THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1946.

The Curmudgeon Joins The Chorus

A new voice joins the considerable chorus of opinionmongers in this stately journal today. We refer to Honest Harold Ickes, the Old Curmudgeon himself, whose works will appear thrice weekly over on page one, out of reach but not out of hearing of these chaste precincts.

Mr. Ickes is the only non-journalist we've ever heard of who became a columnist by popular demand. Many an editor, noting his predelection for colorful epithets while he was still an uninhibited public servant (or bureaucrat, if you prefer) decided that Honest Harold would answer his circulation department's prayers. There were even publishers who urged that the Curmudgeon abandon his cabinet post years ago in order to take up the pen. And when he finally departed from the Interior Department, amidst the bursting of verbal stink bombs, syndicate executives were waving check books at him before he reached the street.

His first offering is rather mild. It will blow the hat off no reader, and some, who expected Mr. Ickes to take off in full cry after his numerous enemies, may be a bit disappointed. We think, however, that we need but wait until Honest Harold becomes a little more accustomed to his new strange surroundings. In the course of setting forth his principles in column number one he gave forth with a pungent and accurate definition of the third party movement that will, we think, stand for many years to come. "In this country," he wrote, "except in special circumstances, a third party has been about as useful as an extra man on a honeymoon." We read great promise in that.

The Curmudgeon, like the late Iron Pants Johnston, will be at his best, we are certain, when he is riled. In these days, when every citizen's blood pressure mounts with each succeeding headline, that should be often. We shall be watching our new pundit with great interest, and from this safe distance.

The Dilemma In The Fifth District

THE hottest Congressional race in North Carolina is making up over in the Fifth District, and, despite its highly complicated local background, it serves as a sort of laboratory example of the dilemma faced by candidates, and by voters, in this one-party state.

The incumbent, John H. Folger, is standing for re-election, and his record shows him to be a Democrat in fact as well as in name. He has consistently supported the Roosevelt-Truman policies, which are also Party policies, and his return to Congress will constitute the Fifth District's endorsement of the Democratic program.

Now there are a great many citizens of the Fifth, particularly up around Winston-Salem, who regard the Democratic program as dangerously radical. They cannot, therefore, in good conscience, support Mr. Folger. They will, we presume, cast their ballots for one of the other candidates, and in all probability for Thurmond Chatham, a wealthy and conservative manufacturer, whose views more nearly parallel their own.

Mr. Chatham, a candidate in the Democratic primary, clearly does not believe in, or intend to support the Democratic Party when and if he goes to Congress. He is, as the faithful *Raleigh News & Observer* keeps pointing out, not a man of pronounced Party loyalty; he has openly and actively supported Republican Presidential candidates running in opposition to the late President Roosevelt.

We suspect that Mr. Chatham would, if such a thing were practical in the Fifth District, enter the Congressional race as a Republican because that Party's program, as he has demonstrated in the past, now embodies the conservative principles in which he, no doubt sincerely, believes. But, since he would insure his defeat by adopting the G. O. P. label, he has chosen to offer under the Democratic banner, which stands for all the things he does not believe in. Such action, of course, involves a degree of hypocrisy, and, although we do not blame Mr. Chatham for bowing to the inevitable, we do think he should have a more fitting choice of political organizations when he feels his country needs his services.

The conservative voters of the Fifth are placed in a most peculiar position. If they vote for Mr. Chatham, knowing that he will follow the G. O. P. line in Congress, they are nevertheless voting to maintain a technical Democratic majority. This means that they are voting for legislative chaos, helping to guarantee a schism in the Democratic Party which will make the party system, upon which orderly government depends, unworkable. They will be voting to perpetuate the Congressional paralysis which has already done so much to hamper reconversion, and of which conservative thinkers, as well as liberals, are highly critical.

It is clear that the conservative voters of the Fifth District suffer from partial disfranchisement; they can vote for their man, but they can endow him only with negative power. Mr. Chatham, as Congressman, could join informally with the Republicans, as other members of the North Carolina delegation do, to turn back Democratic legislation, but he could not exercise a voice in the establishment of Republican policy, when and if the G. O. P. ever formulates a positive program, nor could he expect to receive a share of that Party's patronage when it again becomes a national majority.

It has long been our conviction that the conservative voters of this state, with whom we would probably disagree 90 per cent of the time, deserve the opportunity to throw their full weight behind a political organization that reflects their views. They cannot do so as long as they are offered only a choice of loyal and disloyal Democrats.

Mr. Dulles States A Principle

JOHN Foster Dulles, the thoughtful and able foreign affairs adviser of the Republican Party, has lately stated a principle that deserves a place alongside the somewhat similar pronouncements of Voltaire, Jefferson, and Paine. "If I were to be granted one point of foreign policy and no other," he told *Editor & Publisher*, "I would make it the free flow of information."

It is hard to conceive of a single international principle more important than the one Mr. Dulles has chosen. The free flow of information could not, of course, solve the world's problems, but it is fundamental. We must understand our neighbors (and they're all close neighbors now) before we can live at peace with them. We do not have to look far for a pertinent example of what happens when the flow of information is controlled by design or by ignorance. We are currently engaged in a diplomatic struggle with Russia, accompanied by an armament race, and neither the Russian nor the American people know why the relations of these two onetime allies have deteriorated so dangerously, or understand the issues that underlie the struggle.

Mr. Dulles has not contented himself with a mere intellectual exercise. He proposes that the UNO establish a special committee, and a strong one, for "the study of worldwide free press and the exchange of general news." The proposal carries weight, for Mr. Dulles served as a delegate to the London session of the UNO and his voice is heard with respect in high places, Democratic as well as Republican.

Here, it seems to us, is a positive proposal behind which this country could put all its weight. When we make an issue of the Iranian matter the world has reason to suspect our motives, knowing that we are deeply interested in Iran's oil and strategic location. Even as the champion of any and all small nations against aggression, we are subject to pertinent criticism, for it is obviously to our political advantage to maintain a status quo which favors us and is inimical to Russia, our principal competitor for world domination.

But when we campaign for a free press we are preaching what we already practice. The American Government demonstrates every day that it has no reason to fear the free flow of information, that it has thrived on more than a century and a half of conflicting opinion. The worst criticism the Russians can bring against the American press is that it is in capitalistic hands and therefore does not adequately serve the common man; that charge will not impress any citizen of the world familiar with the workings of Communist propaganda.

Men everywhere have an ingrained respect for the truth; their instinct for knowledge may be temporarily trampled by the totalitarians, but it can never be completely obliterated. If we take the lead in fighting vigorously for its revival our motives cannot be suspect, for the free flow of information will benefit the world far more than it does the individual nations, including, notably, this one.

Another Voice

Raising A Sectional Argument?

BALKING by Southern Congressmen against the appeal by President Truman for unity in the Congress does not set us all a-quiver. We reckon we loathe a professional Southerner as much as the next man; but we cling to a representative of our own section who refuses to concede an inch to those who demand it from him as an inherited concession and insist that the claimants show cause.

And we certainly hope, as we confidently expect, that President Truman is not going to throw in with those leaders of the Democratic Party who deem it the acme of liberalism to decry the Southern democracy which has been the one thing they count on in holding the party of Jefferson and Jackson together.

It might be the Southern Congressmen are taking counsel of their self-respect.—*Greensboro Daily News.*

Springtime

People's Platform

A Look At The Woodpile

SOUTHERN PINES

PLEASE accept my hearty congratulations on your editorial "Man's Job For a Very Small Boy," in Saturday's News. I think it was exceptionally good. On the other hand I think you were taking in a rather large slice of territory when you said, in "A Calm Voice in the OPA Storm" that . . . several million honest, sincere business men . . . have convinced themselves that OPA must go." I'd venture even money that if you could put the Gallup on those boys you'd find a majority voting for continuation of OPA; for another year at least.

I liked Marquis Child's picture of OPA; trying to do its book work while undergoing the Buchenwald treatment; getting the hot foot, having slivers driven under its fingernails and having its mustache pulled out one hair at a time. Chester Bowles has turned one cheek and then the other, alternately, until they are both pounded to a pulp. Small wonder he blows his top! He has used up all the sweet reasonableness he had or could borrow. Christ himself lost his temper and drove the money changers out of the temple. It was the same class that Bowles was gunning for and I think he was right in the groove.

Not all members of the NAM approve the OPA-killing advertising campaign with which it is blanketing the country. At least I know of them who do not. A surprising number of those "several million honest, sincere business men" were in business back in the 1919-1920 inflation period your Mr. Wiggins tells about and they learned their lesson. Some of them backed clear down the ladder, stepped off the last rung and went out and "leaned on a shovel" with the rest of the WPA boys. What they want now is stabilization, not inflation. Of course, now and then, you run into one who was knocked so cockeyed he couldn't see for ten years and when he did get his eyes back in focus Roosevelt was President; so, he's been blaming the whole thing on him ever since. (That's no joke, son.)

The people, business men, professional men, farmers, housewives, laborers, expected the continuance of price control for quite some time into the postwar period. It is only the economic royalists, less than one per cent of the population, who are spearheading the fight against OPA. Well-informed observers insist that the people are still overwhelmingly in favor of a continuance of price control. The people, by and large, favor the whole Administration program; so bravely and voluminously set forth by the President some months ago.

What is Congress doing about it? The housing program is being prodded along to the destiny one would naturally expect under the present set up; flat on its back beside the Full Employment Bill and like the Full Employment Bill, bled white, emasculated and devoid of any useful potency. Who is to blame for all the stalling, inertia, ineptitude, inaction in Congress? Is it the swarm of lobbyists that infest Washington like a plague of locusts? In part, perhaps, but they can only function vicariously.

You don't have to tear the woodpile down to find the Simeganbian who has been lurking there. He's out in the open now, boastful, like the big bully playing hookey. He, or it, is the political hermaphrodite; the Senator or Congressman who was elected on a liberal platform, rode into office on the coat tail of a great liberal leader, and now, safely in his berth, bends every effort to repudite every promise in that platform, every precept of that great leader. He runs for office as a liberal Democrat but, once in, he votes consistently with the reactionary Republicans.

—S. A. REED

An Eye For An Eye

CHARLOTTE

THE observation of several jurists that Charlotte, a city of a hundred churches, exceeds the normal crime rate, is both just and factual.

However, there are some contributing causes to the excessive personal delinquency of the population, which may tend to explain its magnitude.

(1) The excessive use of the "suspended" sentence, and (2) The unlimited reference of offenders to the probation officials.

These twin dispositions of infractions of the law lead directly to a certain contempt of its efficacy, and develops many "repeaters."

The "suspended" sentence, unless appealed from at the time of its imposition, is presumed to be automatically enforced upon proof of violation of its terms. A defendant assigned to the jurisdiction of the probation officer is supposed to comply with the requirements of that department. Upon failure to do so, it is the duty of the probation officer to report this lack of co-operation to the court, and the probationer apprehended and punished.

These types of disposition of criminal actions seldom work out, except in theory. Not infrequently a defendant will plead guilty, and boldly ask the court to "give him a suspended sentence" or to "place him on probation," well knowing that such determination of the matter will relieve him of all costs, and only subject him to a vicarious liability.

(3) Population does not make a city—real people are required. The recent large influx of refugees and interlopers to Charlotte, especially the "boll weevil" has added greatly to the crime rate. People migrate for two reasons (1) to prey upon what a good citizenship has through long years developed in their community of (2) because their local grand jury gets after them. Neither type is desirable.

(4) Of late years the churches have been teaching that hell is air conditioned. No longer do we hear that it is a place composed largely of brimstone and atomic bombs, and one of severe punishment for sins committed in the flesh. "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" and the stern doctrines of the Old Testament are decided de trop. What evidently is needed is less "salvation" and more "damnation."

—DUBITANTE.

The Home Grounds

CHARLOTTE

I NOTE Churchill has now returned to England, and I am wondering just how many broadcasts he will be asked to deliver on the home grounds in the first month? He is the big strike-out artist of all times—strike out 75 per cent of his talks and their subjects expressed and things would get back to normal fast.

—T. F. MAGUIRE

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

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Russia In Iran Like U. S. In Nicaragua

WASHINGTON

REMINISCENCES of a reporter—It's been a long time since the sixth Pan-American conference in Havana, 1928; but that conference has certain similarities with what's brewing in New York today. Calvin Coolidge made a special trip to Cuba, the first time in years a President set foot on foreign soil. Charles Evans Hughes, ex-Secretary of State, dominated the U. S. delegation. Frank B. Kellogg, his successor as Secretary of State, also trotted out famed in the background. A big, important U. S. delegation, calculated to impress the Latin brothers.

Reason for the desire to impress the breathen: Worry . . . Worry over American troops on Nicaraguan soil . . . Worry over American troops on Haitian soil . . . Worry about the right of American troops to intervene in various countries such as Mexico to protect U. S. oil . . . virtually the same problem at issue in New York over Iran.

Memory flashes: Charles Evans Hughes, sedate, bewhiskered, impressive, buttonholing Latin delegates. He made a great picture, did a beautiful job of organizing a block of pro-USA nations . . . Cuba, Panama were set as was Poland and Yugoslavia are to Russia today . . . Hughes' objective: To prevent any discussion of intervention. In other words, the USA reserved the right to land troops on foreign soil without being hauled before the public corpse of Pan-Americanism . . . Hughes won out. Our interventions in Haiti, Nicaragua, were successfully barred from the agenda. We didn't have to stage a walkout as the Russians did at New York.

Biggest test: Whether the USA would consent to arbitrate disputes with its Latin neighbors . . . Hughes had instructions to duck even this. The State Department didn't even want to discuss the matter. It was a tough fight to bar all debate of arbitration, but Hughes won out even on this.

Public Opinion

PAN-AMERICAN arbitration conference, Washington, 1929 —U. S. public opinion, usually ahead of the Government, by this time had begun to change. . . . There had always been resentment against landing troops in Nicaragua. The Pulitzers plus other liberal newspapers poured a torrent of abuse on the State Department. Even conservative papers were skeptical. . . . Charles Evans Hughes was raked over the coals for opposing even the discussion of arbitration at Havana . . . Like Russia, we still demanded the veto, but unlike Russia, the American people didn't support their Government. They were way ahead of it.

Meanwhile two small nations—Bolivia and Paraguay—started to tangle in the Chaco. Since the United States did not have to submit to arbitration, it was glad to recommend arbitration for others. The Chaco dispute was arbitrated. After that we couldn't very well avoid accepting the principle of arbitration ourselves. . . . Hughes and Kellogg went into reverse, wrote a sweeping formula for arbitrating disputes. . . . However, the question of landing U. S. troops on our neighbors' soil still remained our prerogative. We still retained the veto. . . . And it took years for the Senate to consider the arbitration treaty finally signed by Hughes and Kellogg.

New York, 1946—Today, Russia, fuming against the United Nations, is in the same boat as the USA before the Pan-American Union. Instead of Nicaragua, it's Iran . . . But there is one essential difference . . . In twenty years, the USA moved far ahead in international morality—due to the power of public opinion. The American people, its press and pulpit, were continually pushing their Government . . . The opposite is true in Russia. The Russian people know little about Iran, little about the UNO conference, have to take what their Government gives them. A Stars and Stripes quiz of Red Army soldiers showed that most of them thought Churchill was an American. . . . We have to make allowances for Russia because in a sense she is a new nation—sensative and suspicious. But until the Russian people run their Government, until we penetrate the Soviet iron curtain and get to know the Russian people, we face the dismal prospect of turmoil and misunderstanding for many years to come.

Columnist Ickes

PROBABLY it was pure accident, but Harold Ickes begins his new career as newspaper columnist on the same day he is needed most in his old job as coal administrator. And, good columnist that he is, probably most people would prefer Ickes at the helm in the coal dispute rather than wielding a pen three times a week.

As a columnist, Ickes should tell the inside story of how he outsmarted John L. Lewis during the last coal strike and made him call it off. However, since he probably won't tell it, this competitor will.

During Lewis' illegal walk-out over organizing foremen last Fall, Ickes pulled his trump card. The Government-owned Big Inch and Little Inch pipe-lines no longer were needed to carry oil to the East Coast; so Ickes threatened to convert them to natural gas.

Natural gas is the thing which John L. Lewis dreads most. It makes him see things under the bed. Piped up from Texas where much of it goes to waste, gas can be sold in the Big Eastern Industrial centers at a rate which would put many coal mines out of business. Furthermore, Texas gas operators figure that in five to ten years, atomic energy will jeopardize their investment, and are anxious to sell their gas now.

With this trump card, plus the fact that the miners themselves didn't want to strike, Ickes bulldosed Lewis into calling the strike off.

Today the two Government pipe-lines are filled with salt water, and Mr. Ickes, instead of battling with John L. Lewis, is brandishing a pen.

Bertram Benedict

The British Loan

WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 30

The Editor,
The News,
Charlotte, N. C.

FOR days I have been dreading that a letter like yours of the 23d would come in. I knew sooner or later I'd have to do a pro and con piece about the British loan, and was shrinking from it because the arguments for and against are difficult to compress into as small space as is demanded by the parallel column treatment.

Now I see I'll have to buckle down to it, and you'll have the result soon.

—BERTRAM BENEDICT,
Editorial Research Reports.

THE chief arguments of the supporters of the proposed loan to Great Britain and the answers of the opponents may be summarized as follows:

Britain by fighting on against Hitler and joined the war against Japan made victory easier for the U. S.	There would have been no war at all if Britain had stood up to Hitler and the Japanese at the beginning.
Britain's refusal to surrender after Dunkirk shortened the war; the loan equals only 15 days' cost of the war to the U. S.	The U. S. has already made Britain an outright gift of the $18 billion net* of the Lend-Lease advances for war purposes. (*Approximately).
A strong, solvent, and friendly Britain is a bulwark to the U. S. in the postwar world.	The loan does not guarantee that Britain will pursue postwar policies helpful to the U. S.
The loan is needed to put Britain on its feet economically, and before the war Britain was our best customer, taking almost one-sixth of all our exports, much more than we bought from her.	If Britain's economic and financial position is as weak as is claimed, a mere $3.75 billion won't help much.
The proceeds of the loan will be spent chiefly in the U. S., helping our own economy.	The terms of the loan agreement do not specify where the funds are to be spent.
If all the interest payments are met, the U. S. will get back over 80 years $2.2 billion more than it advanced.	If—. And fifty years is a long time.
Britain agrees to end at once her day-by-day controls on business transactions with Americans, so these can collect in dollars. And at the end of a year, exchange controls are to be ended in the whole Sterling Area.	Britain will retain controls over imports, limiting what the U. S. can sell her,
Unless the agreement goes through, the world will be divided into two competing economic and financial blocs.	Competition is the life of trade; the U. S. isn't afraid of it. And the place of export trade in our whole economy is over-rated.

THE chief arguments of the opponents of the loan and the answers of the supporters may be summarized as follows:

The loan would set a precedent for similar advances to other nations, including Russia.	Each request will be judged on its merits, and only agreements favorable to the U. S. will be made, if any.
Britain's record as a borrower is bad; she defaulted on her World War I debt to the U. S.	That debt was for old expenditures; the payments were to be met by payments to Britain from her debtors. This loan is to restore productivity, not to pay for past expenditures.
The loan would strengthen Britain as our competitor.	Much of what Britain sells abroad we don't export. And a competitor can also be a customer.
The loan would finance the Socialist program of the present Labor Government.	The Socialist program is internal, doesn't apply to foreign trade. And a Socialist Britain is a bulwark against a Communist Continent of Europe.
The loan will help bolster British imperialism.	No sovereign nation will allow another to dictate its foreign policy; would British imperialism be weakened without the loan?
Britain ought to turn over to us, in payment, some of her territory in the New World.	We got many concessions in the negotiations; we couldn't get everything.
Britain doesn't agree to dissolve the British Empire preferential system.	Britain does agree to consider sympathetically the lowering of all trade barriers at an international conference on the subject.
If Britain is a sound risk, she could have got a private loan.	A private loan would have provided no trade concessions.
The 2 per cent interest rate is too low. The U. S. is paying 2.9 per cent on its War bonds.	It seems too high to the British; these were the best terms we could get.
Our public debt has already reached the staggering total of $277 billion.	The loan is equal to only 1-1/3 per cent of our debt.
An advance of $3.75 billion to buy goods in the U. S., already scarce, will strengthen the inflationary forces in U. S.	The advance will be spread over several years, will be used chiefly for capital equipment, not consumer goods.

The World War I Record

HERE is the record of World War I's British war debts payment:

After World War I Congress in setting up the World Debt Commission, Feb. 9, 1922, specified that the interest rate in refunding agreements replacing the war-time debts should be at least 4 1-4 per cent. Congress specified also that any new bonds taken in exchange for the war-time bonds should mature no later than 1947." Congress eventually had to agree to less onerous conditions. In 1931 Congress consented to the one-year Hoover moratorium on all intergovernment debts, but rejected Mr. Hoover's proposal to have the debt agreements reconsidered.

After the moratorium expired, Great Britain paid in full the first war debt payment due. During the ensuing new negotiations on the debt, the British made two "token" payments on the next debt payments due.

President Roosevelt declared that these token payments kept Great Britain from the status of a defaulter. Thereupon Congress said, in effect, "Oh yeah?" and passed, in April, 1934, the Johnson Act. This banned new loans in the United States for any country in arrears, whole or partly, on its war debt payments—and Great Britain made no more payments.