THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1952

MECKLENBURG MADNESS

COMPLETELY ignoring the old adage, Mecklenburg County Democrats leaped without looking Saturday—and they landed smack in the middle of a rather foolish predicament.

Mesmerized by the mellifluous oratory of the old master, former Governor-Senator Cameron Morrison, they drifted right along as Mr. Morrison extolled the virtues of Senator Richard Russell of Georgia. And before they woke up, he had them committed, as a delegation, to support a resolution "instructing" the North Carolina delegation for Russell at the State convention in Raleigh Thursday.

Now Senator Russell is an A-1 candidate for the Presidency. Of the Democrats now seeking the office, he's probably the best qualified. And it is a cruel turn of Fate that he is handicapped in his aspirations by his sectional background.

A resolution "endorsing" Senator Russell, yes. But the tight, inflexible "instructions" given the Mecklenburg delegation to Raleigh ought not to be repeated by the full state convention.

The North Carolina delegation ought to go to Chicago with full freedom to act for the best interests of North Carolina and the Democratic Party. If it wants to offer its allegiance to Senator Russell in the early stages, fine. But it ought to take a tip from Mr. Russell himself. The Georgian will be a big man at the convention because of his bargaining power. It will be the epitome of folly if the Democratic state convention follows Mecklenburg's example and throws away its bargaining power by "instructing" the delegation for Senator Russell or anyone else.

ONE LITTLE VOTE

ALTHOUGH heavy voter registration in Mecklenburg the past three Saturdays indicates a keen interest in the forthcoming elections, it is no guarantee of a heavy vote. Every year millions of Americans who are properly registered fail to vote. Maybe it's because of bad weather, other work, or just apathy. But often the excuse is: What difference is my one little vote going to make, when 50 or 60 million will be cast?

One little vote can make a lot of difference, and election returns are filled with case histories showing that another vote in just some precincts of one or two states, would have greatly altered the course of history.

Take, for example, the 1948 Presidential election. Governor Dewey lost Ohio and California to President Truman by approximately one vote a precinct. In Ohio, with 9,247 precincts, he lost by 7,107 votes. In California, with 16,802 precincts, he lost by 17,865 votes.

Each of these states had 25 electoral votes. Had there been one more Dewey vote in most of the Ohio precincts, and one or two more Dewey votes in each of the California precincts, neither candidate would have had electoral college majority, and the election would have been thrown into the House of Representatives.

But, as all remember, it was supposedly "in the bag" for the Republicans. A few Dewey supporters stayed home, thereby exercising a profound negative influence on American history.

And of course there's the famed 1916 Presidential battle between the GOP's Charles Evans Hughes and President Wilson. If one more Hughes supporter had voted in 3,807 of California's 5,000 precincts, Mr. Hughes would have been elected President.

Never underestimate the power of your one "little" vote. It is tremendously powerful.

IN THE INTEREST OF THE COMMUNITY

THE selection or the retention of a pastor is nominally a congregation issue of which the community (and the editorial writer) take only passing note. In the case of Dr. James A. Jones, pastor of the Myers Park Presbyterian Church, the whole community, having vicariously shared the fruits of his work, has a stake in the decision he must make. Hence, we presume to speak our piece.

Dr. Jones has already been assured by an official spokesman for his congregation, by the deacons and elders of his church, and by many individuals on the outside, of their earnest hope that he will remain at Myers Park Presbyterian. And we are quite sure that he will give weightiest consideration to their entreaties, as indeed he should.

But Dr. Jones does not belong exclusively to the congregation of the Myers Park Presbyterian Church. He belongs to the whole community. The rich combination of talents and the wide diversity of interests that make him such an inspiring minister also enables him to be an unusually effective leader in broader community activities. The community, as well as the church, will lose if he goes to Atlanta.

Dr. Jones will make his own decision. These are matters for one's mind and heart, one's soul, one's conscience. Whatever the decision, it will be accepted without question by his friends. We just permit ourselves the hope that it will be to stay in Charlotte.

NEW TREND IN MEDICINE

TWO stories in the news recently from widely separated points had a closer connection than a casual reading would indicate.

One was from Atlantic City, N. J. It told of a new experiment at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School. The other was from Jerusalem, Israel. It announced the graduation of the first medical class from the Hebrew University.

What the two schools have in common—an affinity not entirely revealed in the stories—are projects designed to turn out better-rounded doctors who have a full understanding of the social needs of the communities in which they are later to work.

At Pennsylvania, young doctors in training are assigned to visit selected families, not to prescribe medicine or give treatment, but simply to act as "advisory middlemen" between patients, doctors, and hospitals. And thus they come to look at medicine through the eyes of the patient, and to understand his problems and those of the society in which he lives.

As explained by Dr. Kenneth E. Appel, Pennsylvania feels that the confined life of the medical student often serves to "dehumanize" him, and he adds:

"Human problems are more realistic than laboratories, textbooks, test tubes and tissues. Under this new educational device, disease is seen in its development, course, convalescence and impact on the family emotionally and economically."

In Jerusalem, the Hebrew University works hand-in-hand with Hadassah in training young medical students. Both the University and Hadassah are denied the use of their fine, modern facilities atop Mt. Scopus, now behind the Jordan-Israel truce frontier. Both have to use makeshift facilities. But because Israel's health problems are so great, due mainly to the huge tide of immigration since May, 1948, they consider it essential that the medical student think in terms of public health as well as private practice. And a part of their training consists of service at public health and social welfare institutions.

Far-sighted medical men in the U. S. have long realized that the segregation of medical students in laboratories and classrooms hindered the full development of the doctor's total personality, and limited his awareness of his duties as a citizen. Yet of all the professions, medicine needs understanding, sympathetic, and socially-conscious practitioners.

If we appear to overemphasize these two seemingly unrelated stories, it is because we detect in them an encouraging indication that the profession as a whole is moving to fill a quite noticeable gap in its education processes.

From The Raleigh News & Observer

SENSIBLE JUDGE

IN RALEIGH practically all judicial dealing in juvenile delinquency is carried on in secret. In Charlotte the well qualified juvenile court judge expressed himself strongly against such procedure and declared his feeling that "the public needs to know what lies behind some juvenile delinquencies."

Commenting on the publicity given the case of a young girl in Charlotte who set fire to two churches last month, Juvenile Judge Willard Gatling said:

"The public has a right to know the facts in this case and what lay behind it. Sometimes the juvenile and domestic courts have been over-protecting and I think the public needs to know what lies behind some juvenile delinquencies.

"One has to be guided by the principle of common sense. In this case the children at school knew all about it anyway. Often a child can be pilloried mercilessly at school and the real facts hushed up."

In this particular case, as the judge indicated in his verdict, the child was a "victim of a broken home". The strange behavior of the child was accounted for by the failure of the parents. If the case had been hushed up, however—as is the regular custom in Raleigh—all the child's associates and many adults would have been carefully covered up and protected. Indeed, in many juvenile delinquency cases the solicitous secrecy is for the benefit of the adults involved and not the children.

No people in our community deserve the protection of public vigilance more than the children. Sensible juvenile court judges understand that. No judge or court is wise enough or good enough to be allowed to deal with children in trouble without any public knowledge of his acts. Secrecy does not protect; it makes every ineptitude, injustice and stupidity possible in dealing with the difficult problem of juvenile delinquency in any community.

'But If You Want A Hot Accompanist—'

McGranery Hearing Turns Up Odd Assortment Of Evidence

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

JAMES P. McGRANERY, the Pennsylvania judge the President has chosen to clean out corruption in the government, will probably be confirmed as Attorney General of the United States shortly, after these words are printed. There is still time to note, however, that this event is likely to turn out to be another folly joke on the American people.

The oddest testimony, now released on motion of the Judiciary Committee minority, was given by the Young Tuk Democratic leader of Philadelphia, Richardson Dilworth. Dilworth and McGranery, admittedly, are old-time political enemies. Yet Dilworth's testimony was buttressed by an elaborate apparatus of photostats and court records. And it cannot be lightly dismissed, since the main facts are not disputed.

HERE ARE THE FACTS

In brief, in the Summer of 1939, when King George and Queen Elizabeth of England were due to visit this country, an Irish revolutionary, Sean Russell, came here with the avowed invention of assassinating them. He was promptly picked up by the FBI. The Clan Na Gael, an extremist Irish group, thereupon persuaded McGranery, then a Democratic member of Congress, to try to get Russell released. And at McGranery's request, President Roosevelt allowed Russell to leave the country after $5,000 bail had been posted.

This $5,000, raised with great difficulty from rich members of the Clan Na Gael, was deposited with McGranery as surety against Russell's bail bond. Part of the money was transmitted to McGranery by James McGarrity, a Philadelphia chieftain of the Clan Na Gael. The rest was handed to McGranery direct by a Clan Na Gael officer, James Brislane. Russell left the country, and in 1941, the Clan Na Gael began to ask for its money back. By 1944, although there was no proof of Russell's whereabouts, his bail bond was dismissed. This removed the only pretext for McGranery's holding the $5,000 of surety money, and the Clan Na Gael grew more insistent on being repaid.

No less than seven lawyers applied, at different times, to McGranery. One of them, Thomas M. J. Vizard, testified that in 1945 McGranery offered him a deal, whereby he would give the Clan Na Gael half the money and keep half himself—thus, in effect, acknowledging the Clan's claim. Meanwhile, McGranery had first been appointed to a high Justice Department post, and then, in 1946, had been named a District Court Judge. Possibly because so one likes to sue a Federal Judge, none of the lawyers pressed the Clan Na Gael claim until the Clan visited Dilworth.

Dilworth brought suit against McGranery on the Clan's behalf in 1948. Despite his offer to Vizard, McGranery now alleged that the $5,000 he was holding was really the property of the Clan's Philadelphia chieftain, McGarrity. McGarrity had died in 1946. McGranery had never made any attempt to acknowledge his supposed debt of $5,000 to McGarrity's estate. McGranery's signed receipts to the Clan Na Gael were entered in evidence. Hence the court ordered McGranery to repay the $5,000 to the Clan Na Gael, less about $1,200 of expenses he claimed to have incurred in obtaining Russell's release.

In his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Dilworth characterized the whole business as a "shabby" attempt at "misappropriation." McGranery hardly attempted to answer Dilworth, except to point out that Dilworth was a member of Americans for Democratic Action. This greatly outraged Sen. McCarran and several of his colleagues—who then denounced Dilworth as a probable subversive.

'LEGAL IGNORAMUS'

In addition to Dilworth, Thomas McBride, one of the most respected leaders of the Philadelphia bar, also appeared against McGranery. McBride testified that McGranery was a legal ignoramus, totally lacking in judicial temperament. As evidence, he offered the enormous number of reversals of McGranery's judicial decisions by the Federal Circuit Court. Among the McGranery errors cited, were such really fantastic rulings as the denial of the right of counsel to a defendant in a criminal case, and a charge to a jury grossly confusing the nature of "reasonable doubt." Evidence was also offered that after the Clan Na Gael case, McGranery sought to use his judicial power to revenge himself on Dilworth, through one of Dilworth's clients.

The explanation of McGranery, both as Federal Judge and as Attorney General-nominate, is simple enough. When Sen. and Mrs. Truman first came to Washington, Rep. and Mrs. McGranery were good neighbors to them. In short, McGranery is another Truman crony. He is also a man of considerable surface charm. But whatever the rights and wrongs of the Dilworth and McBride testimony, the evidence certainly does not suggest McGranery should be counted on for the great clean-up of the Federal government, which he has said will be "as easy as pie."

New Day Dawning?

Republicans And The South

(An Editorial From Life Magazine)

SENATOR Mundt (R-SD) never got off the ground with his hopeless scheme for a merger of the Republican and Southern Democratic parties. But he may be right when he says, "The key to America's political future is in the South." Our fastest-changing region is already in a political turmoil which foreshadows more to come.

The strangest and most failure-prone of all political machines, the Southern G.O.P., has had a firecracker pinned to its coattails by the Ike-Taft contest for delegates. For instance in Texas (not typically Southern, but what is?) the tight little Zweifel organization is strong for Taft, but the people—Republicans and Democrats — seem to prefer Ike. Lacking a primary, Texas Republicans have been fighting it out during the last fortnight in precinct and county conventions. Result: a series of rump meetings, bolts and standoffs that may not be composed this side of Chicago.

The standoff pattern had already been set in Louisiana, where the incumbent pro-Taft machine resorted to the most ruthless tactics—"brazen thievery," Senator Tobey has called it—to maintain its control. One machine-supported delegate chairman named Robert Butler elected himself delegate while the rest of the meeting—four Ike men—sat helplessly but vociferously by, their votes uncounted. An honest count in Louisiana would probably have sent at least 10 of 15 delegates to Chicago for Ike. Instead, the furious Ike-men must now send rival delegates and maybe conduct a floor fight for credentials.

What are these Southern Republicans fighting so fiercely about? Like most Southern politicians, they refuse to fight each other about Negro rights; that explains none of it. Like Ikemen and Taftmen elsewhere, they feel strongly about their respective candidates; that explains part of it. There is also the question of who controls the state organization. Southern Republican parties by and large are not really parties but little patronage machines. This year the chances of a Republican President are better than usual, control of these little machines is worth more than usual, and the fighting is consequently fiercer than usual. That explains still more of it—but not all.

• • •

NEXT to Senator Russell the favorite candidate of the South as a whole is probably Ike. The inroads he could make among Southern Democrats already present the Republican Party with a special problem: what should its policy be, if any, in this region where its future may lie?

First, it could bid outright for the Negro vote, which has been growing rapidly in numbers and at the same time has been steadily losing interest in Abe Lincoln's party ever since 1932. This vote might be partly recaptured if the Republicans went down the line for FEPC. That would be a bold gesture, but it probably would not hasten the day of Negro equality. For although Negro rights are properly a national issue, Negro equality can only be achieved in the places where Negroes live and work. The rapid but uneven progress of recent years has been largely the sum of state and local achievements, both in North and South. A strong federal hand in this rate of progress, besides raising troublesome policing questions, would lose the Republicans the support of many Southern whites who favor racial progress and whose work is essential to it.

Or, second, the Republicans could write off the Negro vote and try some new variant of the Mundt scheme. The states' rights issue on which a Republican-Southern Democrat coalition would be based has much national force and legitimacy. However, no Southern Democrat is really interested; and for the Republicans it would be sure death in the long run—especially if it involved being as "conservative" as a Dixiecrat on the subject of Negro rights.

A third choice is the best. The Republicans need a strong organization in the South which will stand for legitimate states' rights, but which will also fight within the states for more progress toward racial equality.

• • •

FOR this purpose the established Southern Republican machines are almost useless. They are totally uninterested in the uphill task of winning local elections, enlarging the party, or working at politics more than once in four years.

In most of the Southern organizations the incumbents are for Taft, the rebels for Ike. If the latter win, they might of course then settle down and run their little patronage machines just as they were run before. But that game is about played out, for the South is still changing fast. Some of the newer active Republicans—the organizers of the Republican Southern Conference for Eisenhower, for instance—have other plans. One of them, John Pritchett of Tennessee, claims that if Ike is elected "the Republican Party as we have known it in the South will be swept away and we will have a real two-party system there." The local battles in Louisiana and Texas are a portent that this great reform may be in sight.

The new Southern middle class and the Republican Party need each other, and the Southern Negro needs real two-party rivalry for his own bargaining strength. If the Southern Ikemen can bring that goal nearer, more power to them.

Quote, Unquote

We've come a long way from the days when a dairy farmer took his milk to town in a bucket, asked a price and got it if he could. That federal milk hearing here finally ended Wednesday, in which farmers asked, among other things, "to raise the differential over basic formula" prices. In the old days the farmer would just take his milk back and feed it to the hogs. — Dallas Morning News.

Dick Russell in the White House will fulfill out lifelong dream — a Confederate president to run the Yankee treasury. — Ellaville (Ga.) Sun.

Firing Crooked Policemen Better Than Retiring Them

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

IT takes a rat to tell one, and we got a singing mouse in this town name of Harry Gross who has not only kissed but is telling. The cops are getting fired for playing commercial hooky with the bookie, and it is hard to hewup a slab of sympathy.

What makes it pretty and poetic is that the coppers—a brace of captains, a sergeant and a patrolman—all got the heavy axeroo a few days before they might have retired to live, shall we say, sinfully off their time in grade. It killed their pensions, and that is a thing we have needed for many a day.

I don't care much for this fat slug, Harry Gross the bookie, a sort of Serge Rubinstein of the gambling business, but he needs a round of applause for instigating a treatment we have ached for. He is singing his ugly little head off, and the people who took his dough are being busted front and center. They are not being demoted or transferred and they are losing their time.

The worst thing about police business is that in the past we have always punished the sinners by demoting them or retiring them when they get the fingers in the glue or foul up on an important job. We never fired them, really, and we never punished them, really. We made a swift governmental adjustment in their jobs.

This don't make no sense, hardly a-tall. There is not enough to lose to keep the people semi-honest in the performance of their appointed tasks. And the other thing, of allowing them to retire when they get caught stealing, is a stupidity out of the world. Being allowed to quit is not sufficient penalty for being a malfeaser in office. What the bum needs is a clout on the skull to go with the reprimand and a hell in the eye to fit the resignation.

But the point I had in mind was that I'm truly glad they canned the cops that Harry Gross, the unsavory bookie, squealed on. The punishment of retirement is not sufficient punishment for the sinners, as the avenue of promotion is not the right reward for the expedient and lucky. The administration of the law is a long and tortuous process. In the cop business we are not electing Miss America, nor is a bad cop entitled to anything but a just return on the investment of his sins.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

McKinney Criticized For Big Spending

WASHINGTON

THE personal and political expenses of Democratic National Chairman Frank McKinney are causing a lot of backstage comment in top Democratic circles this week. They've also caused the resignation of the Democratic budget officer, William S. Bradley.

Bradley resigned with a caustic confidential letter calling attention to McKinney's personal expenses, which include $750 to the Marian Service Co. of Miami, reportedly for handling his yacht; and $2,175 paid to a photographer, P. H. Ho of Indianapolis, McKinney's home town, for "pictures of chairman."

All this came to the surface when Democratic budget officer Bradley submitted his resignation, with a stinging private letter blasting the manner in which McKinney was conducting Democratic finances.

Itemized Expense Account

BRADLEY also sent a letter to two top Democrats, Jonathan Daniels of Raleigh, N. C., and Molly O'Riordan of Boston, itemizing the chairman's extravagances. These included personal expense checks paid to McKinney for $3,000 each on Jan. 1, Feb. 2, and March 26, plus $1,720.76 on March 25, the latter credited as "expense acct.—Florida." This was in addition to the $750 to the Marian Service Co. of Miami, reportedly for handling the McKinney yacht.

McKinney's total for expenses up to March 25 was listed as $10,578.93. This, however, did not include his bills at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington.

In fairness to McKinney, it should be noted that he has not received a salary from the committee.

Bradley's letter was received by members of the Democratic executive committee meeting in Chicago last week and immediately became the talk of the meeting. Brought to the attention of Chairman McKinney, he gave the following explanation of the expense account.

First he stated that the $40,000 sent to Cook County was not for the purpose of cutting down the Kefauver vote in the Illinois primary, but was the Cook County half of the Jackson Day dinner, the proceeds of which are customarily shared by local and national committees.

He also stated that his $10,578.93 personal expense account for three months covered trips totaling 23,000 miles and attendance at nine Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners.

On his exciting trip to Florida, McKinney said he had entertained various big contributors on the yacht and managed to raise $32,000 for the Democratic Party. He said the Florida trip had cost him a total of $4,900, but he had charged the Democratic Committee $1,720, which he figured was the cost of seven receptions for big contributors.

Regarding the $2,175 paid for photographs, McKinney said there had been a big demand for photos of himself, but since he had used some of them personally, he later made a $1,000 contribution to the committee.

He also pointed out that he was running the committee for 21 per cent less this year than last, even though it was a campaign year; and that Bradley, who had made the charges against him, was sore because he had been let out.

The executive committee ended by giving McKinney a rising vote of confidence.

Bradley, who has been budget and controls officer under three previous Democratic chairmen, also had some critical things to say about Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners. This column has been able to obtain a copy of his confidential letter, dated May 13, to Chairman McKinney. Salient portions follow:

Bradleys Letter

"SINCE Jan. 1, and as of April 30, 1952, your office has exceeded its budget by the amount of $18,912.90. This has been occasioned by your employment of more 'assistants to the chairman' than were provided for in the budget, and at a higher scale of salaries, and the extraordinarily liberality of the expense allowances granted them," Bradley told McKinney.

"I do not know the source of the information on which you based your public statement that 'the 1952 dinner was the most successful ever held'," the budget officer continued, "but it was completely erroneous. The records of the comptroller's office could have provided the correct figures, had they been consulted. The 1950 dinner, held in the Armory, under comparable cost conditions, produced the following results: total receipts—$581,543.00. Total costs—$120,872.66. Net receipts—$460,670.34.

"A notable example for the establishment of controls is the recently held Washington Jefferson-Jackson dinner. In spite of the fact that the total receipts for the dinner ($422,946.00—including pledges) were far below expectation, the expenses could have saved approximately $50,000.00 by the application of reasonable controls over spending and waste.

$40,000 For Chicago

"OF the total receipts, only $360,221.00 was in cash. Out of this, we will pay approximately $138,000.00 in dinner and promotion costs, leaving only about $221,000.00 in available cash, for the present use of the committee. A few practical economies, applied in contracting the dinner costs, would have saved thousands, but unfortunately, no effort was made in that direction. As a result, on the basis of the 5,380 dinners which we paid for, the cost was $25.10 per plate—while on the more accurate basis of the 4,120 contributors, the cost was $32.06 each. This estimate is predicated on full collection of all pledges. If we fail in this, the per-plate cost will be considerably higher.

"Of the $61,000.00 in pledges, accepted in lieu of cash, approximately $18,000.00 came from persons who still owe us for their 1951 dinner pledges—some of whom owe for years even previous to that. All of these matters were called to Judge Howard's attention in ample time to have taken effective measures, had you so desired."