

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1952

TOO BIG FOR HIS BREECHES

THE South Korean Constitution, drawn up in 1948 under U.N. sponsorship, empowers the democratically elected Assembly to elect the President. The Assembly is due to elect a president June 23.

The incumbent, Dr. Syngman Rhee, does not want to leave office. A majority of the Assembly, however, oppose him.

So Dr. Rhee has threatened to dissolve the legislature. On the excuse that Communist plotters threaten to take over the government (a threat pooh-poohed by U.N. observers) he declared martial law. Some anti-Rhee legislators were jailed, others went into hiding. Rhee supporters have boycotted the Assembly, so a quorum is lacking and no business can be done. Now Dr. Rhee has banned *Newspaper* and *Voice of America* broadcasts, which criticized him.

So far protests by President Truman and diplomats have had no noticeable effect on

the Rhee position. He protests that he merely wants direct, rather than indirect presidential elections. But his control over youth groups, which periodically stage demonstrations in his behalf, and the army and police suggests that he is more interested in the continued rule of Syngman Rhee than in extension of the franchise.

But for the blood and service of U.N. soldiers, Syngman Rhee would long ago have been strung up, shot or imprisoned. This is not to say that Dr. Rhee should bow and scrape to U.N. rescuers. But the U.N., when the North Koreans attacked, has assumed a unique responsibility which would seem to warrant maintenance of civil as well as military order. We trust the U.N. will show Asia that it can truly would-be manipulators of democracy as well as outright aggressors down to size.

TAFT AND A TWO-PARTY SOUTH

IN A SEARCHING analysis of the dispute over Republican delegates from Texas, the *Christian Science Monitor* has come up with this conclusion which ought to be obvious on the face of it but which is apparently being ignored by the Taft forces. Says *The Monitor*:

"If there is going to be a Republican Party in the South, it can only start by enlisting former Democrats. But it can stay if these former Republicans are prepared to stand."

There, minus all the frills, is the essence of the problem facing the Southern GOP delegate to the Chicago convention.

Does he truly want a lively, effective two-party system in the South? Is he willing to risk his position in the party hierarchy by opening the party rolls to ex-Democrats who might outnumber the chosen faithful? Does he want to try to win elections—local, state, and national?

Or does he want to kiss the South goodbye as a factor in the electoral vote column? Does he prefer to limit his activity to being outplayed by Presidential candidates every four years? Does he choose the fading light of patronage over the reasonable expectation of victory?

To an independent Southern newspaper the *True News*, the answer is clear. There is a tremendous enthusiasm for Dwight Eisenhower among independent voters and among Democrats who have grown cool to

the National Democratic Party. There is utterly no enthusiasm for Harry S. Taft, whose Republicanism is of the right-wing variety and whose political machinations smack of Pendergastism.

If Southern delegates to the Chicago convention really want to win the forthcoming national election, they will vote for Eisenhower. If they prefer to preserve their positions of influence in their tight little organizations, they will vote for Bob Taft and thus invite another defeat.

SILLY STUFF

THREE Eisenhower-backed Senators—Tobey, Tamm, and Morse, voted last week to give the President authority to seize the steel mills temporarily. That proves, said Taft Manager David Ingalls, that there are "grave doubts that General Eisenhower could conduct any kind of a campaign against the Truman Administration."

That's beautiful logic. Let's follow it right out the window.

Three Taft backers, Senators Brewster, Malone, and Butler voted to confirm Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. That must prove that there are "grave doubts that Senator Taft could conduct any kind of a campaign against the Truman Administration's foreign policy."

How silly can politicians get, anyway?

OF SKYHOOTIN' AND SHIBBOLETHS

DAVID EISENHOWER has now gone on record sufficiently to permit one to analyze his ability as a grammarian, and to compare his use of the language with that of incumbent of the office for which Eisenhower is available, and for which the incumbent, to the relief of English teachers, is not.

John Gunther once wrote that Eisenhower was an aside who could master the subtle differences between "shall" and "will" and "if" and "when." He was right. Gunther, spent a good deal of time with Fowler's *Modern English Usage*.

A reading of the text of Eisenhower's Atlanta press conference suggests that he should spend even more time with Fowler's book, particularly the "shall-will" section the aide should have studied.

Fowler does not underestimate the importance of correct usage of "shall" and "will." They, he says, are the shibboleths of the English language. He rules that plain future or conditional statements and questions in the first person should have "shall" or "should," not "will" or "would." Webster goes on to say that "in the first person shall usually expresses mere futurity. Will, when used in the first person, has more often followed him who felt volition or willingness, as in 'I will go'."

At Abilene Eisenhower interchanged the two forms, when used similarly, with gay abandon. "I would say, let's start with the questions," "I should say that 'I will go.' . . . to indulge in personalities, 'I would say . . . I believe the struggle . . . should be stated in the terms of principles and objectives.' "I should say this: By no means of means, I even given thought to the possibility of the people I should appoint to major positions."

Then he wrapped several into one paragraph with "I should say again I am not going to indulge in any kind of personalities under any pretext whatsoever. I should say this: When you are talking about a name that is supposed to mean and to convey to an idea or a program of action, I shall say this."

But in other respects Eisenhower displayed a solid grasp of the language, from little-used words to slang. Some newsmen didn't follow him when he called any connection between him and any political administration

a "shibboleth." But he was using the phrase quite correctly, it being defined by Webster's as "a party cry or pet phrase" as well as a "criticism or test," as Fowler used it in referring to the "shall-will" business. A shibboleth is a word or phrase which is preferred to one which is more neutral to Russia an "ultimatum," as did President Truman.

And we can think of no better word than "skyhootin'" which Eisenhower used, a description of what will happen inflationary without control. We don't find the word in dictionaries, but as every Westerner who has skyhoisted off a belly-fishin' brook knows, it means to skeddadle upward, to beat leather, to get up and get going. It is more expressive than President Truman's favorite, "a lot of hoey," and vastly better than the President's incorrect reference to primaries as "eyewash," which is flattery intended to deceive, when everyone knows primaries are nothing but hogwash.

QUESTION

SECTION 163-201 of the General Statutes of North Carolina, entitled the "Corrupt Practices Act," reads as follows:

"Intimidation of voters by officers made misdemeanor—it shall be unlawful for any person holding any office, position, or employment in State government or for any person with any department, institution, bureau, board, commission or other State agency . . . directly or indirectly to discharge, threaten to discharge, or cause to be discharged or otherwise intimidate or oppress any other person in such employment on account of any vote such voter or any member of his family may cast, or consider or intend to cast, or not to cast, or which he may have failed to cast, or to seek to control any vote which any subordinate or such person may cast . . . or not to cast, by threat, intimidation, or declaration that the position, salary or other benefit of such person . . . depends on the way the person votes. A violation of this section shall be a misdemeanor punishable in the discretion of the court."

Does that, we wonder, include Governors as well?

'You Know, This Isn't Just For You Personally'



Taft Likened To Truman

'Pendergastism' — GOP Style

WASHINGTON

SO haphazard is the method of selecting Presidential nominees that a mere handful of men and women are likely to determine the choice confronting the voters in November.

They are obscure men and women who sit momentarily in the seat of power, thanks to the chaotic accumulation of ancient custom and almost-forgotten rules that govern the selection of a President.

So close is the contest between Senator Taft and General Eisenhower that the votes of 14 States alone, which the Republican nomination. All evidence indicates that the Taft delegates mean to ride these delegates' contests through, regardless of the fact that in most cases the shadow delegates from the shadow party in the South were elected by fraud, deceit and bribery.

But there is a difference in the convention machinery between 1912 and 1952 that could prove important. In 1912 the temporary chairman had the power to pass on the delegates who would be heard in the convention hall prior to hearing the delegate contest.

The chairman, Elmer Root, was an undubious pro-Taft. He seated the pro-Taft delegates who then had the power to vote except in the case of the delegates who were involved, and they voted against all the pro-Roosevelt delegates.

But under the convention machinery this year the Republican National Committee by a vote

of 51 to 49 would vote along with the untested delegates in the convention hall. Conversely, that a margin of 51 might make the difference.

Then on Louisiana the pro-Taft delegates of Mississippi, Texas and Georgia would provide a total of 59 pro-Taft votes. This is a bitter contest with Theodore Roosevelt, who eventually led his forces out of the convention to form the Bull Moose party.

President Taft was defeated by Woodrow Wilson in the election that Fall.

But there is a difference in the convention machinery between 1912 and 1952 that could prove important. In 1912 the temporary chairman had the power to pass on the delegates who would be heard in the convention hall prior to hearing the delegate contest.

The chairman, Elmer Root, was an undubious pro-Taft. He seated the pro-Taft delegates who then had the power to vote except in the case of the delegates who were involved, and they voted against all the pro-Roosevelt delegates.

But under the convention machinery this year the Republican National Committee by a vote

of 51 to 49 would vote along with the untested delegates in the convention hall. Conversely, that a margin of 51 might make the difference.

Then on Louisiana the pro-Taft delegates of Mississippi, Texas and Georgia would provide a total of 59 pro-Taft votes. This is a bitter contest with Theodore Roosevelt, who eventually led his forces out of the convention to form the Bull Moose party.

President Taft was defeated by Woodrow Wilson in the election that Fall.

But there is a difference in the convention machinery between 1912 and 1952 that could prove important. In 1912 the temporary chairman had the power to pass on the delegates who would be heard in the convention hall prior to hearing the delegate contest.

The chairman, Elmer Root, was an undubious pro-Taft. He seated the pro-Taft delegates who then had the power to vote except in the case of the delegates who were involved, and they voted against all the pro-Roosevelt delegates.

But under the convention machinery this year the Republican National Committee by a vote

of 51 to 49 would vote along with the untested delegates in the convention hall. Conversely, that a margin of 51 might make the difference.

Then on Louisiana the pro-Taft delegates of Mississippi, Texas and Georgia would provide a total of 59 pro-Taft votes. This is a bitter contest with Theodore Roosevelt, who eventually led his forces out of the convention to form the Bull Moose party.

President Taft was defeated by Woodrow Wilson in the election that Fall.

But there is a difference in the convention machinery between 1912 and 1952 that could prove important. In 1912 the temporary chairman had the power to pass on the delegates who would be heard in the convention hall prior to hearing the delegate contest.

The chairman, Elmer Root, was an undubious pro-Taft. He seated the pro-Taft delegates who then had the power to vote except in the case of the delegates who were involved, and they voted against all the pro-Roosevelt delegates.

But under the convention machinery this year the Republican National Committee by a vote

of 51 to 49 would vote along with the untested delegates in the convention hall. Conversely, that a margin of 51 might make the difference.

Then on Louisiana the pro-Taft delegates of Mississippi, Texas and Georgia would provide a total of 59 pro-Taft votes. This is a bitter contest with Theodore Roosevelt, who eventually led his forces out of the convention to form the Bull Moose party.

President Taft was defeated by Woodrow Wilson in the election that Fall.

But there is a difference in the convention machinery between 1912 and 1952 that could prove important. In 1912 the temporary chairman had the power to pass on the delegates who would be heard in the convention hall prior to hearing the delegate contest.

The chairman, Elmer Root, was an undubious pro-Taft. He seated the pro-Taft delegates who then had the power to vote except in the case of the delegates who were involved, and they voted against all the pro-Roosevelt delegates.

But under the convention machinery this year the Republican National Committee by a vote

of 51 to 49 would vote along with the untested delegates in the convention hall. Conversely, that a margin of 51 might make the difference.

Then on Louisiana the pro-Taft delegates of Mississippi, Texas and Georgia would provide a total of 59 pro-Taft votes. This is a bitter contest with Theodore Roosevelt, who eventually led his forces out of the convention to form the Bull Moose party.

President Taft was defeated by Woodrow Wilson in the election that Fall.

But there is a difference in the convention machinery between 1912 and 1952 that could prove important. In 1912 the temporary chairman had the power to pass on the delegates who would be heard in the convention hall prior to hearing the delegate contest.

The chairman, Elmer Root, was an undubious pro-Taft. He seated the pro-Taft delegates who then had the power to vote except in the case of the delegates who were involved, and they voted against all the pro-Roosevelt delegates.

But under the convention machinery this year the Republican National Committee by a vote

of 51 to 49 would vote along with the untested delegates in the convention hall. Conversely, that a margin of 51 might make the difference.

Then on Louisiana the pro-Taft delegates of Mississippi, Texas and Georgia would provide a total of 59 pro-Taft votes. This is a bitter contest with Theodore Roosevelt, who eventually led his forces out of the convention to form the Bull Moose party.

President Taft was defeated by Woodrow Wilson in the election that Fall.

But there is a difference in the convention machinery between 1912 and 1952 that could prove important. In 1912 the temporary chairman had the power to pass on the delegates who would be heard in the convention hall prior to hearing the delegate contest.

The chairman, Elmer Root, was an undubious pro-Taft. He seated the pro-Taft delegates who then had the power to vote except in the case of the delegates who were involved, and they voted against all the pro-Roosevelt delegates.

But under the convention machinery this year the Republican National Committee by a vote

of 51 to 49 would vote along with the untested delegates in the convention hall. Conversely, that a margin of 51 might make the difference.

Then on Louisiana the pro-Taft delegates of Mississippi, Texas and Georgia would provide a total of 59 pro-Taft votes. This is a bitter contest with Theodore Roosevelt, who eventually led his forces out of the convention to form the Bull Moose party.

President Taft was defeated by Woodrow Wilson in the election that Fall.

But there is a difference in the convention machinery between 1912 and 1952 that could prove important. In 1912 the temporary chairman had the power to pass on the delegates who would be heard in the convention hall prior to hearing the delegate contest.

The chairman, Elmer Root, was an undubious pro-Taft. He seated the pro-Taft delegates who then had the power to vote except in the case of the delegates who were involved, and they voted against all the pro-Roosevelt delegates.

But under the convention machinery this year the Republican National Committee by a vote

of 51 to 49 would vote along with the untested delegates in the convention hall. Conversely, that a margin of 51 might make the difference.

Then on Louisiana the pro-Taft delegates of Mississippi, Texas and Georgia would provide a total of 59 pro-Taft votes. This is a bitter contest with Theodore Roosevelt, who eventually led his forces out of the convention to form the Bull Moose party.

President Taft was defeated by Woodrow Wilson in the election that Fall.

But there is a difference in the convention machinery between 1912 and 1952 that could prove important. In 1912 the temporary chairman had the power to pass on the delegates who would be heard in the convention hall prior to hearing the delegate contest.

The chairman, Elmer Root, was an undubious pro-Taft. He seated the pro-Taft delegates who then had the power to vote except in the case of the delegates who were involved, and they voted against all the pro-Roosevelt delegates.

But under the convention machinery this year the Republican National Committee by a vote

of 51 to 49 would vote along with the untested delegates in the convention hall. Conversely, that a margin of 51 might make the difference.

Then on Louisiana the pro-Taft delegates of Mississippi, Texas and Georgia would provide a total of 59 pro-Taft votes. This is a bitter contest with Theodore Roosevelt, who eventually led his forces out of the convention to form the Bull Moose party.

President Taft was defeated by Woodrow Wilson in the election that Fall.

Preservation Of U.S. Liberty Should Be Our Life Business

By RAYMOND MOLEY

Last of a series of 12 articles of a condemnation of the book "How to Keep Our Liberty: A Program for Political Action," by Raymond Moley.

THE INCOMPARABLE economic achievement of the United States is revealed in the most obvious facts of our daily life. It is all around us in the things we use and the things we do, and it is in the pages of our history. Countless volumes have been written about it; it is the theme of much of our oratorical discourse.

It is necessary here only to note briefly the fact of this achievement for our main concern is with its causes and the relation of these causes to future progress.

The system that created our achievement we are asked to abandon for another that was planned a century ago by Marx, a man who knew only the infancy of free industrial enterprise, and who considered only the needs of the means of life.

When we direct our attention to the many specific relations of our national existence we find that nearly all of these causes, including the use of God-given natural resources, have something to do with liberty.

THE PRESSURE OF NEED

It is a valid law of nature and of history that the pressure of need impels the masses of men to seek for better living conditions in the mountains and valleys. The lure of America is the lure of a better life, of a better future, of a better present. This is the lure of the American people, and it is the lure of the American people.

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

William A. Dunning, a great historian, once said that we were at the mercy of a hardy breed of "kickers." They were people who hated the restraints of entrenched authority. They wanted to be free, they asked no odds, no nearly purchased protection, no subsidies but a piece of virgin land or a post for profitable trade. This was a manifestation of the love of liberty.

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a

What is needed is to be sure of our directions. For the preservation of liberty is a never-ending quest. In a