

**THE CHARLOTTE NEWS**  
 And Evening Chronicle  
 Published Every Afternoon Except Sunday By  
 The News Publishing Company, Inc.  
 W. C. Dowd Jr., President Burke Davis,  
 and General Manager Editor  
 Lieut. J. E. Dowd, USNR, Vice President and Editor on leave for the duration  
 • W. C. Dowd, 1863-1927 •

The daily edition of The Charlotte News was established in 1858. The Evening  
 Chronicle (established 1893) was purchased by and consolidated with The  
 Charlotte News May 8, 1914.

The News desires to be notified promptly of errors in any of its reports that  
 proper correction may be made at once.

MEMBER ASSOCIATED PRESS AND AP FEATURES

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all  
 news dispatches credited to it, or not otherwise credited to this paper, and also  
 the local news published herein.

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Charlotte, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879

SUBSCRIPTION RATES  
 By carrier: 20 cents a week; one month, 67 cents. By mail: One month  
 87 cents; three months, \$2.60; six months, \$5.20; one year, \$10.40.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1943

**The United Nations They Won't Last Forever**  
 By Dorothy Thompson

WASHINGTON

IN HIS speech to Congress on the State of the Union, the President has finally defined some idea as to what he wants the future peace, and suggested that it would be well for all of us at this critical period, to confine ourselves to the larger objectives and not get bogged down in argument over methods and details.

At this stage of the war, this is certainly common sense advice. Yet the President himself did make two positive statements regarding post-war policy, as it affects our present enemies, the Axis. The first was that after the war we shall maintain the present grand alliance, United States-Britain-Russia-China, together with the smaller United Nations, and disarm and keep disarmed Germany, Italy, and Japan.

The main idea dominating the President's thought is security: security in the domestic field, and security in international life; permanent protection against the possibility of aggression ever happening again. The President does not believe that "magnificent isolationism" will afford us this security, or that we can "maintain peace by good intentions alone." He apparently believes that any future menace might come from the Axis powers alone, since the United Nations are bound together "in solemn agreement" that they themselves will not commit acts of aggression or conquest against any of their neighbors.

He accepts the thesis that the roots of trouble, in the future as in the present, will remain permanently the same.

Now, on this, it might be well to have a little historical perspective. The first aggressions in this war were committed by two nations who were our allies in the last war, Japan and Italy. So the idea that a beaten enemy will always be the first again to take up arms is not necessarily correct. Japan and Italy emerged from the last war as victors despite their military victory. Mussolini, who emerged in power to turn Italy into an aggressive, imperialist state, was the very man, who in the previous war, had contributed most to leading Italy into the camp of the Allies.

Furthermore, both Italy and Japan were committed to keeping the peace after the last war. They were members from the beginning of the League of Nations, and signed all the solemn agreements to outlaw war which were so numerous in the twenties.

**Side Glances**



"There's the old dodger at it again—looking for stray ticket stubs to help him out on next year's income tax"

**Flim-Flam Flynn Shame On ER**  
 By Raymond Clapper

WASHINGTON

IN THIS Ed Flynn case, I find myself spluttering not so much at Flynn as at Roosevelt. He's the one who ought to know better, and who does know better. I don't believe that the President wanted a trusted politician in Australia to keep an eye on General MacArthur and watch for anything that looked like 1944 Presidential politics. Ed Flynn wanted to be an ambassador and Mr. Roosevelt undertook to make him one.

It was not surprising that Ed Flynn wanted a diplomatic post. He was eager to take almost any one that the President would offer. Mr. Flynn has been beaten around in the paving-block service 25 years as chairman of the Democratic National Committee was marred by the constant reiteration of the charges despite the fact that two grand juries considered them and returned no indictments.

Quite understandable, Mr. Flynn wanted the kind of vindication and prestige that come from a diplomatic appointment. It would mean a lot to his family. Diplomatic life carries a glamour of distinction, so as the movers would lead one to think. The New York politician wears a morning coat and a high hat on special occasions and he looks with awe on a crest in which, the movers suggest, such are the striking clothes. It was the most natural thing in the world that Ed Flynn should ask the President to fit him up with a diplomatic job.

But it is difficult to understand why Mr. Roosevelt should send Mr. Flynn to Australia. True, our Minister there is an old career man, Nelson Johnson, who has been in the foreign service 25 years and is ready to retire. But Australia is a tricky spot right now. The Government there hangs on by a majority of one. It is anti-Churchill. Australian politicians play a game of complaints frequently about inadequate aid from the United States. There have been strikes and other instances where the co-operation was not all that was wished.

General MacArthur has conducted himself with discretion in a most delicate situation when it would have been so easy for such a spectacular figure to stek his neck out to the disadvantage of our mutual interests. If Mr. Flynn brings the properties to acquisition in his own prospective nomination. That is in itself a sufficient indication that he is likely to have trouble finding his way around in such a delicate and complicated situation as exists in Australia.

And it is unwise and unwise to bring the diplomatic field as a place for buying politicians, especially now when our relations with other Governments are becoming more complex than they ever have been. We are entering a new period in our foreign relations and we shall need the very best technicians at all contact points.

I don't subscribe to the idea that no laymen should be appointed to diplomatic posts and that everything should be left in the hands of career men. The professionals are needed in all missions to handle the technical work. But sometimes they are too restricted in their interests, and lacking in that political sense or feeling for the forces that may be surging around them.

Almost invariably they are tied in with the reactionary groups wherever they may be because they play with rich people and they are apt to be bought. Yet a man like Joseph P. Davies, a future-proofer, can go into Communist Russia as Ambassador and get on better than anyone else we ever had there. He had a shrewd judgment of what was going on. He sensed the things that career men sometimes miss.

So the argument against Mr. Flynn isn't that nobody but career foreign-service men should be appointed to be head of missions. The point is that when you choose a layman into the field, you are likely to be very, very good indeed, a man of distinct achievement and one commanding respect in his own field—a man like Governor Lehman for instance—who is better equipped to do the relief and rehabilitation work than any career foreign-service officer.

**First Lady In Battle, North Carolina's Name Leads All the Rest**

In the first week of September, 1941, on a night when the moon was over the choppy waters of the North Atlantic, the sixteenth battleship of the U. S. Navy lifted her terrible voice in battle roar for the first time. She was not the biggest warship afloat, nor the fastest, nor the most heavily armed. She was just the most deadly of them all. She was the sleek 35,000-ton North Carolina.

Her commander, when all was ready, pressed a button and her great turret burst into a blinding, deafening roar of flame. Her nine sixteen-inch guns and half of her 20 five-inch guns shattered the night with a single explosion of two and three-quarter tons of powder; twelve tons of shells rained through the night. And the Navy's ENCY came through. She heeled over, settled back, and swirled on. She stood up under the kick of the greatest salvo ever fired by any ship of any navy on any sea. She was ready for battle.

On October 26, 1942, at an hour when the battleships were a do-do of modern warfare, a ship of the North Carolina class (and it matters not if she was the ENCY or a sister), was making way through warm tropical seas in company with a carrier force, seeking contact with warships of Japan. She found them, and more. Three waves of Jap planes gave her a baptism of fire, but of them all only one came through the curtain of steel. It fell to the bristling guns on her decks.

Torpedo planes and dive bombers gave her no rest. One wave of bombers came in through the melee. Twenty of them came down, and all were blown to bits or plunged into the sea. The young lady of the North Carolina class, in the battle of Santa Cruz, was perfection, and she wanted to try again.

On November 14, she had her second chance. Herding a flotilla of destroyers with one or more other battleships, she blazed into a Jap trap eagerly and made a massacre of the battle of Guadalcanal. Before enemy cruisers could get their range, she had sent them sailing down to the bottom; her escorts cleaned up or routed the rest. She breathed destruction wherever she went, and sea power or air power meant nothing to her gunners.

The Madame X of the North Carolina class brought a grand new name to naval warfare; and a new day as well. For their brief time, the terrible sisters are the most fearful vessels afloat. North Carolina class leads the way in the sea, which leads all the rest in war on the seas. In the struggle for freedom, its fame already belongs to legend.

**Revolt Wildcat Coal Strike a Blow At John Lewis the Dictator**

Pennsylvania's wildcat strike of United Mine Workers, keeping some 18,000 men idle at a crucial point in a war-vital industry, is not simply another bit of evidence of Labor's irresponsibility. The work-stoppage in the coal fields is an indication of an evil which has long existed in the syndicalist regime of John L. Lewis. King John himself has deepened the strike in the face of public indignation, but its origin is in the Lewis family, and of the Lewis family alone.

Under present conditions, the strike is intolerable and unjustified. Miners have not been striking against the coal operators. They have been striking against the union, UMW. They have protested increased wages of \$4 a year in union dues. Last issue they struck once before, in 1941.

For whatever reason they struck, the wildcaters would not be justified. But it is to be remembered that they are violating a contract in wartime because they realize there is no democracy in their union. It belongs, not to them, but to their dictator. Because the Federal Government has steadfastly refused to assume control over union activities as it has over other monopolistic enterprises, the workers have been exploited.

The Lewis autocracy is plain to be seen: 71 per cent of UMW's dues-paying members do not have the right to elect their own district officers. UMW records show that 312,000 members are in "provisional districts" where officers are hand-picked by Lewis. That condition exists in 21 of 30 UMW districts, and it

**The Budget Figure**  
 By Herblock

When we come to the President's budget message, which is rich in elements annually leading to insecurity. It breaks out a proposal unprecedented in our history: a budget of 100 billion, less of 50 billion, an annual per capita civilian expenditure of 1,400 for food, clothing and everything else, or only \$300 a national debt on big we might as well call it "it" and forget the actual figures.

The question before the house is whether an enlarged social security plan is not as necessary, and natural, a corollary to this budget as here are to cloaks, and stamps to letters, and buttons to vests.

The size of the budget does not disturb us. The only doubt, rightly suppressed at the moment, is the ultimate threat to our social security. There is no way to avoid insecurity except by a plan for security. I don't know how to put this any more plainly. Let me try it another way. If we set up a plan for social security, then, unquestionably, we have social security, and the budget's vague promise of insecurity no longer holds.

Or, put it this way: If we can guarantee a minimum standard of living to all persons, in spite of unemployment, sickness, accident, death or breadwinners, demobilization of troops, high taxes, economic dislocation, then, by heaven, we shall have a minimum standard of living, and our threat will be forever a statistical and not a social and human, and we can manage them.

The point I am trying to make, and it is so simple it is baffling, is that if we arrange some way whereby in all our cat and mouse game of the next ten years, then we can handle the next ten years. This budget plan, a social security plan as naturally and inevitably as there are needs insurance and food falling on the customers.

If we are secure, we are secure and if we are insecure, we are insecure, and the cure is out. It is perhaps time to lay aside the conception of the war as an unpredictably balky animal that might or might not be tamed. If response to treatment is due, almost everything else. Let's stop enjoying quick, avoidably uncertainties with quite such melancholy delight.



**Peace-Time Rationing A Social Security Plan**  
 By Samuel Grafton

NEW YORK

I AM NOT one who believes that things happen accidentally and therefore I propose to all you men and idea that Great Britain is planning with a Beveridge plan for social security, not because she wants to give us a model to copy, but because she is trying with a plan for social security because her future is insecure.

This extraordinarily simple explanation was never insufficiently sinister to those who regard all political change as the result of diabolical plotting. If we will suggest our normal political belligerence for a moment, and concede that the world makes sense, we will be struck by the following facts: Great Britain has always needed up to a billion pounds a year in income on foreign investments, profits from the carrying trade, and from insurance, to keep going. Her foreign income has been running out to finance the war, her carrying trade has been scrambled and her insurance and financing services have been taken up the cap. Her future is insecure, and so the Beveridge plan suddenly comes along, and its arrival is as sudden as that of the rainbow after a drought.

Great Britain may have lost in the next peace than in the last and out of this need a Beveridge plan has been born. It is actually only a kind of peacetime rationing plan, guaranteeing all sections of the British population a cut in whatever goods are available, by guaranteeing the lives of the millions; each benefits in every conceivable adversity. Relief money will be distributed instead of ration coupons, but social justice, against hardship and social disturbance by rationing, is the same.

I concede that this is not the popular picture of the Beveridge plan, which is sometimes regarded as a sudden break with tradition and an ideal impulse. But the fact that England is turning to a Beveridge plan because she has, in, does not mean that the ideal is not a good one. I should say, more, Political virtue does not lie in sudden burning hunches, but in the exercise of good judgment on inevitabilities.