

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

TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1952

EISENHOWER WINS THE FIRST ROUND

The first major test of relative Eisenhower and Taft strength took place at the Republican convention in Chicago yesterday. The result was hailed by Eisenhower supporters as a victory, indicative of other wins in the future. Certainly it gave an important psychological boost to Ike's candidacy, but it would be an error to infer from the voting that the General will win the nomination.

The issue at stake in yesterday's balloting was more than an Eisenhower-Taft struggle. It was a contest between two great leaders, though certainly the battle between the two contenders for the nomination was an important part of the issue. The broader issue was a question of morality, whether the open convention should rubberstamp the shoddy and undemocratic seizure of delegates from Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas that had been approved by the Taft-dominated National Committee.

The parliamentary maneuvering was fairly complicated. First, Senator John Bricker of Ohio, a steadfast Taft supporter, moved that the rules of the 1948 convention be adopted. That would have meant that the 68 in-all-would have the right to vote on other delegate contests.

MACARTHUR THE KEYNOTER

BEFORE General Douglas MacArthur delivered the keynote speech last night, the Republican convention was completely obsessed with the bitter fight within its own ranks. General MacArthur, as all good keynoters should, reminded them in no uncertain terms that the bigger battle is yet ahead and that it will be fought against the Democrats.

As keynote speeches go, the MacArthur performance was a humdinger. It literally threw the book at the Democrats. It charged with everything from moral indignation and naive to deliberate perversion of U. S. traditions. It found grievous fault with domestic programs, foreign policy conduct in office. It was packed with embittered phrases and emotional phrases and feeling indignation. It was on the whole, an effective speech from the viewpoint of the right wing of the Republican Party which dictated General MacArthur's selection as keynoter, as well as making all the other arrangements for the convention. And coming on the heels of the loss to the Eisenhower forces in the struggle over contested delegates, it undoubtedly was a shot in the arm for the forces of Senator Taft, whom General MacArthur is backing for the nomination.

Still, the speech left something to be desired. It was essentially negative. It was grimly pessimistic, and even despondent. It was full of over-optimism and gross exaggeration. And there was very little that General MacArthur had not said before, either in his memorable address

THE UPS AND DOWNS OF COUNTY TAXES

MECKLENBURGERS still smarting from the increased property tax valuation may get some solace from the knowledge that 10% of North Carolinians are faced with increased taxes too. Sometimes it's accomplished by higher rates, sometimes a higher level of valuation. And as for the county duck officials can testify—support of revaluation is often one of the quickest ways for a county commissioner to commit political suicide.

Bill Sharpe has rounded up some county tax figures for The State, and here are some of the interesting things he discloses: Family County has the highest rate in the state—\$2.20 per \$100, as compared with Mecklenburg's pre-revaluation rate of \$1.02. Present rate of \$9.10 means that for every \$100's worth of taxable income smaller than Family's—the last revaluation of property in that county occurred in 1919.

ICE, MINK AND COLLARD GREENS

The Office of Price Stabilization, in one day last month, moved price ceilings from ice, mink coats, and 77 "specialty food products" described as unimportant to the average family's living costs.

There are some rather curious things about this business. The price controllers displayed a fine regard for public reaction by announcing for a week the announcement that ice merchants might now charge anything they wish. We assume that the officials were completely honest in saying it was accidental that this announcement came during one of the worst heat waves in history. Their sensitive public relations nerve was also exhibited in their explanation of the delay: When they removed ceilings from the price of whisky a week ago, they just couldn't bring themselves to do the same for ice on the same day.

The subject of mink and the price of mink leaves us cold, even on a hot day. Not many people are wealthy enough to worry too much

other Taft supporters and a key man in organizing the convention machinery with Taft backers. Rep. Brown sought to amend Governor Langley's motion to eliminate seven Louisiana delegates who had been chosen by district conventions. It was that motion which lost 658 to 148—a larger margin than had been anticipated, mainly because such key states as Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and California gave a bigger vote against the Taft-sponsored Brown amendment than had been anticipated.

Certainly the division was significant. It showed that the Taft camp had either overestimated its total strength, or else had been making excessively broad claims. It showed further that General Eisenhower has a large reserve strength in states which have Republican governors than anyone had predicted.

But if it was significant, it was not conclusive. Undoubtedly some delegates who will vote for Senator Taft on the first ballot felt that they should take the other side in this moral issue. That they deserted Taft on this vote does not mean they will desert Taft when it comes to voting the disputed delegates or that they will quit him on the first nomination.

By the same token, the outcome gave a lift to the Eisenhower leaders and to the countless millions of Americans who have withstanding the Taft assault to prevent the seating of any delegate not approved by two-thirds of the National Committee (in effect, those same 68) until they had been passed on by the credentials committee and the full convention.

The last came on still a third motion, offered by Rep. Clarence Brown of Ohio, another Taft supporter and a key man in organizing the convention machinery with Taft backers. Rep. Brown sought to amend Governor Langley's motion to eliminate seven Louisiana delegates who had been chosen by district conventions. It was that motion which lost 658 to 148—a larger margin than had been anticipated, mainly because such key states as Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and California gave a bigger vote against the Taft-sponsored Brown amendment than had been anticipated.

Certainly the division was significant. It showed that the Taft camp had either overestimated its total strength, or else had been making excessively broad claims. It showed further that General Eisenhower has a large reserve strength in states which have Republican governors than anyone had predicted.

But if it was significant, it was not conclusive. Undoubtedly some delegates who will vote for Senator Taft on the first ballot felt that they should take the other side in this moral issue. That they deserted Taft on this vote does not mean they will desert Taft when it comes to voting the disputed delegates or that they will quit him on the first nomination.

By the same token, the outcome gave a lift to the Eisenhower leaders and to the countless millions of Americans who have withstanding the Taft assault to prevent the seating of any delegate not approved by two-thirds of the National Committee (in effect, those same 68) until they had been passed on by the credentials committee and the full convention.

The last came on still a third motion, offered by Rep. Clarence Brown of Ohio, another Taft supporter and a key man in organizing the convention machinery with Taft backers. Rep. Brown sought to amend Governor Langley's motion to eliminate seven Louisiana delegates who had been chosen by district conventions. It was that motion which lost 658 to 148—a larger margin than had been anticipated, mainly because such key states as Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and California gave a bigger vote against the Taft-sponsored Brown amendment than had been anticipated.

Certainly the division was significant. It showed that the Taft camp had either overestimated its total strength, or else had been making excessively broad claims. It showed further that General Eisenhower has a large reserve strength in states which have Republican governors than anyone had predicted.

But if it was significant, it was not conclusive. Undoubtedly some delegates who will vote for Senator Taft on the first ballot felt that they should take the other side in this moral issue. That they deserted Taft on this vote does not mean they will desert Taft when it comes to voting the disputed delegates or that they will quit him on the first nomination.

By the same token, the outcome gave a lift to the Eisenhower leaders and to the countless millions of Americans who have withstanding the Taft assault to prevent the seating of any delegate not approved by two-thirds of the National Committee (in effect, those same 68) until they had been passed on by the credentials committee and the full convention.

The last came on still a third motion, offered by Rep. Clarence Brown of Ohio, another Taft supporter and a key man in organizing the convention machinery with Taft backers. Rep. Brown sought to amend Governor Langley's motion to eliminate seven Louisiana delegates who had been chosen by district conventions. It was that motion which lost 658 to 148—a larger margin than had been anticipated, mainly because such key states as Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and California gave a bigger vote against the Taft-sponsored Brown amendment than had been anticipated.

Certainly the division was significant. It showed that the Taft camp had either overestimated its total strength, or else had been making excessively broad claims. It showed further that General Eisenhower has a large reserve strength in states which have Republican governors than anyone had predicted.



Minority Of GOP Dissents

Foreign Policy--Still Bipartisan

By VIC REINEMER, Associate Editor, The News

"BIPARTISANSHIP," says Senator Taft, "is today a fraud. Since 1948 Mr. Truman has not bothered to consult any of the Republican leadership, even about the fateful step of making war in Korea..."

This week, indeed, the North wind from Chicago will bring us few bipartisan sentiments, and many indications of discord even within the Republican Party. Perhaps, then, this is a good time to remind ourselves and the Republican Party that Senator Taft's statements to the contrary notwithstanding, our foreign policy during the past four years has continued to be remarkably bipartisan.

In 1948 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee heard testimony on the North Atlantic Pact from many witnesses, including Republicans such as Robert A. Lovett, now Secretary of Defense, Warren A. Austin, now Ambassador to the U.N., John Foster Dulles, until recently a high-level State Department consultant, and Charles P. Taft, Robert's brother who has been frequently consulted by the Administration. The committee then declared:

"From the beginning of the deliberations of both the committee and the Senate on the Vandenberg Resolution and the treaty have been conducted on a wholly nonpartisan basis."

By a bipartisan vote of 82 to 13 (50 Democrats and 32 Republicans) in favor of ratifying the treaty, two Democrats and 11 Republicans (including Senator Taft) voted against it.

MSA Support Also Bipartisan

Later in 1949, in considering the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, President Truman's foreign policy was supported by a bipartisan vote of 48 to 13.

As regards China, prior to its "loss," the Republican-controlled 80th Congress reduced the Administration's request for \$400 million in foreign aid to \$50 million. The Foreign Relations Committee declared that it could not "underwrite the destiny of China."

CHICAGO CONVENTION BEGAN THIS afternoon, the Eisenhower forces had the big break they were waiting for. The time was after midnight. The place was the National Convention Center. The break was the resignation of Michigan National Committeeman Arthur Summerfield. The break was a great agreement between Summerfield and Gov. John Fine of Pennsylvania that they would throw their combined support to Dwight D. Eisenhower at the psychological moment.

Perhaps the existence of this Fine-Summerfield agreement has become public property before these words are printed. Although it was still a close-knit secret when the news was written up, it was found fast and confidentially here. It will be a heavy blow to the hopes of Sen. Charles McNichols and Summerfield led the majority of the two biggest officially uncommitted delegates to the Eisenhower camp. But perhaps Senator Taft will come up with a counter-blow of his own.

In any event, the background of this Fine-Summerfield agreement is vividly interesting. In the case of Summerfield, his uncommitted status has been strictly for public and Taft consumption ever since General Eisenhower's resignation. The General departed, Sen. Henry Cabot Lodge arrived in Detroit, Sumnerfield, and got the word he was wanted. He went behind the shield of his supposed neutrality, Summerfield was in fact at the time negotiating with the Michigan's 46 delegates for General Eisenhower.

Gray Recommends Fingernail Polish, Sulphur, For Chiggers

By LOUIS GRAVES

ONE DAY last week President EISENHOWER went out on the Fairgrounds near the Central church road, as it is sometimes called, and walked over a piece of lawn which had been recently mowed. He did not spend long time on his walk but that was long enough for him to acquire a large colony of chiggers.

At a conference that he attended the next day his fellow conferees were to kill him or put them in the woods, it would keep the chiggers off. I tried it once and it worked.

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

"That's just what a man in the State Forestry Department said to me," said Mr. Gray, "if you're bitten by chiggers recently but I am always interested in what serves to kill them or put them to flight. Sometimes sufferers ask me for advice on this subject and I like to be able to acquaint them with the latest discovery."

ADVICE SOUGHT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT

FORESTER RECOMMENDS IT