THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher — J. E. DOWD, General Manager — HARRY S. ASHMORE, Associate Editor

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1947

There Can Be No Compromise Now

OPPOSITION to President Truman's forthright demand for American assumption of British economic and military obligations in Greece and Turkey grows apace, as was to be expected. Some of it comes from the far left, an automatic reaction to any defiance of Soviet Russia. Some comes from the far right, from the dead-end isolationists who do not believe the United States should assume any obligation outside its own borders. This can be dismissed as inevitable but unimportant, but from somewhere around the political center there also arise cries of protest against this departure from traditional American foreign policy.

Those who placed their faith in the United Nations can only read in the President's message the gravest threat to the establishment of world government. Unilateral action in opposition to Soviet Russia is the antithesis of world order based on international co-operation. It divides the world into two spheres of influence, East against West, and recognizes the inevitability of social, political and economic—if not military—conflict between them. At the very best it means that the United Nations must be placed in escrow until the disunited nations work out their differences through the traditional, and historically futile, methods of power politics.

There is no doubt that Mr. Truman and his advisers adopted this course only because they had decided that the United Nations offers no real hope of peace. The President's message to Congress is an unequivocal statement of his belief that co-operation with Soviet Russia is impossible. Once he had reached this conclusion, he could only recognize that no sound basis for a new world order now exists, for the United Nations can have no meaning so long as the only two powers on earth capable of waging war place their differences above it.

We may say, as Mr Truman did say, that we seek to preserve the international status quo in order to uphold the principles set forth by the United Nations. But this is simply another way of saying that the principles of Soviet Russia are incompatible with the principles of the United Nations. The United Nations, then, becomes a combination of Western nations dominated by the United States and dedicated to the task of saving the world from Communism. Obviously, this leaves no place in U. N. for Soviet Russia, and an international organization without Russia, essential though it may be, is something less than an instrument for preserving the peace.

The historians may very well find that Mr. Truman and his advisers were wrong in abandoning the international approach to peace in favor of the unilateral approach. They may discover, when it is possible to read the record of the post-war period without emotion, that our initial distrust of Russia was groundless, that Russian aggression was based on fear of the United States, just as Mr. Truman's "serious course" is based on fear of Soviet Russia. Conceivably, this could be the vicious circle that has come to bound man's hope of peace. But, unfortunately, none of this is of immediate importance now that Mr. Truman has spoken his piece. So long as the President of the United States, or the chief of the Russian State or both, believe that international co-operation is impossible it *is* impossible.

The great danger is that the Congress will accept Mr. Truman's estimate of the situation and refuse to accept his program for meeting it. There can be no compromise here. The Congress could repudiate the Administration, refuse the appropriations and the authority Mr. Truman requested, and reaffirm its faith in the United Nations by insisting that UN take over the abandoned British obligations in the Mediterranean. But certainly there is no sentiment in Congress for such action as that—and nothing less can take the curse off the President's blunt condemnation of Russia.

This leaves only two real alternatives. We may accept the course proposed by Mr. Truman, hoping that somehow, despite the logic of history, a balance of power may yet provide the basis for a new world order. Or we may turn again down the old road to isolation. Mr. Truman's program offers at least an outside chance of peace. The alternative offers none.

The Legion's 'Dusk To Dawn Survey

ONE of the most ambitious surveys ever undertaken in Mecklenburg County gets underway today During the next seven days members of the seventeen county posts of the American Legion will visit every family now resident in Mecklenburg.

The project, sponsored by the Legion's County Council, has two primary objectives. The first, but least important, is to sign up new Legion members. The second is to see that every veteran, or veteran's widow, in Mecklenburg is obtaining full benefit from the mass of special veteran's legislation now on the books.

The laws applying to veterans have now attained a volume and a complexity that would baffle a Philadelphia lawyer. They cover insurance, hospitalization, pensions, loans, education, on-the-job training, and rehabilitation. A good many persons, understandably uninformed of the possibilities open to them, are letting valuable opportunities slip away. In some cases, the Legion believes, veterans and the widows of veterans are suffering real hardship simply because they do not realize that the Government can and will assist them.

The Legion has always made it its business to keep track of veteran's legislation, and every post has its specialists in the various fields. Deserving cases located by the survey will be investigated and referred to the proper Federal agency for action. And the Legion will follow up to see that results are obtained, just as it does for its own members.

Greatest emphasis will be placed on child welfare and the rehabilitation of disabled veterans, but the whole field of veterans' benefits will be covered in the "dusk to dawn" campaign of home visits. Certainly this is an ambitious public service and a valuable one. It should give the Government material assistance in meeting its obligation to those who served in time of war.

The Taxi Drivers' 'Defense Fund'

AMERICANS are a sentimental people, apt to favor the underdog in any controversy. Thus it is always fairly easy to raise a defense fund for persons who have run afoul the law in spectacular fashion, particularly if there is some suspicion that political persecution is involved in their prosecution. It is customary, however, for the defendants to plead innocent.

This condition does not apply in the case of the 31 Greenville men now under indictment for the lynching of Willie Earle, 24-year-old Negro. The men, taxi-drivers for the most part, have signed statements admitting that they took the Negro from a Pickens County jail by force and stood by while one of their number killed him with a shotgun.

Now, however, a defense fund is being raised in their behalf. Contributions have been forwarded from several South Carolina and Georgia towns, but the main center of activity is in Greenville, home town of the defendants. Jars labeled simply "Taxi Drivers' Defense" have been placed around on cashier's counters, in the manner of Red Cross collection cans. Over $2,000 has been raised so far, most of it in small change.

The taxi drivers are entitled to an adequate defense; their friends are entitled to help them obtain it. But is there any reason to believe that the contributors to the defense fund—and there must have been hundreds of them—are motivated by a desire to see justice done? Are the South Carolinians who are chipping in with nickels, dimes and quarters really trying to guarantee a fair trial—the sort of trial a shotgun denied Willie Earle?

The jars, we are afraid, should be labeled: "A Fund To Uphold Lynch Law And Guarantee The Right of White South Carolinians To Defy Their State, Take The Law Into Their Own Hands, And Commit Murder."

'You're Sure You'll Send For Me As Soon As Possible?'

Statesmen At Work

High Cost Of Living

(NOTE: Last week Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas, Democrat, of California, armed with a bundle of charts and basket of groceries which cost her $15 as against $10 in November, arose in the House of Representatives to discuss the high cost of living and to plead for a continuation of effective rent control. The conclusion of her address and the ensuing debate with Representative Frank B. Keefe, Republican of Wisconsin, are reprinted from The Congressional Record.—Eds., THE NEWS).

IF we are to do our part in holding the world together in an effort to achieve freedom for all peoples and, therefore, for ourselves, it is imperative that we face up to attack and lick this problem of the high cost of living before it tears loose in a spiral of run-away inflation and a new outbreak of industrial strife.

Let us draw together and again rise to meet the challengers and the opportunities that confront us. Then in deed as in words, Mr. Speaker, "America the Beautiful" will be more truly beautiful in the eyes of all the freedom loving peoples of the world.

This is America's moment. May we prove our democratic faith by our works at home and abroad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I have any time left I shall be very happy to answer any questions.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman and apologize because I felt I had to make my few remarks first.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say that I have listened with great interest to the very fine statement the gentlewoman has made. I would like to ask her, however, just what she specifically recommends out of this general statement that she has made appealing to the Congress and to the public? What does she recommend that this Congress do to alleviate the situation of which she complains?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. As the gentleman can see if he followed my remarks——

Mr. KEEFE. I did follow the gentlewoman's remarks very carefully.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I am trying to sound an alarm before it is too late on the question of rent control. I feel it would be disastrous if rents were allowed to skyrocket as food prices have skyrocketed since we did away with an effective price-control program in June.

Now, the gentleman asks me how would I do it. I do not say it is to be facetious; but if you do not like the words OPA, call it anything else you like, but keep a real rent-control program. But, as long as there is a great housing shortage in the country, as long as we have not yet housed our veterans, we ought to keep rent control. That was promised by this Congress last year when you killed OPA. Almost no one came out and said they wanted to kill the rent-control program.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentlewoman that I am in complete accord with that, but I think that so far as I personally am concerned, and with the thesis of attempting to hold down rents in vjew of the situation facing the Nation, I think that this Congress has expressed itself and did express itself. What I would like to have the gentlewoman answer is the question that concerns me as an individual Member of Congress what I am going to be able to do and what others are going to be able to do in view of the alarm which the gentlewoman has sounded and generated, and which some of us have also generated and sounded? What are we going to do about it, and how? That is what I would like to know.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman is talking about the over-all program? I thought I made myself clear in my speech. I wish you would follow the recommendation of the President of the United States under the Employment Act.

Mr. KEEFE. We are talking about rent control now.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. All right, talk about rent control. You have to keep the 649 area rental offices, and you cannot have rent control through a court enforcement system, and that is what is being proposed.

Mr. KEEFE. That bill is before the President now.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That is right, and I hope he vetoes it.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand the gentlewoman's position is that he should veto that bill, the deficiency bill, which is now up there?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. If vetoing the bill could save the rent-control program, yes, but in the last analysis it has to come back to this Congress, and the gentleman who is talking represents the majority party.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentlewoman this question? The gentlewoman has said that the whole program will go out and there is no use fooling the American people.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman knows it will go out.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not talking about rent control.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I say, the gentleman knows it will go out. The gentleman voted for it to go out.

Mr. KEEFE. Rent control still remains; does it not?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. What good does that do? What good does it do to have rent control if you cannot have the area rent control office?

Mr. KEEFE. I am a renter. I live in an apartment.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman will find out.

Mr. KEEFE. I will find out. You bet I will find out and that is what the gentlewoman ought to tell the people of America because——

Mrs. DOUGLAS. What good does that do? They do not care whether you find out.

The average wage in America is $47.58. That family already has its budget bursting at the seams to buy meat, potatoes, coffee, eggs, and milk. According to my sampling, the housewife is not able to buy oranges and grapefruit any more.

Mr. KEEFE. I know that.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The court will have millions of cases before it eventually. Here is this case. What will Mr. Brown and his children do? They do not care whether you are uncomfortable or not. They care whether they are uncomfortable.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, I have never had a conversation with the gentlewoman before. I see the impossibility of even getting a word in, because she has the floor.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not want to be facetious. I do not think this is a facetious matter. It affects 50,000,000 American families. I am trying to talk for the American people.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, let me ask this——

Mrs. DOUGLAS. It is going to be too late when they talk in 1948. They will have been thrown out of their houses by then.

Mr. KEEFE. Again I struggle to get one word in order to ask my question, and I hope the record will show that.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. They do not care what the record shows here. They will not care about the record when they are thrown out of their houses.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I surrender back the balance of my time. No one can go against that.

Marquis Childs

New Domestic Crisis

WASHINGTON

IF WE ARE to do the things in the world that, in President Truman's definition, we must do in order to avert collapse and dictatorship, then we in America must have strength and stability. An America torn by dissension and harassed by economic troubles cannot help anyone.

This is the time to take a long, hard look at the domestic situation shaping up just ahead of us. In many industries a showdown on wage negotiations is coming up shortly.

Steel is a significant example. In January, by mutual agreement, the United States Steel Corp. and the United Steel Workers agreed that the wage contract then in force should be continued for two and a half months beyond the end of the contract. This was a reasonable compromise intended to give both sides a chance to work out details of a new contract.

Since that agreement, only a few meetings have been held between the company and the union. Those meetings were not concerned with living costs in relation to wages. Union negotiators are said to have come out of those meetings feeling that the steel company wanted to cut back union privileges and union guarantees virtually to the old non-union days.

NOT SURPRISING

That the company should feel a new confidence would not be surprising. Many of the labor proposals now before Congress would cut the unions down to a status so feeble that they would be almost certain to melt away. A great deal of the talk out of Washington is along the line that the unions must be curbed and disciplined, by which the extremists mean that they must be reduced to impotence.

Leaders in the steel union, which has been kept free of Communist infiltration and influence, are pessimistic. They are wondering how they can go to their membership with the kind of proposals put up by the company, even if they were of a mind to accept those proposals.

Their gloom is not lightened when they reflect that thus far the question of a wage increase has not even been considered. And time is rapidly running out at the moment when new and drastic price increases are hitting the consumer right where he lives.

This last is perhaps the most serious side of the picture. Maybe things like seniority rights and the union shop could be negotiated. But it is hard to negotiate away a cost-of-living rise that makes it almost impossible for the housewife to stretch the family budget to cover food and rent.

Rep. Helen Gahagan Douglas of California dramatized that fact the other day when she brought a market basket full of groceries onto the floor of the House. She told members she had paid $15 at a low-price chain store for the butter, eggs, meat and so on that the basket contained. Last June, she told the House, it would have cost $10 to buy those same items. And she brought the comparative sales slips with her to prove her point.

QUOTES BLS

Mrs. Douglas quoted a Bureau of Labor Statistics release showing that wholesale food prices had gone up 3.1 per cent for the week ending March 6.

Then she went on to point out that, in the four years preceding last June, the over-all food price had risen on the average only 15 per cent. In the eight months since June, when in effect price controls were destroyed, the rise has been 30 to 35 per cent on the average.

Mrs. Douglas' speech was a plea for continuing rent controls. In the deficiency bill passed March 5, funds were provided for continuing OPA until April 30. This fund was cut by $3,000,000 in conference, which makes it doubtful if OPA can go on as long as that.

Congress must act before that date to save rent controls. Sen. Robert A. Taft has said that action on rents will come shortly after the end of March and that possibly, to save money, enforcement will be put in the Department of Commerce.

"You certainly have no rent-control program when you talk in terms of court enforcement," Mrs. Douglas said. "And that's what is being talked about here in Congress. Remember that 50,000,000 families will be affected.

RENTS TO RISE

"If they wake up May 1 with no real rent controls but with only the promise of a court-enforcement program to be passed by Congress at some indefinite date in the future, what will happen? Landlords will raise their rents from one end of the country to the other. Not the Republican-proposed 10 per cent but 25, 50, yes, and even in some cases 100 per cent."

These are the realities we had better face. A strike is a divisive thing. But sometimes strikes may grow out of the pressure of circumstances even though no one may want a strike.

Samuel Grafton

Ban On Communists

NEW YORK

IF we really intend to save Western civilization, we're going to have to be a little less nervous about it. Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach's proposal to outlaw the Communist Party doesn't save Western civilization; it merely rubs out one of the differences between it and what we're trying to save it from. How do you save, in fact how do you even tell apart, a civilization which outlaws the opposition from a civilization which outlaws the opposition? If the Schwellenbach idea goes through, the quarrel between East and West ceases to be a broad quarrel between dictatorship and freedom, and becomes a naked, narrow war between Communism and capitalism, with both sides using the same techniques of arm-twisting and eye-gouging. It is Mr. Schwellenbach's masterly suggestion that we throw away our best argument, freedom, our one incontrovertible ace, the highest card in the game.

HIGH DIFFERENCE

For no matter what excesses capitalism may commit, it will have a case so long as it maintains freedom; while no matter what progress Russia may make, her case will be defective so long as she maintains a state orthodoxy. To suggest that we transform this high difference into a dull pushing and pulling between corporations and collectives, is a monstrous piece of bumble. American capitalism needs Communists, if only because Russia doesn't have capitalists, to underline that asseveration of freedom by which it seeks to keep open its approach to the minds of men.

It is argued that the Communists want to change our way of life, as indeed they do. But to suggest that we change our way of life, ourselves, in order to keep them from doing so, is one of the poorest proposals for foiling anybody ever placed on the record. And the very poorness of Schwellenbach's proposal, its pathetic weakness, its nervous lack of style, are in a way, more important, as news, than his specific proposal itself; for these qualities indicate a certain flutteriness, a kind of agitation which, if they became the dominant American moods, will paralyze us and render us quite incapable of saving even a flea's way of life.

For Schwellenbach's hand muddies the sharp differences and the bright colors into an indeterminate gray. It does so at a time when the world is looking for clear distinctions, for incontrovertible differentiations. I am morally convinced that we are making something of the same error in our new policy of giving military support to Greece and Turkey, for just as Schwellenbach proposes to fight suppression with suppression, so Truman proposes to fight expansionism with something very like expansionism. In both areas, a struggle which should be carried on at the highest moral level is being pulled down to the merely physical. The argument over which is better is being transformed into a row over which is stronger.

But better makes stronger; and one must be concerned about that nervousness which is erasing high distinctions for the sake of puny ad hoc devices, and trumpery improvisations.

For we can hope to save our way of life only by defending it with dignity, and with grace, by actions which have implicit in them all the force of those ideas that thread through our history. The way to save our kind of life is to live it.On the domestic field, that means meeting the Communist approach with argument; on the international field it means meeting Russian expansionism with law, with formal United Nations action, not by hasty, almost panicky switches to the other fellow's way of playing the game.

UNANSWERABLE ARGUMENT

The one argument the Communists cannot answer at home is that we allow them to function; the one strategy the Russians could not controvert internationally would be our firm, patient, even tough refusal to take unilateral action. To junk these approaches is to throw away our best weapons in the name of arming ourselves. The world may follow a cool, confident and morally secure America, but it may well have its doubts about that agitated mood which, like a fog, mushroomed over our capital city last week.

Another Voice

A Monumental Slip

"WHY Clutter Up Square with More Monuments," asks *The Raleigh Times* in a captious editorial caption which omits the question mark, possibly for reasons of space already cluttered up. Well, why?

Since we can take a monument or leave it, our interest in the cause is historical and even slightly sentimental. *The Times* is disturbed over a movement to honor the memory of Presidents Andrew Johnson, Andrew Jackson and James K. Polk, North Carolina's three native Chief Executives, with a monument to be erected in Capitol Square, This leads our Raleigh contemporary into the slip:

> Granted that Andrew Johnson was born in North Carolina, that Jackson was reputed to have been born here, and that Polk went to school in the state . . .

The inference, we gather, is that James Knox Polk was not Tar Heel born. He just "went to school in the state." But more than one biographer would disagree. Eugene I. McCormac, the Dictionary of American Biography's authority on the eleventh President, sets down his birthplace as Mecklenburg County, a rather substantial birthplace, we are told.

If *The Times* is no longer than this on its history, then we submit that it may be a bit short on things monumental. It may be worth an heroic bust or two to jog the memory of our Capitol Square guardian. A great state, suh, this North Carolina. Three Presidents ,or maybe two and one-half. Count 'em.—*Asheville Citizen.*

———

An Eastern veteran's cottage that began as an $11,000 construction job had run to $30,000 at last report. Included at the larger figure, of course, are doorknobs, and glass all around.

———

Being a stranger, one hesitates to pass the word along to the prince who marries Babs Hutton, "This is her fourth romance, so please be kind."

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round:

Truman Should Avoid Greek Royalists

WASHINGTON

OPINION is unanimous on Capitol Hill that President Truman's message on Greece and Turkey represents the most momentous foreign policy step taken by the United States since President Roosevelt decided to convoy supplies across the Atlantic in 1940 to aid beleaguered Britain.

The two moves are regarded as analagous. One cast the die in regard to Germany. The other may cast the die in regard to Russia.

In fact, the message is so vital that some of the President's best friends on Capitol Hill wish he would not becloud the issue by the friendships he keeps.

Specifically they are worried over the fact that spokesmen for the extreme Greek Royalists, against whom a large part of the Greek population is so bitter, appear to have ready access to the White House.

Shortly before President Truman delivered his historic message, for instance, he conferred with Archbishop Athenagoras of the Greek Orthodox Church and Reverend Thomas Daniels, sometimes known as Papathomas Daniels, or Daniel Papathomas. Greek-Americans who know this pair were amazed that they could get inside the White House, let alone hold a long conference with the President, and later be wined and dined with Truman's military aide, General Harry Vaughan.

Not only does the Archibishop represent the extreme Royalist faction in Greece, but the Reverend Daniels is one of the most controversial figures in the Greek Church.

Controversial Priest

THE records of the District of Columbia show that on Feb. 14, 1938 suit was filed by local Greek-Americans to remove him as pastor of the Saints Constantine and Helen Greek Orthodox Church because of unpriestly behavior. The police records of the District of Columbia show that on July 22, 1930, he was arrested on a charge of drunkenness (case 930503) and forfeited collateral.

The records of the Superior Court of New Haven, Ct., (7/26/17) show that he was cited by Judge Donald Werner as having "committed adultery" in the divorce case of Heris vs. Heris. The Court of Common Pleas in Philadelphia (9/13/16) also shows him cited for adultery in the divorce case of Coroneos vs. Coroneos. The Atlantic City police court (8/25/22) also shows the priest arrested on a charge of grand larceny in connection with the theft of $650 worth of jewels from a hotel room. He was discharged for lack of evidence.

In such bad repute is Rev. Daniels with the Greek-American community, that the St. Sophia Church of Washington has adopted a standing bylaw that he may not enter the church even as a worshipper.

No wonder many Greeks were shocked and amazed that this man should be received by the President of the United States, be entertained in the company of his military aide, and appear to be advising the President on Greek policy.

Congressmen who have been looking into the Greek Church influence at the White House at first were inclined to think that the contacts of the Royalist Archbishop and Rev. Daniels were purely social. However, inquiry at the State Department has developed that in one case they succeeded—through their friend, General Vaughan—in overruling an Assistant Secretary of State who had authorized a passport to an American citizen of Greek origin. Daniels protested—through General Vaughan—that the passport applicant was unsympathetic to the King of Greece. And they got their way. The passport was withheld.

Justice Frankfurter Heckled

LAWYERS practicing before the Supreme Court long have wished they could turn the tables on talkative, inquisitive Justice Felix Frankfurter.

It remained for a young Harvard law professor to turn the tables and heckle Justice Frankfurter while he was making a speech.

The occasion was the annual law review dinner of the Harvard Law School. Frankfurter, former Harvard professor, was the guest of honor. Called upon to speak, the learned Supreme Court Justice pontificated in his usual manner. He talked the way he writes, replete with Victorian phrases.

In the audience was Felix's old colleague, Professor Thomas Reed Powell, himself an authority on the Supreme Court and author of a book on the Court's encroachment on state police power. In no awe of the Justice, Powel whispered audibly, sometimes derisively, commenting on his friend's mannerisms.

However, it was not Powell but Robert Braucher, a young assistant professor and former student of Justice Frankfurter's, who dared heckle openly. The Justice was talking about the racial and religious freedom of the Harvard Law School.

"We can be very proud," he said, "that everyone is admitted no matter what his color or creed."

At this young Braucher rose, started to challenge Frankfurter regarding the color line.

"Sit down, you . . .!" roared the Justice, his voice trailing off into an inaudible name.

Braucher did. Later he wrote Frankfurter a note of apology. Frankfurter, however, has a long memory. Backstage betting is that at the end of the school term, Braucher will be dropped.