

Thomas L. Robinson... President and Publisher
Brodie S. Griffith... General Manager
Cecil Prince... Associate Editor
R. L. Young Jr... Managing Editor
Huey Stinson... Circulation Manager

MONDAY, AUGUST 20, 1956

Act Dignified — Look Alert — And Remember
We're All Very, Very Proud Of Richard Nixon

Democrat Pros See No Hope
If President's Health Holds

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

Should The Conventions Be Abolished?

WITH only half of their two-week term before the Big Eye served, puffery-eyed Americans must wonder if conventions shouldn't be abolished.

Must nomination of presidential candidates be what Russia's Baker of the New York Times calls "the circus, New Year's eve, the fight for the heavy-weight championship of the world, Saturday afternoon at the horse opera, the night before the big game and a weekend with the Marx Brothers and all in one?" and must delegates and the watching public be battered by "superlative after superlative, cliché after cliché, whoop after whoop..." until they are too glassy-eyed and stunned to scream for mercy?

Conventions have been pretty much the same ever since Andrew Jackson invented them, and the question always recurs: Can anything good come out of such a bedlam of parades, intrigue, heat, brass bands, hard liquor, ambition, tummy hats, sectional rivalry, horse-racing, jealousy, publicity stunts, frayed nerves, bad temper and worse oratory?

The answer, we think, is the convention is the best of all possible devices. And considering the absurdities it provokes, the convention has performed excellently in producing candidates who not only typify the majority opinion of the parties but who are capable of administering the offices they seek.

Certainly there are exceptions. Harding being one that comes readily to mind. And some would argue that the case of Sen. Taft is proof that conventions fail to choose the best qualified. He was qualified without doubt, but who would argue that the people themselves in preference primaries would have chosen the coldly efficient Taft over the warm and winning ways of Wendell Willkie or Dwight Eisenhower.

Somewhat the 2,000 delegates and alternates to a convention may be a meeting of minds that generally reflects the popular will. Thomas E. Dewey, who carried GOP conventions for himself

and President Eisenhower, made a compelling case for conventions in a series of lectures at Princeton University.

"The spirited atmosphere of our national political conventions... is part of the tested process by which the major national parties compete for popular support and popular imagination. No one has invented a more effective way of bringing concentrated attention to political matters of the greatest importance to the country, and of bringing about ultimate agreement on policies and candidates.

"Agreement must be reached—and perhaps there is no better way than jamming two thousand hot, weary people, who are running short of cash and time, into a jury room as big as a convention city and keeping them there until they make a decision. Behind all the sound and fury lies the massive common sense and accumulated wisdom of our free system.

The only alternative to present conventions that has been steadily advanced is that party primaries be held in each of the 48 states with the results binding upon the delegates. Unless one candidate could win a majority of delegates from all the states, of course, the convention would revert to the tools of trading and compromising it now uses. The smoke-filled room would assume greater importance than ever.

Aside from that, however, what candidate could muster the physical and financial strength to run in 24 primaries, much less 48, without wrecking his health or compromising his integrity when placed at the mercy of more political bosses than have ever been assembled at one national convention?

The convention is here to stay and the people will survive them so long as it is possible to turn off the Big Eye, to return to a convention that sheds while a razor is doing his utmost to hit the highest note on the old theme of cliché and contradiction.



Settlement On Civil Rights
A Platform's Strongest Plank

By WALTER LIPPMANN

ALTHOUGH the convention adopted the platform a few hours after Stevenson's nomination became a certainty, the men who put together the long section on foreign affairs were not thinking very much about any presidential candidate.

For by no stretch of the imagination can this section be read as a serious and responsible statement of what would be U.S. foreign policy if a Democrat became President. The many paragraphs are not a platform on which a party can stand.

There is a heterogeneous heap of planks thrown together in the hope of pleasing every pressure group, wherever located, with which politicians have to reckon. The result is not a statement of national policy but a collection of items supposed to appease or attract the various localities.

NO WORSE
The best thing that can be said for the Democratic foreign policy platform is that it is no worse, no more demagogic and no more irresponsible, than was the foreign policy section of the Republican platform on which Gen. Eisenhower ran in 1952. Indeed, there is reason for wondering whether the authors of this Democratic platform did not use the

Republican platform of 1952 as a working model. For on the Far East, the Middle East, and on the European satellite countries, the Democrats in 1956 are making most of the same promises raising most of the same hopes, and tying themselves in most of the same knots, as did Mr. Dulles when he wrote the Republican platform of 1952. The reason the two platforms are so much alike is that both are designed not as national policy but as voter bait.

LOOSE WORDS
Gov. Stevenson said that Gen. Eisenhower was the one who followed the decision of the Supreme Court would have dared to hope that the northern and the southern Democrats could find it—all things considered—with no rancor, so calmly, with such an overwhelming determination on all sides to be tolerant and accommodating.

PERSUASION
The words of the platform are an unequivocal declaration in favor of using persuasion to bring about compliance. Insofar as the words chosen to say this are somewhat muted, are not emphatic and defiant, are couched in the language of under-statement, it is because the Democrats are so persuaded, and if they are to be persuaded, it will have to be by people who live in the South and know its problems.

NOTHING WEAKE
For those who believe that desegregation must end by consent, and never by force, there is nothing weak in the civil rights plank. It is, indeed, a courageous act of accommodation on the part of the political leaders of the South and one which does them great honor.

Words, political words at a convention, are cheap. But this was an act when because it means so much to the internal peace of the nation, has given the Democrats a claim on the confidence of the voters. It is, indeed, a courageous act of accommodation on the part of the political leaders of the South and one which does them great honor.



DULLES AND STEVENSON
Some Words Must Be Forgotten.

THE impression left by the Democratic convention in Chicago, to say the least, You might almost say that the Democratic party's second nomination of Adlai E. Stevenson is like a man marrying his mistress, long after the flames of passion have flickered and gone out, because he is one to darn his socks.

In this respect, the contrast between 1952 and 1956 has been very marked indeed. Four years ago, there really was passion. The Democratic party's intellectual and idealistic elements were showing flames of love from their eyes, ears and noses. But plenty of the harder-boiled types were also stirred by the bright image of the successful, reforming, literate and thoughtful governor of Illinois.

This time, it could hardly have been more different. Stevenson himself was not going through any agony of the garden, and praying as he said he did in 1952, "let this cup pass." He was working like a mule to get the nomination in an approved, tough, practical way.

OLD PASSION
Meanwhile, however, there were few signs of the old passion anywhere. Most of the idealists and intellectuals certainly were, and Stevenson. One of the mildly depressing aspects of this rally in Chicago was the way the high minds and the deep thinkers turned peevish towards Harry Truman and Averell Harriman, because their man was being obstructed by the former President and New York governor.

As for the practical politicians, the basic attitude of most of them was typified by two leaders of important delegations who talked with reporters. For various reasons, these men cannot be quoted by name. It is enough to say that they are big men in their states, who picked Stevenson early, stuck with him through thick and thin, and held their delegates in for a long time.

Both of them insisted, perhaps a little glibly, that Stevenson was a "fine man" and both emphasized his peculiar quality of personal distinction. But both added, very frankly, that they did not think Stevenson had much ability to get through to the voters—to establish the close personal and emotional contact with the people that is the real mark of the successful political leader.

They predicted, in fact, that he would make a decidedly inferior campaign, although both breathed sighs of relief at the presence of Stevenson's able campaign manager, James A. Finnegan. They thought Mr. Archer would at least insure that the campaign would be orderly and well organized, which it certainly was not in 1952.

People's Platform
On Poetry And Beer

Rock Hill, S. C.
Editors, The News:
DRESSED are the poets and drinkers. They will tell our grandchildren and their grandsons that the poets and drinkers long after the profiles on the marble statues have been dulled.

A recent news item announces that Arthur Guinness, Sons and Co., the famous British beer brewers, are going to make awards for the three best poems in English, published for the first time in the Isles and Ireland during the year starting July 1, 1956.

Who would do that poetry and beer are suited to each other? Perhaps the citizenry should also be asked to make awards for the three best poems in English, published for the first time in the Isles and Ireland during the year starting July 1, 1956.

Both of these playwrights changed the life of the theater. So did Shaw. Though at death, Shaw left an estate worth about \$1,500,000, his earnings as an actor for the first nine years of his career were less than \$20. The man urged by the critics to give his work to write left not only the great dramatic accomplishments but he produced an awakening and amazing growth of the mind in the English theater. He made the audience think. He will stand high as an example to young writers to keep punching.

Both of these playwrights changed the life of the theater. So did Shaw. Though at death, Shaw left an estate worth about \$1,500,000, his earnings as an actor for the first nine years of his career were less than \$20. The man urged by the critics to give his work to write left not only the great dramatic accomplishments but he produced an awakening and amazing growth of the mind in the English theater. He made the audience think. He will stand high as an example to young writers to keep punching.

Both of these playwrights changed the life of the theater. So did Shaw. Though at death, Shaw left an estate worth about \$1,500,000, his earnings as an actor for the first nine years of his career were less than \$20. The man urged by the critics to give his work to write left not only the great dramatic accomplishments but he produced an awakening and amazing growth of the mind in the English theater. He made the audience think. He will stand high as an example to young writers to keep punching.



PRESIDENT EISENHOWER
Calls For Help Coming

They had picked Stevenson, these two men said, not because they expected him to make a stirring campaign, but almost because they could count on him not to. The people of their states, they explained, did not want the kind of rip-snorting, issue-thumping, dust-raising campaigning that Harry Truman and Averell Harriman wanted. In their states, the mood was an Eisenhower mood, amiable, contented, anti-political and — one had to say it — more than a little complacent. Stevenson's moderation would not offend against that mood. It would fall with it nicely.

NO CHANCE
As for the outcome, well, they really did not think Stevenson had a snowball's chance in hell of carrying their particular states if Eisenhower's health held up. Of course, you had to remember the big Democratic gains in 1954. But they were really honest about it. The President's health was the one real factor to watch.

Eisenhower would have a hard time convincing himself to a television campaign. He would be cruelly pressed for help on the spot by every Republican candidate for every local office from Senator to dog-catcher. If Eisenhower succumbed to the pressures to overdo, if he had another sort of some sort, then the whole picture would change. And then Stevenson, with his moderation making him a sort of Eisenhower imitator, would have a real chance.

It seems an odd, not to say grim, campaign strategy for the two great American political parties. But an amazing number of Democrats genuinely are thinking along these lines.

Nixon & Stassen: It's Not The Record

DONT PAY much attention to what the candidate says, the voters are told. Look at the record. It provokes.

This injunction has some of the anti-espionage flavor of the politician's promise "not to engage in personalities."

Yet it is basically misleading. For personally and what a politician says are equally important with how he has voted.

A case in point is unfolding in San Francisco where the difference in Richard M. Nixon having assurance and having certainty of being renominated is not how he has voted, but what he has said.

Harold Stassen put forward Christian Herter as a man who could pull millions more votes than Nixon. If that statement is true, and there is evidence of truth in it, it is not because the legislative records of Messrs. Nixon and Herter differ so much.

They differ very little, in fact. Nixon and Herter opposed each other's position on only four of 30 significant roll call votes from 1947 through 1950, when they served in the House together.

Nixon was against, and Herter for authorizing \$60 million in 1950 to help build up South Korea. Herter was against, Nixon for an amendment weakening the Fair Employment Practice Com-

mission. Herter was for, Nixon against it. He prevented the 84th Congress from writing excess profits tax legislation. Nixon was against, Herter for restoring previously curtailed postal deliveries.

They agreed in 1949 to recommit the Trade Agreements Extension Act, delete low rent public housing provisions from the National Housing Act, extend existing rigid farm price supports rather than try out the Brannan plan, prohibit poll taxes as a requirement for voting in national elections, exempt natural gas producers from federal regulation. They agreed in 1948 to restore war-time curbs on installment buying and raise Federal Reserve Bank requirements, extend the draft act, reduce income taxes in 1947, they both voted for the Taft-Hartley Act. In 1950 they opposed extension of federal rent controls.

There is nothing in the record to justify Harold Stassen taking on such a forcible campaign to oust Nixon from the vice presidency. He never would have changed it without knowledge of a reservoir of resentment of Nixon's personality and harsh utterances. Stassen has not been looking at the record. He is thinking of people who say they "just don't trust Nixon"—not because of how he has voted, but because of how he has acted.

PASTEL-BULBS AND PARTY CLOTHES

TWO of the biggest manufacturers of light bulbs have introduced pasteltinted bulbs of several shades as a means of beautifying people and furnishings. These new tints are listed as: pink, aqua, candlelight yellow, sun gold, dawn pink, spring green and sky blue. If these do not all flatter the skin, there probably is some mood or occasion that they do enhance.

It is fascinating to think what the ladies will eventually do with the pasteltinted bulb. A woman is always at her loveliest in her own home where the background has been chosen to make the most of her particular coloring. The clever hostess has always worn exactly the color and cut of dress most flattering to her. And now she has added to her arsenal these pasteltinted bulbs. If and when these bulbs become widely accepted, what changes will they bring?

The changes might even rival those being predicted for automation as it slowly spreads across the land. For instance, is the pasteltinted bulb going to put a cooling hand on the fevers and hurries of both Paris and American fashion creators? Will one white cocktail dress and one white formal dress be sufficient since they will adopt the color of whatever bulb is in use? Or will there simply be a multitude of tests to determine just how a sharp red ballroom melode into the light of sky blue pasteltinted bulbs? Will "Dawn Pink Bulbs" go on the cards along with the R.S.V.P.?

Will there be hurried exits from parties because facial makeup and pasteltinted bulb clash? Will the matching of woodwork and furnishings with just the

right shade of pastel-bulbs replace the use of dark green turtl and magnolia branches with the creamy white of camellias and chrysanthemums? And just where is all this going to leave the poor male, somberly clad in tails with probably even the white tie barred because it would pick up a gaudy purple or something even more incongruous?

Science knows the exact power of the full moon on the tide, but has never estimated, by half, its pull on the untied.—WALL STREET JOURNAL.

There is very good reading in this year's phone book. The plot is better than many television plays, but the type is too small.—CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

The personality that is allowed to live in youth will never grow much beyond the stubble stage.—ROCKMART (GA.) JOURNAL.

The music in a man's heart is dead when he doesn't join in on a few bars of "Street Acre."—GREENSBORO (GA.) HERALD-JOURNAL.

Economists say the American dollar is now worth only 515 cents, but we haven't been able to find anyone who will sell a buck at that price.—LEXINGTON-HERALD.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

LARGEST question mark in the mind of every delegate attending this otherwise carefully calculated gathering of the GOP clan is whether the older man who is to be nominated by acclamation does or does not want the young man from California as his running-mate again.

Green Light
They are puzzled by the fact that President Eisenhower has praised Nixon yet at the same time never definitely endorsed him, that he seems to like him yet has given the green light to a member of his official family, Harold Stassen, to work against him.

The broad answer to the mystery probably goes back to the general similarity between the public relations strategy of Dwight D. Eisenhower and the man who first made him a general, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Though differently in their goals and in making international decisions, their public relations techniques are almost identical.

A Tizzy
When the Republicans were meeting in 1940, FDR threw them into a tizzy

Ike & Nixon: The San Francisco Story

By appointing two top Republicans, Henry L. Stimson as secretary of war and Frank Knox as secretary of the Navy, it took the publicity spotlight away from the GOP. When the Democrats were meeting in Chicago last week, Eisenhower did somewhat the same thing, by hauling the Democratic leaders back to Washington to confer over Suez.

Wallace Case
And like FDR, Ike doesn't like to fire a man who has been loyal. Take the case of Henry Wallace and the way he was eased out as vice president. His situation was almost identical with that of Richard Nixon, with one important difference, namely the party bosses were against Wallace. The party bosses are behind Nixon.

History Repeats
In both cases, however, it was known that with an adam unshakable present re-elected, the chances were strong that the vice president would end up as president. It was also feared by those around Roosevelt as today with Nixon—that Henry Wallace would be a drag on the ticket.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

ROOSEVELT, however, didn't want to tell him this, just as he didn't want to tell Nixon. He delegated the job to two members of his official family—Secretary of the Interior, Ickes and Judge Sam Rosenman, the same Rosenman who was braunting for Averell Harriman in Chicago last week.

Not Easy
They figured that Wallace, who once remarked, "I'd like to sit under a tree and study philosophy," would be easy to pry out of the vice presidency, but when they went to see him, Wallace was irked, and like Nixon, said he would retire unless FDR himself wanted him to.

He went to see Roosevelt himself, Wallace had been completely loyal to Roosevelt. Enke Jack Garner, he had never undercut the President's program on Capitol Hill. And like Nixon, he had made speech after speech, some of them to try out of the vice presidency, but when they went to see him, Wallace was irked, and like Nixon, said he would retire unless FDR himself wanted him to.

He went to see Roosevelt himself, Wallace had been completely loyal to Roosevelt. Enke Jack Garner, he had never undercut the President's program on Capitol Hill. And like Nixon, he had made speech after speech, some of them to try out of the vice presidency, but when they went to see him, Wallace was irked, and like Nixon, said he would retire unless FDR himself wanted him to.

Drag On Ticket
Yet FDR knew he would be a drag on the ticket. He knew this, but he

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

cause of Wallace's loyalty, he didn't tell him to step aside. Finally, when Wallace himself brought the matter up, Roosevelt gave him an answer almost identical with Ike Eisenhower's advice to Nixon "to chart his own course."

"If this were a pacetime election, I'd insist on your being with me," he said. "But I'm a war president and I can't do that now. However, I'll do anything you think will help."

FDR Ducked
And he suggested that he call up some of the party leaders to bring support for Wallace's renomination. Wallace, however, asked Roosevelt to issue a statement of support. But just as Eisenhower has ducked giving Nixon a personal statement, so FDR ducked on Wallace.

The most he gave him was a statement that if I were a delegate from New York I would vote for Henry Wallace. But at the same time he said this, he also gave a letter to Democratic Chairman Bob Hannegan stating his preference for Harry Truman and Justice William O. Douglas.