THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

W. C. DOWD JR., Publisher — J. E. DOWD, Editor — HARRY S. ASHMORE, Associate Editor

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1946

[There's No Secret About This Bomb]

The Two-Way Road To Peace

THERE is every reason to believe that Harold MacMillan summed up the prevailing view in Great Britain when he arose in Parliament the other day to announce that the old Russo-British-American alliance of the war years is "virtually if not formally in abeyance."

"The world is being divided among different political and economic interests," Mr. MacMillan said. Randolph Churchill, the undistinguished son of a distinguished father, has belabored this thesis a little more frankly in his syndicated column. "They (the Russians) have decided to try to split the free nations and, in particular, to rupture the close relations which exist between the British Empire and the United States." Young Mr. Churchill speaks of the Russians in the terms his father once applied to the Germans, charging them with "global, totalitarian ambitions."

There is ample evidence to support this British view. Certainly Soviet diplomacy seems to be concentrating, as Mr. MacMillan says, upon an outward pressure in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. It is also obvious that such expansion constitutes a threat to what Mr. MacMillan terms "well-recognized and established British interests," and therefore to world peace.

The old alliance of the war days, which we now look back upon so wistfully, was nervous and uncertain at best. All three parties accepted it reluctantly in the face of a common danger, and in its best days it was never more than a military working arrangement which insured the final encirclement of Germany.

It is true that we contributed a vast amount of materiel to the Russian army, but it is equally true that both America and Britain looked upon Russia as a sort of convenient natural obstacle to German strategy, not as an ally. The Russians, of course, replied in kind.

We haven't, as Mr. MacMillan claims, lost the complete unity of the war years. We never attained any unity that went beyond a common, immediate purpose; the western democracies and Russia fought independent wars, sharing nothing except an enemy who stood as a greater threat to each of the Big Three than they seemed to each other. If the alliance holds together until the necessary peace settlements are made it will only be because fear of another war now serves it as fear of Nazi domination once did.

The road to lasting peace, of course, is a two-way street. If the Russians have made no move to start down it, neither have we; we have no reason to expect the Russians to start beating their swords into plowshares while we beat ours into equipment for the manufacture of atomic bombs.

Officially and publicly the United States and Great Britain have announced that they will take any necessary step to guarantee their own security until such time as the UNO can provide security for all the world. Russia, clearly, has reached the same decision and is acting on it. The tragedy is that no nation concerned seems to understand that independent security for Russia necessarily constitutes a threat to the security of the United States and Great Britain, and vice versa. The simple principle that no one of the Big Three can attain security until all three have it may yet rise above the conflicting ideologies that now obscure it. It's our last, best hope.

Greetings And Salutations

JAMES A. DOMBROWSKI, secretary of the Southern Conference of Human Welfare is in receipt of an abusive letter from Senator Bilbo of Mississippi in which The Man remarks that "if I were called upon to name the Number One Enemy of the South today it would be the Southern Conference of Human Welfare." Logically enough, the Southern Conference considers Senator Bilbo's condemnation high praise, and has republished the letter in its entirety.

We are intrigued, not by the letter's painfully familiar content, but by its beginning and ending. Senator Bilbo, evidently aiming at insulting Mr. Dombrowski, has dropped the traditional "Mr." from the salutation, addressing him as "Dear Dombrowski." This illustrates the manner in which we are all shackled by the conventions of correspondence; the Senator, who obviously hates Mr. Dombrowski's guts and wants him to know it, has been forced to bestow upon him a term that connotes fondness and intimacy.

A better solution, we think, might have been to drop both name and prefacing adjective. A letter beginning simply, "Sir:," invokes a picture of pistols for two and coffee for one. It does, however, confer a certain gentility upon the person so addressed, and this, obviously, Senator Bilbo had no intention of doing. The word "sir," used orally by a Southerner of the old school, can be made to convey a vast scorn, but it seems to be impossible to carry this irony over into print.

Arriving at the end of his bitter communication, Senator Bilbo again reverted to an ancient form. He prefaced his signature with the cold, but respectful, "Yours Truly." This might have been avoided by simply letting the signature stand stark and alone, devoid of any ornament. There seems to be a tendency in this direction anyway, denoting not a decline in courtesy but laziness. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and the other founding fathers were in the habit of signing all communications, "I have the honor to remain Your Obedient Servant." By Abraham Lincoln's day abbreviation had set in, and The Emancipator used to scrawl, "Y'r Ob't S'vt." Even that effort left him so exhausted he customarily whittled his signature down to a simple "A. Lincoln."

The need for the establishment of a new convention is obvious. In these distrait times a good part of any citizen's correspondence is devoted to the exchange of insults, and they necessarily lose some of their potency when they are bracketed by the flowery, respectful stereotypes imposed by Emily Post and the other arbiters of taste. President Truman, for instance, publicly slapping Harold Ickes by denying his request for an extra three weeks in office, led off with "Dear Harold . . ." Mr. Ickes, we would guess, is about as dear to Mr. Truman as a case of hives.

There will, we suppose, be some stubborn opposition to any plan for suddenly bringing the salutation and the closing phrase into the context of the letter; backward-looking citizens might be shocked by a letter beginning, "You heel:" and ending with "I have the pleasure of wishing you dead." Perhaps the only solution is to telegraph, not write, which, in addition to stripping away all ornament, adds a final insult by delivering the message over the telephone in the flat, nasal tones of a young lady who mispronounces all two-syllable words.

The Contrast At Chapel Hill

WE never cease to be amazed by the contrast between the towering reputation of the University of North Carolina and the niggardly salaries paid its faculty. The matter is brought to mind by a report of the Trustee's Visiting Committee, which recently recommended a new scale that would bring faculty income up around the financial level of the more backward graduates of the institution.

Annual pay now ranges from $1,400 for instructors to $4,500 for full professors. The Committee proposes a new scale beginning at $1,800 and going as high as $6,000. The recommendation has been favorably received by the Trustees and there seems to be some chance of its being adopted in a year or so.

Few employers would offer a university graduate a salary as low as $27 a week, and, of course, most instructors at the University have devoted considerably more than four years to preparation for their task. The situation in regard to senior faculty members is even more ridiculous; many of them have attained national reputations, reputations that would command many times their current income in any field other than education.

Even when comparisons are confined to the academic groves the pay of the University faculty is absurdly low. North Carolina, in almost any professional judgment, now ranks among the first ten universities in the country. Yet at Harvard, for instance, full professors are paid $15,000 and more.

So far North Carolina has managed to hang onto most of her faculty giants despite the higher salaries offered elsewhere. There are two related reasons—the pleasant intellectual weather at Chapel Hill and Frank Graham's practice of paying his employees in academic freedom. But the war, which halted the production of college professors as well as nylon stockings, has sharpened the competition in educational circles. The Visiting Committee was making no idle threat when it pointed out that the University cannot retain its present high standing unless salaries are raised.

The North Carolinians who most assiduously search for radicals at Chapel Hill have the greatest reason for supporting the movement for higher faculty pay. It is quite understandable that some of the North Carolina faculty might have a tendency to criticize an economic system that values a talent for selling life insurance above the ability to split an atom. The marvelous structure of free enterprise looks entirely different when viewed from the bottom; no matter how dedicated to the truth he may be, you have to expect a certain amount of bias in the outlook of an instructor whose annual income compares with the village garbage collector's.

Even the higher salary scale proposed by the Visiting Committee is inadequate, but it would help. And it seems a small gesture of appreciation for an institution that has, in the 24 years since the present pay level was determined, become North Carolina's greatest single asset.

People's Platform

Miscegenation And The FEPC

CHARLOTTE

IN recent weeks there has been quite a bit published in THE NEWS by your readers pro and con the FEPC. Morally, I am for it. I agree with your stand that it cannot be brought about by law. But I would like to attack one of the more common arguments brought against it.

One of the writers asked, "Would you just sit around until one day our offspring show up to be cicanninies, or what have you?"

Back around the turn of the century there was a society—I forget the name—composed only of people who had married across the color line. Now you never hear of it. Miscegenation is ont only no longer popular, but leaders among the Negroes have stated that that is what they want least, if at all. A Swedish Sociologist came here and for five years lived in this country collecting material for his work. Again I forget the name of the work or the author (Note: Probably "An American Dilemma" by Gunnar Myrdal.—Eds., THE NEWS) but the two volumes say among other things that miscegenation is tenth in the list of things the Negro wants.

But to me the biggest fallacy in the argument is pointed up by this—if you raise your children richt you need never fear that they will marry across the color line. The problem is with the parents. Besides, how would a Negro ever get into your social circle enough to have a chance to become attractive to one of the whites? Love and marriage are usually the expression of a lot of similar and later identical good times. If you have enough enjoyable times with a boy or girl, you will learn to love him or her. Sounds simple, but that is the way that it works! And what are the chances that that will happen when the only equalit- is that of jobs? In New York, where they now have a state FEPC, and where there has always been a mor- or less equality of races, you find that Negroes, Chinese, and Italians, etc., are all in there own portions of the town, and the mixing and mingling in as littl- or less than in the South.

Really the North, with all its "equality" has less of it than the South. During the war, the temporary FEPC devoted itself more to the North than to the South. Listing fifteen cities as major points where it worked on complaints, only two of those 15 were in the South.

The argument that miscegenation would be promoted by the FEPC is an emotional one. It is good for the demagogue but not for the person who thinks.

—H. Warren Felkel

Another Vote For Breger

RELATIVE to "Mr. Breger" (Editorial page same date) please leave well enough alone!! If you remove him from the back page we fear that C. A. Paul will try to substitute Ralph Sprinkle, and like most human beings we are "terrified" by the thought of what we haven't seen, sometimes.

—Breger Fan

Overdose Of Brass

CHARLOTTE

KEEP your cartoon, "Private Breger." I enjoy it. No use letting brass—emphasis on brass—hats tell us what to do in civilian life. I'm a veteran of World War I, and believe thou me I got enough of dictating by brass hats.

—Breger Fan.

(Note: The original suggestion that we drop "Breger" was made by a captain at Fort Bragg. He just said he didn't like it. And, although we doubt if the captain could draw a brass hat from the quartermaster, his being against it seems to insure the cartoon automatic support. It's as good a reason as any for keeping it, we suppose.—Eds., THE NEWS).

Support For The WAC

GAFFNEY, S. C.

JUST a word about a letter I read in The News written by a WAC. I want the public to know I will back her up anytime and I am not a WAC either.

But my husband was in the service over three years and was stationed at Greenville, Mississipi around 18 months. I stayed with him there, and I met some WAC's at the camp, and I have never met any sweeter girls in all my life. And believe me they really worked too. They were on the job as well as the boys. I'll always be a booster for the WAC, for I know what they did.

Mrs. H. L. J.

The People's Platform is available to any reader who cares to mount it. Communications should be less than 300 words, typewritten, if possible, on only one side of the paper. Libel and obscenity will be deleted—otherwise anything goes. Each letter must be signed, although we will withhold the writer's name upon request.—Editors, THE NEWS.

An American Fascist

AS a case history in the disease of Nazism, the career of Robert H. Best is worthy of study. Best, a native American, has just been arrested in Germany after many months of eluding Allied authorities. He was indicted in 1943 for treason, on the basis of his Nazi propaganda broadcasts, specially beamed to the United States.

Best was a popular newspaper correspondent back in the 1920's. He started his career in South Carolina, and his work won him a promotion to a good foreign assignment, in Vienna, for one of the leading American news services. He was a member of a large and interesting group of American journalists who covered Central Europe during the period following Versailles, and his associates of that time remember him for his Southern charm of manner as well as for his competence in his profession.

They also remember, however, that the genial Bob Best had something that amounted to a phobia on the subject of race. His feeling against Negroes was intense. When the transfer from the streets of Charleston to those of Vienna left little fuel for the fire of that prejudice, he gradually shifted his animosity to a group closer at hand, the Jews. The epidemic of anti-Semitism which swept down into Austria with the rise of Hitler found Best's mind already prepared to provide a culture for the germ of racism.

The result was inevitable. American correspondents, interned at Bad Nauheim when the Germans overrun the continent, eventually became available for repatriation but when the group left joyfully for home, Best chose to stay behind. There he contributed his bit to the Nazi effort to split American public opinion, operating on the sound conviction that house divided must fall. Blinded by his race theories, he was able to overlook all the horrors of the Nazi regime.

Robert Best as an individual was not very effective in influencing American opinion. His importance lies only in the example he furnishes of what can happen to a man who allows the corrosive substance of race hatred to eat into his brain.

The Louisville Courier-Journal

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

The Long Shadow Of Boss Pendergast

WASHINGTON

PUBLIC memory is short; so perhaps it is not out of order to recall that exactly one year ago a man who had served eight years in the Cabinet and four years as Vice-President was so pilloried before the Senate that Roosevelt finally withdrew the name of Henry Wallace as head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

But this week delightful George Allen, who has backslapped and wise-cracked with every Senator on Capitol Hill, was confirmed as director of the RFC after very little cross-examination, almost no debate, and, in the end, without even a roll-call vote.

Most remarkable thing about the George Allen vote was that Senator Alben Barkley, who knows better, championed Allen's right to continue holding jobs with private corporations while still serving in this vitally important Government post.

One corporation of which George Allen is vice-president is the Home Insurance Co. It so happens that this company figures very largely in the scandalous graft which sent Harry Truman's old friend, Boss Tom Pendergast of Kansas City, to jail.

Background of this affair is important. The fire insurance companies operating in Missouri had been forced to impound $9,676,002 while the question of new rate increase was being threshed out in the courts.

Pendergast Bribe

The company which had most at stake in this nine-million-dollar kitty was the Home Insurance Co., of which George Allen is now vice-president. Its share was $737,389.21. Naturally it was anxious to get this little nest egg returned to the company's treasury rather than go back to the policy holders.

So a deal was finally worked out between the companies whereby Boss Pendergast was to receive a bribe of $750,000. In return, the court suit was to be compromised, the fire insurance companies getting 60 per cent of the nine million, the policy holders getting only 20 per cent.

First installment of the Pendergast bribe was $10,000, and it was ponied up by fourteen different companies. But, since Home Insurance had the largest amount at stake, it sent more than any other company—$15,000. Later, the fire insurance companies kicked in a total of $330,000 to Pendergast, but before they could pay the entire $750,000 the Government probe was started and he never got the balance.

It was in 1938, during this Government probe and before Pendergast was finally convicted in 1939, that Home Insurance, in desperate need of friends, made George Allen a vice-president. Allen was a former WPA administrator with no great business talents. But he had one great asset—close connections in Washington.

George, who is a very frank and likeable person, doesn't claim to know anything about insurance, but he does know plenty about getting into the Executive Mansion at almost any hour of the day or night.

George Sits Pretty

Following this, the fire insurance companies, including Home Insurance, were indicted by the Justice Department for violating the Anti-Trust Act. However, the Insurance lobby, including George Allen, pushed legislation through the House of Representatives exempting insurance companies from the Anti-Trust Act. Thanks to highly skillful lobbying, the Justice Department finally compromised the case.

Meanwhile, Home Insurance and other companies operating in Missouri did not go to jail. Tom Pendergast served his time, but not the insurance executives who shelled out $330,000 and were willing to pay up to $750,000.

Harry Truman, of course, has such a blind-spot regarding Pendergast that one of the first things he did after becoming President of the United States was to reappoint Milligan, the U. S. District Attorney who convicted his old friend.

Ninety-six Senators, however, are not all supposed to have blind spots. At least a majority are supposed to have a statesmanlike approach to appointments to high office. That is what the system of Senate confirmation is for.

As a director of the RFC, George Allen is now in a position where he can promote Government loans to insurance companies or to other firms which owe money to insurance companies. It certainly pays to be a charming host at dinner

Merry-Go-Round

Postmaster General Bob Hannegan may resign as chairman of the Democratic Party much sooner than anyone thinks. He is in worse need of a rest than Truman. . . . Chinese Ambassador Wei Tao-Ming will retire from the diplomatic corps soon to become mayor of Shanghai. . . . Ex-Sgt. Max Novack, who wrote the "What's Your Problem?" column for Yank Magazine, has joined Tom Clark's staff at the Justice Department as an expert on veterans' affairs. . . . Norman J. O. Makin, Australian delegate to the UNO Security Council, will become Australian Minister to Washington. . . . Dr. Herbert Evatt, Australian Foreign Minister, will be that country's permanent Security Council delegate. . . . American Ambassador to Yugoslavia Richard Patterson has his eyes on the job of U. S. Minister to Canada. . . . Jimmy Byrnes and Henry Wallace have lined up against Fred Vinson and Marriner Eccles on the issue of more foreign loans. Vinson and Eccles are opposed to large foreign loans after the British loan passes Congress. Wallace and Byrnes are insistent that the U. S. must help countries like France and Russia get rehabilitated.

Marquis Childs

Producers Sit Pretty

WASHINGTON.

WHEN President Truman and his economic advisers sat down to reach final agreement on the new wage-price formula, they had before them some remarkable figures supplied by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those figures showed that U. S. corporations had a record volume of cash on hand in banks.

The total on Sept. 30 of last year was $25,700,000,000. During July, August and September, it had increased by $1,900,000,000.

On the other hand, according to the SEC report to the White House, Federal taxes owed by corporations took the first substantial drop since 1938. Accrued taxes as of Sept. 30 amounted to $14,600,000,000, a decrease of $1,800,000,000 since the end of the previous quarter.

"This reduction," the SEC noted significantly, "was occasioned by the tax refunds under the tax adjustment act and, to a lesser extent, by the decline in income during the quarter."

BOWLES ARGUMENT

Chester Bowles, the new Stabilization Director, argued that the profit position of American business was so favorable that wage increases could be met in part at least out of profits. This is the stand he will take in trying to hold the new price line.

The net working capital of U. S. corporations is shown by the SEC report to be $59,900,000,000. That is more than double what it was in 1939 and an all-time high.

Business men say that the 50-billion-dollar figure gives a false impression, because it includes inventories and no one can predict that will be realized from goods on hand. But their worry over inventories seems to be somewhat unnecessary in view of the fact that this is a sellers' market with a fantastic demand for everything under the sun.

What will be realized from goods

With regard to tax refunds, widely exaggerated estimates of what the carryback provision of the tax law will mean through 1946, allows corporations to get back part of the excess profits tax they paid during the war if their 1946 earnings fall below the average for the years 1936 to 1939.

THE CARRY-BACK

An example of the carryback given in this column some weeks ago over-estimated the amount to be reclaimed in a typical case by about one-third, even though the example was checked with a Treasury expert. In hearings before Congress, the Treasury estimated that about $550,000,000 would be returned to corporations under the carryback.

Besides the carryback, there are two other tax refund provisions which work in complicated ways to swell corporation coffers. Thus far, however, the amounts realized from these sources are small. The really sizable money, according to the Treasury, is involved in amortization clauses allowing a company to write off the cost of a plant in five or even in two or three years.

Looking at this picture of vast corporation reserves, you see how strong industry is in relation to labor. Business, in the current industrial warfare, occupies an entrenched position of great power.

PRIVATE MEETING

In Detroit last week, in a hearing before National Labor Relations Board member Gerard Reilly, C. E. Wilson of General Motors told of a meeting in New York on Jan. 9 with the heads of steel, packing and other industries. Wilson added that there was nothing "sinister" about the meeting.

The Government, it seems to me, should know more about that meeting. At the start of the steel strike, an alert Senate should have had a special committee inquiring into every phase of the industrial crisis.

If there are industrialists who want to take advantage of their wartime prosperity to break the unions, then we should know about it. If there are extremists in the unions who are using a monopoly position to make impossible demands, then we ought to know about that, too. This is a failure of Government. A new formula picked out of the air is not likely to endure for long.

Samuel Grafton

We're Still Waiting

NEW YORK

NOWHERE is American policy in a worse state of confusion than as regards the future of Germany; and this is not merely Mr. Truman's confusion, nor Mr. Byrnes' confusion; it is everybody's confusion, it is a great, roaring kind of community confusion.

It has shown up in the fight over feeding the Germans. When this project arose, America's liberals and Nazi-haters objected; whereupon the opposition, including the isolationists, adopted a heavy humanitarian stance, and attacked the liberals as baby-killers. It seems to me that American liberalism, perhaps unavoidably, fell into a kind of trap on this issue, for it allowed the opposition to form a strange, loose united front, of Quakers, other decent humane folk, and charitable Americans generally, along with the isolationists. And the last, characteristically, have dribbled glycerine tears on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays about the hungry Germans, but they have thus gone on to use the emotion thus generated to throw mud at the Nuremberg trials on Tuesdays and Thursdays; in effect, tying a tin can to America's heartstrings.

WITHOUT A PLAN

Nothing shows more clearly than this debate our lack of anything like a coherent plan for the Germans; for if we had a plan, the food issue would stand in its proper, minor place as part of that plan; for lack of a plan, the whole battle is fought out on this narrow and ungrateful and indecisive line.

Our confusions at home are mirrored by our confusions in the field. Our officials in Germany cannot work with the right, for it is Nazi; but they do not care to deal with the left; they fear that; and the result is a kind of paralysis, broken by sporadic, almost barbarized bursts of action.

We let many Nazis alone in their jobs for a time (as in the famous Patton episode), then, stirred by protests in the American press, we tear through one zone with a threshing machine, throwing more putative Nazis out of jobs than have been cleared out in either the British or Russian territories.

Having been thus "hard," we soften up in other directions. The Potsdam agreements say that Germany shall not have a higher standard of living than the surrounding countries; we tend to interpret this as a guarantee that she must have a standard of living at least equal to those other countries. We turn the maximum into a minimum; and Germany, oddly enough, becomes the only country in Europe for which America is, in effect, underwriting a recovery plan.

RUSSIAN PLAN

It seems clear that the Russians are scotching us. They have happily embraced the German left, giving it great responsibility; while they quarrel with us for feeding Germans, they feed them; and while they quarrel with us for not purging enough Nazis, they purge very lightly; and meanwhile, consistently, they build up a solid, leftist governmental apparatus. The Russians, obviously, are shooting for neither a "hard" peace nor a "soft" peace, but for a new peace; that is, a peace with a new Germany, one remolded nearer to their hearts' desire.

CHAIN OF FEARS

It seems to me we have done nothing comparable. I once wrote a pamphlet suggesting that the best we could do in Germany would be to stick around physically, but otherwise to let nature take its course; to allow the Germans a free political development, hoping them if they went wrong, but otherwise letting them, through trial and error, try to grow up. But our fears chain us; we do not seem quite as ready to apply our own free system as the Russians are to apply their way of life; we do not, somehow, seem to believe in ourselves and in our strength. The first anniversary of victory approaches, and finds us in a brown study waiting; but the worst of it is we cannot quite say what it is we are waiting for.