angle. If you want to know what has happened to Federal spending, compare 1940 and the estimate for 1952.

Table with 2 columns: Year (1940, 1952) and Major security (Military, Veterans, Civilian Control, etc.)

MORE THAN A 'BOYISH PRANK'

ATTORNEY Guy Carwell was obviously A overreaching himself when he told County Recorder Ed Stiles that he was Charlotte's cross-dressing man.

Nothing more than boys trying a cat on a dog's tail, or something like I have done as a kid, like turning over a washbub. . . . It was a joke like I'd play on your knees or on Mr. Ben's.

Trepanning on a man's property at night is bad enough. When that man is a Negro who has just announced for public office in the midst of a wave of Ku Klux Klan terrorism, the humorist comes in front of his home is no 'boyish prank'. It is a deliberate and calculated attempt to intimidate him. It may have been a thoughtless deed in the

'FRIENDS' OF DUBIOUS WORTH

ALTHOUGH they haven't said a publicly, we suspect that the more thoughtful Negro graduates students at the University of North Carolina would prefer that their "friends" tend to other matters and leave their "friends" to make their own way at the University.

It must have caused the students acute mental discomfort when a Durham attorney for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People came to the University was "harassing" the Negro law students, trying to prevent their graduation, and seeking to discourage others from seeking admission.

If the University has a policy of harassment, it would have to be set by President Gordon Gray, Chancellor Robert B. House, or Law School Dean Henry Brandeis. And knowing the integrity and the fairness of those three gentlemen, we simply don't believe that they would brook any such policy, if the

AS IT MAY LOOK FROM THERE

IF YOU WERE an American soldier fighting in Korea what would you think when you heard that someone had written:

We invited the attack in Korea. Or: The Korean War is a needless war. Or: The Korean War is 'Operation Killdeer'.

The United States should pull out of Korea and set up a new defense line based on Formosa and Japan.

Militarily, the United Nations has proved itself helpless. And what would you think if, on obvious political purpose, a group of Senators demanded certain casualty figures on Korea previously classified as secret?

With one exception the statements and the call for so-called responsible leadership, some of whom appear to high office. The one exception is a statement by a Communist agitator, whose line is scarcely distinguishable from the arguments of the other side of the other end of the political spectrum.

First, it is politically impossible to reduce expenditures for veterans' programs.

Second, it is legally impossible to reduce the bill for the national debt.

That leaves major security programs and all other government costs. Senator Byrd's \$9 billion cut would have to be applied to those two categories.

If the cut were applied to "nonessential expenditures" only, it would virtually put the Federal Government out of business. Some savings can be effected, to be sure, in this bracket. Federal agencies are wasteful of manpower and equipment, and they have

When all is said and done, the major portion of Senator Byrd's budget cut must come from the security program, including the military and atomic energy program, and foreign economic-military aid.

Cutting the budget to Senator Byrd's figure, or even lower to the anticipated revenue total of \$71 billion (in order to avoid a deficit) boils down, then, to calculating once again the fiscal year's national debt.

If the Congress, in its reasoned judgment, decides that we have undertaken too heavy a load of security preparation, it can cut the program back. Whether Congress is in a highly doubtful. Equally dubious is its ability to do so wisely, for Congress has not equipped itself with the necessary facilities for handling expenditures intelligently.

In conclusion, be not misled into hoping for a reduction in taxes next year, bearing a sudden ending of the international tension. Whether we like it or not, we are caught in the vortex of a world-wide epidemic of preparedness. Our best political brains have found no answer save to pile up arms and to bolster our allies.

And, of the old popular song has it, that's where our money goes.

Once upon a time and not more than that, a grown son demanded the keys to the garage and came out with the lawnmower.—Walt Jr. Journal.

Controlled Convention

THE Eisenhower-Taft Republican county convention held at the Mecklenburg County Courthouse on March 1 illustrates how far the Republican party in this state falls to mesh with the basic principles and practice of popular government; or, we might say, democracy.

That convention was controlled, manipulated and dominated by the little group of old Republican party hacks and office seekers who have kept the Republican party in the South a minority party for the last three generations.

Including the Eisenhower Democrats there were probably 300 persons there, yet every move and action was initiated and guided by not more than four persons: old, rugged, cunning manipulators who knew what they wanted and got it. The sincere "amateurs," as Dr. Burris calls them, did not know the faint idea of what was going on.

I believe that every candid person, after serious thought, will come to the conclusion that government under the banner of the Republican party, as controlled by the committee and convention system such as exists at present in the Republican party in North Carolina. It affords too plain an opportunity to self-seeking and more or less unprincipled manipulation. That is what has gone on with the county now; too much professional politics—too faint is the voice of the people.

I say not the power of the party, but the hands of voters in primary elections and eventually it will rest in the hands of the people in the general elections. That means county officials, state officials and party officials.

Politics In Arizona

PHOENIX, Arizona. THIS is not coming from the Democratic chief, talks or party big-wig of this state, but from a member who would like more information, writes to the 29th Air Service Group Association, P. O. Box 385, Dover, Ohio.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON. DON'T be surprised if you see the Senator Russell being veered over toward General Eisenhower at the last minute.

Though the Democrats are hell-bent to have Russell stay in the race and end up a splinter party, the men in Georgia is too smart to get that. He is out not to split the Democratic Party, but to accomplish two things: block Truman and block civil rights.

A good many Democrats, including even the President, have been watching the battle inside the Republican Party with interest, intermingled with glee. They remember the olive branches sent to Eisenhower months ago suggesting that he run as a Democrat. And even the President dropped a word the other day indicating that it was not too late to bring Eisenhower into the Democratic fold—if the Republicans continue their isolationist foreign policy.

No Tax Cleanup

GEORGIA friends of Senator George of Georgia who watched his vehement opposition to reorganizing the Internal Revenue Bureau remember his battle with Franklin Roosevelt over the appointment of revenue collectors and other Federal officials in Georgia.

When Roosevelt appointed Senator George in the Democratic primary in 1935, FDR appointed a committee of three men, Gov. Ed Rivers, U. S. Attorney Lawrence Camp and State Director Charles H. Baker to study the Georgia situation.

The plan was to keep Federal jobs away from Georgia, thereby prevent him from building up a powerful local machine.

When the committee was formed in the war, Truman did not carry out Roosevelt's policies and Federal jobs in Georgia drifted back to the old machine.

When Truman appointed a Senate Finance Committee to study the Georgia situation, the committee was headed by a majority of the Senate Expenditures Committee voted against putting tax collectors under Civil Service.

When the Senate Finance Committee voted to put Internal Revenue for tax scandals, but refuse to go along with Truman in cleaning up the source of those scandals.



People's Platform

Letters should be brief. The writers 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 Model For Editorials'

DAVIDSON. Editors, The News:

MAY I offer a special word of thanks to the editor of the editorial, "A Few Words for France," which appears in your issue of March 5?

It seems to me to be a perfect model for editorial on international affairs: it is well-informed, fair and generous—and such qualities are not so consistently displayed by editorial writers in other newspapers, and this time I want to express my appreciation which has deepened steadily during the two years that I have taken the News.

LAIN WILSON

Air Group Reunion

DOVER, OHIO. Editors, The News:

THE 29th Air Service Group Association is holding its fifth annual reunion in Canton, Ohio, on the 20th and 21st of March.

I would put an article in your paper so the men in the Charlotte area will know about it. We were formerly called the 29th Air Service Group before going overseas they changed it to the 29th Air Service Group.

Our members were sent overseas 1942 and returned in October, 1945. We served on the New Hebrides, Guadalcanal, Northern Solomon, N. W. Guinea, Moravia (Dutch East Indies) and the Philippine Islands.

My vice-chancellor, Sam Combs, is from Ontario, Ohio and I am from Dover, Ohio. All former members who would like more information, write to the 29th Air Service Group Association, P. O. Box 385, Dover, Ohio.

Yours truly, FRANK L. PAGE

Reward For A Diplomat

ASSISTANT Secretary of State Ed Miller, who has done so much to promote the Good-Neighbor Policy than anyone since Sumner Welles, was visiting in Puerto Rico and went to the beach at San Juan where he was

This was a great occasion for Juncos and the Mayor proclaimed a holiday. Moreover Miller was welcomed with a series of public events including a luncheon at the Hotel Juncos. The Mayor of Juncos could think of a prize-fighting coat.

Russell Support May Veer To Eisenhower

WASHINGTON. THE Assistant Secretary of State expected the gift graciously and on appropriate occasion by thanking the people for thus honoring him. Not quite knowing what he would do with a fighting cock back in the State Department, however, he simply did not take the cock with him, when Governor Muncie Martin of Puerto Rico whispered to the Mayor:

These Americans do not appreciate the value of a fighting cock. They are used to having the cock in their back and the rooster here and tell Mr. Miller he can make trips down to see him.

The Mayor took the hint. The Assistant Secretary of State looked relieved.

Ambassadorial Switch

MIKE PEARSON, the Canadian Foreign Minister to U. S. born up at Sir Oliver Franks, British Ambassador to Toronto, has been named to the job of Secretary General of the North Atlantic Pact.

This all-important position was offered first to Pearson, but he graciously declined. He was then offered the job by Sir Oliver Franks, but he declined it. Franks' name has been reported desirous of leaving.

During the campaign, Ambassador Franks indicated he would like the North Atlantic Pact post, only to change his mind. Now Foreign Minister Pearson must persuade the British to give the job to Pearson. Franks' name has been reported desirous of leaving.

Franks' name has been reported desirous of leaving. Franks' name has been reported desirous of leaving.

Taft's Entry In N.H. Race A Shrewd Political Gamble

By STEWART ALSTON

CONCORD, N. H. SENATOR ROBERT A. Taft is certainly among the favored politicians in the United States. And when, against the advice of all those around him, Taft entered his name in the primaries here in New Hampshire, he may well have made one of the most brilliant political moves of his career.

His chief rival, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, has an illness averted. This is his immense appeal to the mass of the voters. It is this appeal which really justifies Eisenhower's only

But the powerful political organization of that agile operator, Sen. Styles Bridges, and the backing of all these put together, Bridges is maintaining in public rather sang attitude of neutrality.

Yet it is significant that Bridges became a Senate minority leader with the indispensable help of Sen. Taft, and that he is considered by the party as one of its best Taft Cabinet. It is significant also that Bridges' former assistant, Gen. Robert H. Taft, has been bested by Taft in the 1950 primary with Bridges' silent help, is the only man in the delegation.

Taft has, moreover, the immense advantage of appearing in the flesh, complete with clean-cut manner, while Eisenhower remains an admirable but rather cold figure on the radio. Despite such assets, most of the Eisenhower delegates—say ten out of fourteen—were expected

to win. Taft's defeat has almost been predicted as a Taft victory. But the triumph of Taft forces are really handicapped by the vote, or even a Taft majority, in the preferential primary.

For such a result would seem to knock a cocked hat to the claims for Eisenhower's superior vote-getting powers. In fact, it would mean nothing of the sort.

In the first place, the perennial Harold S. Stassen, who has been the only vote-getter in the primary, drew some votes from Eisenhower. But a far more important factor was the very nature of the primary vote. As elsewhere, the voters who take the trouble to vote in a primary are not the hard core of the party. In the hard-fought Dewey-Stassen contest here in 1948, fewer than half the Republicans who later voted in the election bothered to vote in the primary.

Eisenhower's principal strength is not, of course, among the hard-core Republicans. It is among the independent voters and disgusted Democrats—the "mugwumps," as Taft calls them disdainfully—who are democracy essential to Republican national victory. And here in New Hampshire primary voters are usually the hard core of a hard core. New Hampshire's famous town meetings come usually to vote in the rural and small town Republican vote in force, while the more independent-minded city voters are on their hands. And New Hampshire's rural Republicans are about as conservative as the hard-core Republicans are to be found anywhere in the nation.

Under such circumstances, a Taft majority for Eisenhower will be a downright miraculous tribute to his universal popularity. Yet such a result would mean nothing to Taft, as this outcome has been written off in advance to the benefit of himself. And a Taft majority in the preferential vote will be interpreted as a catastrophe for Eisenhower, while if Taft runs a close second, this will be hailed as a triumph for Taft's strength in the primary.

In short, it is difficult to see how Taft could lose much here, and very easy to see how he could win a great deal. This is why Taft's entry into the primary is a shrewd political gamble he has ever taken.

Hoffman Puts Case For Ike In Its Proper Perspective

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON. POLITICAL speeches being all too often merely a rearranging of tired platitudes, they rarely change anything. But now and then a speaker comes along who convinces and clarifies, and the words carry far beyond the range of the immediate audience hearing them.

Speaking at the University of New Hampshire, Paul Hoffman put the case for the nomination of Dwight Eisenhower as powerfully and yet as simply as has been done in the world in many years.

Because of the high-pressure technique sometimes associated with the word, substance is often to have an unflattering connotation. It is used here in the best American sense of the word, and Hoffman believes deeply in the good of what he has to offer and wants to communicate that belief to as many people as possible.

HOFFMAN'S REASONS His presentation was such a coherent whole that it is hard to summarize. The main reason why Eisenhower is the inevitable leader to unify this nation and solidify the free nations, Hoffman said:

"We have the opportunity to give to the world a dramatic demonstration of what a government of the people and by the people can do for the people, provided we can move out of the narrow, self-centered political amorality which now prevails and into the sunshine

of goodwill, confidence and integrity on the minds of men, now is more heroic than fear or hate."

In Hoffman's view, three choices are possible: the Communist, the aggressive drive of Communist imperialism. One is the belief held by the masses, that the world will be halted only by another general world war. This would almost certainly mean the end of a free society because of the appalling cost in lives, money and destruction.

The second is through a long, long period of cold war, the outcome to be settled by attrition. But the oppressive burden of billions spent for armament year after year might as well amount as disastrous as war.

The third choice "is to wage the peace vigorously, with such imagination and boldness that we can create a new world within Russia and her satellite nations and within the free nations—particularly the United States. This is the result in acceptance by the leaders of Russia of a live-and-let-live arrangement which means that Eisenhower's capacity for leadership must be called into being through the office of the Presidency.

More than anything thus far, this puts the Eisenhower choice in its true perspective. It is a valuable contribution not merely to the campaign in New Hampshire, but to the thinking being in the crucial campaign ahead.