THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

And Evening Chronicle

Published Every Afternoon Except Sunday by The News Publishing Company, Inc
Hugh Stevens, President
Burke Davis, Editor
Mrs. Dowd Jones, Secretary
Hugh S. Cook, Vice-President and Editor, on leave for the duration
S. W. C. David, 1898-1937

The Daily Edition of The Charlotte News was established 1888. The Evening Chronicle established 1902; was purchased by and consolidated with The Charlotte News May 3, 1914.

MEMBER OF THE 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 in 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, 87 cents. By mail: One month, $1.50; three months, $3.90; six month, $6.50; one year, $13.00.

The Picture

Dr. McDonald Has One, But It's No Blueprint

Dr. Ralph McDonald opened his formal campaign for Governor impressively in Winston-Salem. Summing up his platform for the people of his home county (where he broke all records for vote-gathering in 1936), he painted them an attractive picture of North Carolina under his reign. The picture, in fact, is irresistible:

"The one purpose of my administration as Governor will be to help build a greater North Carolina. Increased farm income, a higher wage level, better health and hospitalization, better public schools, better roads, industrial expansion, better state services in every field, constant and emphatic progress along all these lines will be the goal of North Carolina throughout my four years as Governor."

The Doctor then observed, truthfully, that many of the progressive planks out of his '36 platform had been used in the recent development of North Carolina. He said, and we agree, that many who looked upon him as dangerously liberal in his first Democratical race had now come to accept him and the things he stands for. It was his thesis that the tide had been turned in the State, toward progressivism—but that the job has not been finished.

But there was no report on the ways and means of accomplishing further progress for Tar Heelia. Dr. McDonald said that he is now fighting for the same principles he began to fight for in 1935, as a State legislator. The most prominent of these embattled goals was the elimination of the sales tax, which appears to him to be only a tax on the poor man's bread. He was often asked what revenues he had to offer as a substitute for those produced by the sales tax. He gave his answer in '35, in the form of these proposals:

1. A corporation dividend tax, which he maintained would yield $3,600,000 annually. It was rejected by the joint finance committee, which decided it would yield only $500,000 annually.

2. An occupational tax to be applied, without exemptions, to the gross income of all persons who earned more than $1,000 annually. This in addition to the present income tax, and applying to farmers, factory employees, stenographers, professional men and women. It was rejected because of violent opposition from all quarters, and because it was deemed more onerous than the sales tax.

3. A revised corporation franchise tax on the buildings, fixtures and stocks of all State corporations. Discarded after bitter opposition from merchants.

These were the McDonald proposals of '35 designed to relieve the sales tax burden — and the best Legislative estimates were that these left the State about $20,000,000 shy of replacing sales tax revenues. If the Doctor meant (when he said that his principles of '35 were unchanged) that he still favored those means of providing revenues to pay for North Carolina progress, then the picture he painted isn't so pretty. We're thinking of coining an old political proverb to the effect that one picture needs more than 10,000 words.

New Tune

This Is Not The Alben Of The Rebellion

You see, the overnight rebellion of Senator Alben Barkley against Franklin Roosevelt was just a passing symptom of the healthy and good-natured homicidal relationships within the Democratic Party. It meant nothing that Mr. Barkley stood in passion and denounced his chief, calling his hand on the tax veto. A kind of political high blood pressure was responsible for his cry that he would no more carry the Roosevelt banner, without question, up and down the aisles of a half-hostile Congress.

No, that has been two months ago. Americans must know the obvious truth, that November's crisis has brought Democrats together, and that the Democratic hopes are with Mr. Roosevelt, and with him alone. When Mr. Barkley can, still in an impassioned manner, proclaim in New York that the Roosevelt Administration has a record unequalled in U. S. history, and that the President must be drafted for leadership again, that means that he feels the pressure for unity, and heeds not the siren call of the rights of man and Congress.

So far as we're concerned, Mr. Barkley's ringing endorsement is welcome. There is nothing to do but agree with him that, setting aside all grievances, the Roosevelt Administration has given the American people great and lasting gains. And, again, insofar as we're concerned, the nation's obvious course is to ask his leadership again, for the crisis that looms ahead. But you can't stifle those wicked little thoughts: What would Alben have said, in the midst of his speech of rebellion, had some impertinent Republican popped the Fourth Term question? This is a miracle of American production, this consolidation of Party leadership in two historic months.

All Quiet

Vice Settles Down To New Routine

The vice situation in Charlotte, at least to the satisfaction of Army authorities, is under control. This time, rather than firing a long-distance barrage of criticism at City and County officialdom, military leaders met with health officers, surveyed conditions, and found them to be good.

In all truth, they weren't bad at the time of the most recent explosion—now some months ago. It has been suggested that a change of personnel has brought about a change in the Army's attitude, and there is now no probability that there will be other widely-publicized charges and counter-charges concerning vice in Charlotte.

At the last session, as we remember it, the incidence of venereal disease in nearby Army camps and bases was very low, and there was no presentation of definite evidence — before Army representatives abruptly left the meeting, after refusing to answer questions.

We take it for granted that present conditions, meeting with both local and Army approval, mean that there is not now a danger that the May Act will be invoked locally. After so long a controversy, in which nothing was accomplished, the present calm is welcome.

What's This?

Did A Commentator Make Bailey's Decision?

If Drew Pearson is right — and despite the assertion of highest authority that he is a chronic liar, he has an incredible habit of anticipating events —then Senator Josiah Bailey is not really a backer of Harry Byrd for President. The story goes that the senior Senator from North Carolina was undecided as to the Byrd movement, but that a radio commentator, announcing the move in advance, pushed him into acquiescence.

If that is true, then it is no wonder that the movement has such little momentum, and that the Senator took no part in this week's Greensboro Byrd session —and bestowed no blessings upon it. And, again, if the report is true, then we have even less respect for the Senator's position. If he was in such a state that a public announcement of his intentions could push him one way or another, he was in a dangerous spot. Suppose, for example, that the commentator, confused or mischievous had substituted the name of Gerald L. K. Smith for that of Senator Byrd. What then?

The Merry-Go-Round

By Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON

TO keep abreast of the manpower shortage, it is necessary to know that at least three important closed-door conferences have been held on the subject within the last two months. First meeting was on Capitol Hill in the office of the House Military Affairs Committee. There, Gen. H. H. Arnold, chief of the Army Air Forces, admitted that the war against the Axis could not be won entirely by air.

Second was a meeting of Secretary of War Henry Stimson, Representatives John Sparkman of Alabama and John Costello of California. At it, Stimson agreed that drastic action should be taken to keep deferred 4-F workers in essential war jobs, but said that the War Department preferred to remain out of the picture. At the third and most important meeting, held on Capitol Hill, Major General Lewis Hershey flatly told the House Military Affairs Committee that he would have to clamp down on 4-F deferees if we expected to make short work of the war in Europe.

Gen. Arnold was very frank in admitting, behind closed doors, that he and his advisers had been overly bullish about knocking the Axis out by aerial bombardment. Already the Army Air Corps has transferred 36,000 flying men to its ground forces and is preparing to place another 16,000 men, qualified for cadet air training, in mechanical and other branches of the Air Corps ground forces.

Arnold told the Military Affairs Committee that all applications for Army Air Forces cadet training had been stopped for the time being. He testified that the production of equipment for our Air Forces was not keeping pace with the program for the training of pilots and plane gun crews. We have reached a bottleneck where we have more crews than we have equipment, Arnold admitted. The Air Forces chief contended that this was chiefly due to the "lagging" of production.

Keeping 4-F's

Representatives Sparkman and Costello then urged Secretary Stimson to assume the responsibility for keeping draft-deferred 4-F's in essential war jobs. The two Congressmen contended, however, that the War Department should maintain camps, comparable to those for conscientious objectors, to keep them on the job.

Sparkman and Costello pointed out to Stimson that many war workers quit their essential jobs once they were classified 4-F because they no longer needed to worry about deferment. Costello said that there was a shortage of over 3,000 workers in California aircraft plants alone, yet more than 4,300 persons were receiving unemployment compensation in California. Stimson agreed that strong measures must be taken to prevent "loafing" in war plants, but added that this was a problem for the War Manpower Commission.

Told later about Stimson's position, General Hershey declared, "I'm perfectly willing to take over the 4-F's, providing we have camps for recalcitrants set up along military lines. There are now about 70,000 officers in the Army who are available for work along this line." It was suggested that 4-F workers should be given special uniforms such as those worn by soldiers in the last war or perhaps CCC enrollees.

Hershey emphasized that 71,000 men were released from military service each month because of physical disability, while only 45,000 men became eligible each month upon reaching the age of 18. This, he said, was not sufficient to make up for the discharges.

"In other words," Hershey told the Military Affairs Committee, "we are losing more manpower than we are taking in for the Army. I don't care what means you gentlemen use to build up our forces, but it's high time the American people were waking up to the fact that we can't win this war the way we are going—on a hit or miss basis."

Police Gazette

War Production Board officials are chortling privately over the wire-pulling of the Senators from the Bible Belt to get extra newsprint for the Police Gazette.

The two Senators are Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska, who replaced Statesman George Norris, and Tom Stewart of Tennessee. Both Senators appeared at a hearing of WPB's small business committee to ask WPB officials to grant nine tons of extra paper to the Police Gazette. Comeback of WPB officials was that hundreds of religious journals have been denied extra newsprint because of the desperate paper shortage. Therefore why favor the Police Gazette?

What especially amuses Washington is that both Senators come from deeply religious areas. It was not so very long ago that a trial was held at Dayton, Tennessee, home State of Senator Stewart, to prosecute a teacher who argued that man was descended from the monkey. The late William Jennings Bryan, from the home State of Senator Wherry, was present to defend the Bible and claim that man did not come from the monkey.

Wisconsin Hangover

Political strategists of both parties have been carefully studying Wisconsin primary returns in order to gauge the drift in other States. Three things struck them forcefully.

1. The tide toward isolation which followed the last war already has set in. Wisconsin is not typical of the entire country in this respect, but it is probably typical of the Midwest.

2. Stassen, though keeping aloof on the surface, actually seemed to be co-ordinating with Dewey against Willkie. Stassen's four delegates were elected in counties where no Dewey delegates were entered.

3. Dewey got the support of rabble-rouser Gerald K. Smith and took no steps to disavow Smith's support until it was too late.

Dewey had repudiated Smith some time ago but, more recently, when the rootin'-tootin' ex-disciple of Huey Long went to Milwaukee to campaign for Dewey, the New York Governor kept silent until the evening of April 4, the day of the primary. In other words, he waited until he had already received all the benefits from Smith's silver voice.

The political grapevine also has it that Pennsylvania's Boss Pew secretly backed Stassen and maneuvered so that he would take votes away from Willkie. A powerful lot of money went into Wisconsin during the last three days of the campaign and most of it was placed behind Dewey and Stassen. Willkie, on the other hand, had to pay for most of his own expenses.

At Least We Don't Get Shot At

—By Dorman Smith

The Next Secretary Of State?

By Marquis Childs

NEW YORK

YOU sometimes learn more about a political candidate from his friends than from the man himself. One of Governor Dewey's intimates is a man whom the average American has never heard of—John Foster Dulles.

When Dewey speaks of his friend Dulles, it is with affection and admiration. Dulles is his closest adviser on foreign policy and, if Dewey should be elected President, he would probably name Dulles as Secretary of State.

I went to see Dulles to get some idea of his views. He is senior partner of Sullivan and Cromwell, which is perhaps the richest and most powerful law firm in downtown New York. To see him, you go to the nineteenth floor of a building in Wall Street, then step into a handsome foyer done in the dignified tradition of the eighteenth century. Dulles' private office is at the head of an Adams stairway going to the twentieth floor.

While he has played an important part in the direction of some of America's greatest corporations, Dulles' dominant interest is foreign relations. His grandfather was Secretary of State under Benjamin Harrison and he grew up in an international atmosphere. At the age of nineteen, he was secretary to one of the delegations at the 1907 Hague peace conference.

Apart from his friendship with the Governor, who is fourteen years his junior, Dulles has an important influence on foreign policy. He heads a group with the imposing title of the Committee on Direction of the Commission on Just and Durable Peace, which was established by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ.

In a recent statement, the Commission urged not only a general world organization and the regulation of armament, but a far-reaching program of financial and economic adjustment. The basic choice, said the statement, "must be made between international organization designed merely to perpetuate by repression the particular structure of the world which will emerge from the war" and an international order which, "in addition to such use of force under law as is a requisite of order, discharges tasks that are curative and creative."

When Dulles talks about these things, it is with reasonable common sense. He is sceptical of what can be done by arbitrary fiat—by the stroke of a pen.

That in his opinion, was the error of the 1919 peacemakers—and he was one of them. They leaned too heavily on a formal treaty. Any world organization, Dulles believes, must begin with fundamental realities such as the friendship existing between English - speaking peoples around the world.

Above all, Dulles hold that we can show the way to a decent world order only if we continue to set a dynamic example of what democracy can do. Here, in his view, Roosevelt has failed. His tone is one of scholarly seriousness, his few public speeches dull. But when he speaks of Dewey, his face kindles. The Governor, according to his friend, is a quick learner.

Whether as the result of this friendship or on his own, Dewey is on record for positive international collaboration. In three or four speeches in the first half of 1942, he went a long way. And he is expected to promote the foreign plank in the Republican State platform which he drafted. That plank said:

". . . the United States must be prepared to undertake new obligations and responsibilities in the community of nations. We must co-operate with other nations to promote the wider international exchange of goods and services, to broaden access to raw materials, to achieve monetary and economic stability, and thus discourage the growth of rampant nationalism and its spawn, economic and military aggression. As a further safeguard, we must join with other nations to secure the peace of the world, by force if necessary, against any future outbreaks of international gangsterism."

The isolationists dancing around Willkie's political corpse will find that hard to swallow. Moreover, I believe Dewey will stand by it.

Catastrophe lies ahead unless we return to fundamentals, to the disciplined education of our students first as citizens and second as vocational specialists.

—Dr. Robert G. Sproul, president University of California.

All the guys out there are missing death by inches all the time. It gets routine after a little time. In enemy territory.

—Chief Machinist's Mate Walter J. Ruff, back from the Pacific.

SIDE GLANCES

By Galbraith

"Be careful at that party tonight, son! You may have a medal for fighting Japs, but it's a Spring night and you're an awful easy mark for a pretty face!"

COPR. 1944 BY NEA SERVICE, INC. T. M. REG. U. S. PAT. OFF. 4-13

Hosannas For Hull

By Dorothy Thompson

WASHINGTON

MR. HULL'S expose of foreign policy last Sunday was welcome and deserves ungrudging praise. It was by far the clearest statement of the American position which has been made by anybody since the beginning of the war. And, furthermore, it represents progress. Because Mr. Hull's considered statement is not an approach to foreign policy, but represents what it has been all along, then it has been more honored in the breach than the observance.

Let us take the statement on the French Committee of Liberation. This is a brand new statement; it is vastly clearer than any that has previously been made; and it is not in harmony with past practice. Actually, it concedes to the French Committee nearly everything it has ever asked for until about three weeks ago, when General deGaulle for the first time in the history of the committee referred to it as a provisional government for France. Actually, there is nothing in Mr. Hull's statement that is incompatible with what General deGaulle proposed, as a method of procedure, in his speech of March 16th—and has been proposing, for years, while receiving nothing but snubs. Among the representatives of the French Committee here the speech has been received with immense satisfaction, and as a new step.

For the very first time—and in apparent contradiction to previous statements of policy—Mr. Hull says,

"The President and I are clear as to the need from the outset of French civil administration—and democratic French administration—in France. We are disposed to see the French Committee of National Liberation exercise leadership to establish law and order under the supervision of the Allied Commander in Chief. The committee has given public assurance that it doesn't propose to perpetuate its authority . . and that it wishes at the earliest possible date to have the French people exercise their own sovereign will . ."

This is the first time that the President or State Department has publicly recognized the leadership of the French Committee in Metropolitan France. A detailed plan for exercising that leadership as territories became liberated was presented to our authorities in December 1942. That plan envisaged that the committee would be recognized as a purely provisional government only when it was able to move to Paris, and only until a consultative Assembly had been elected on a broad basis of universal suffrage, including for the first time, women, after which the committee would tender its resignation.

A dispatch from Algiers on Monday states "the French were surprised by the favorable character of Secretary Hull's allusions to the committee"—which makes it clear that if this has been our consistent policy, we have certainly kept it secret from the Committee. It is now to be hoped that this policy will be consistently adhered to and not undermined by career diplomacy, in actual touch with the situation, nor sabotaged by personal likes or dislikes sometimes openly expressed by people in high office.

And it is also greatly to be hoped that as a result General deGaulle will retreat from the extreme position he has taken in the last fortnight, and which has seemed dictatorial, inside his committee, and non-cooperative with his allies. In extenuation of General deGaulle, however, it must be said that the policy followed in practice if not in theory, was bound to create just his kind of behavior. It is always a mistake to make concessions only when they are forced by high-handed action. For that is an invitation to high-handedness.

Mr. Hull also took a long step forward in clearly welcoming progressive governments in Europe. In this Mr. Hull is making concessions to the critics. We do not know whether this is due to the improved military situation, or to the approaching invasion, or to what is manifesting itself in Europe—and has been all along.

But the reasons are immaterial to the fact, which is welcome and praiseworthy. The possibility of avoiding chaos in Europe is in exact proportion to our capacity to estimate what the people want. And it is by no means so difficult to analyze and assess the social forces operating in occupied Europe, as our authorities have seemed to think.

It is, for instance, an obvious fact that the opposition to Fascism has, in every country, and without exception, come from the progressive forces. It is in the course of nature that after the defeat of Fascism, these forces will assume leadership. And the extent to which they can be kept within reasonable bounds will inevitably be measured by the extent to which they enjoy sympathy and support, and for the sake of retaining it are willing to accept some guidance.

Mr. Hull Left One Fear

By Samuel Grafton

NEW YORK

SO let us have a toast to the new and better world: wine, boy, for a toast. Ay, and throw the glasses crashing into the fireplace, for it was good to hear Mr. Hull say that fascism must be destroyed everywhere.

It was good, also, what he said there about taking a stronger line with neutrals. There is no question but that he means it. It is clear from our new attitudes toward Argentina and Eire, that we have stopped walking on little cat feet in these premises. We have gone through a complex process, from the days when we ourselves, as a neutral, confusedly sold military goods to belligerents (as oil to Japan) to the day when we stopped doing this, and now to the stage at which we will allow nobody else to do it.

It's an interesting process, called growing up. A certain nervous flurry, which used to mark our pronouncements on foreign affairs, was almost wholly absent this time.

We used to dwell so lovingly on how hard it all was, and how weak we were. We used to flagellate ourselves, with stories of how neutrals had to be respected as neutrals, and how non-neutrals had to be bought off. We used to make a virtue of our willingness to submit to blackmail: we almost used to boast of how powerless we were in the presence of an assortment of third-rate French and Italian politicians of the wrong species. When we couldn't find one to kowtow to, we even used to dig one up, so as to continue the theory.

Much of this, I say, has been dropped out of the Secretary's last speech. We have taken off our gloves, and we have been astonished to find that hair grows on our fists; we have scratched our chin, and have made the delighted discovery that there are bristles on it.

Mr. Hull's speech, with its demand for the extermination of fascism, and its firm line against the bawdier aspects of neutrality, was almost a second American Declaration of Independence. The major difference between this speech, and previous pronouncements on foreign policy, is that this one tells how strong we are, whereas previous orations used to tell us how weak we were.

It was a speech about the throwing away of fears. We are no longer afraid of fascists. We are no longer afraid of neutrals. We are not even afraid of allies any more, for Mr. Hull was firmest on the four-power alliance. So, let us have that toast to the better world; wine, boy, for the toast.

And then, just as we would lift the glass, a thought occurs, and the hand stops. Maybe it's only a small point. But there is an insidious, nagging question about, and if we could only eliminate it, there might be no questions left. It is this: Why, if our policy is so sound, do the people of France and Italy detest it so?

For there was just one cold spot in Mr. Hull's remarkably warm oration. That was the sudden, almost bitter, plea for "order" in Europe. It was like a shadow passing over the speech.

Suddenly, it reminded us of the coldness and bareness of our relations with the European underground. Of how we can explain everything we do, but we can't explain why we are not better liked. Of the bizarre relations into which we have drifted, where the people we have come to make glad. Of the fewness of our handclasps and of our strange, unbending formality in the presence of the heroes whom the people of Europe have thrown up in this war.

Does it fear remain? And is it fear of the people of Europe? Does that one finger on, in spite of the fears we have thrown away?

Quote

THE people are beginning to ask, "What are we fighting for?" A country cannot keep moving from west to east and east to west.

—Polish Government-in-exile's underground liaison officer, back from Poland.

It is high time politicians and self-interest groups cease trying to use the servicemen and women as cat's-paws to feather their own nests.

—Carl J. Schoeninger, Detroit, Comdr. in Chief Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Soviet defense in the southern sector is now aiming to disturb the German withdrawal.

—Tokyo broadcast.

Stettinius Outlines War Aims

NEW YORK—(AP)—America's Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, says the American people want that aspect of their Government will stick to its present war aims.

He said the American Federation of Labor postwar program last night the United States would only to help invaded countries back on their feet, and had as the intention of meddling into their internal affairs after the war.

"We," said Long, "will not permit the armed forces of this country to be used for the support of any group, or any Government, contrary to the will of the people. "The American people need have no fear that the American policy view is not being vigorously and effectively presented on every occasion where our immediate and long-range interests are involved.

The diplomatic policy of foreign policy must be judged both by its effectiveness in winning the war and its success in helping to lay the foundations for peace and economic well-being. And sometimes, he said, the objective is not achieved — "Finland is a case in point."

CONCLUSIONS

Long told the labor forum these three conclusions had been reached:

1. That the major nations and the law-abiding states should create an international organization to enforce peace and security.

2. That nations subscribing to the program, and in due course all nations, should pledge not to use force except within the framework of the organization.

3. That each of the major nations and any others agreed upon should accept special responsibility for helping up the program.

Long said his department would discuss with both parties in Congress the problem of committing the nation's armed forces for international action.

Delegates Favor F. R.

BOSTON—(AP)—Prospective delegates to the National Democratic Convention have been recording themselves approximately two to one in favor of a fourth term for President Roosevelt in an Associated Press poll of 113 candidates seeking the 68 places on the Massachusetts delegation.

Twenty-six candidates in seven of the state's fourteen congressional districts are pledged to vote for native son Joseph B. Ely, a former governor, one-time Al Smith supporter, and anti-fourth termer, for the Democratic Presidential nomination.

Leaders of the pro-Ely group have expressed confidence that they had a chance—by electing enough delegates and winning the support of enough unpledged delegates—to control the Bay State's delegation in the national convention.

But in the first 47 candidates to be recorded in the Associated Press poll, 30 said they would vote for Roosevelt. 16 recorded themselves for Ely, and three were on the fence—although one of the latter said he would favor the president over Ely.

President Roosevelt has not authorized the use of his name in the Massachusetts April 25 primary and, in consequence, the slate of candidates filed by State Committee Chairman William H. Burke, Jr., must be officially unpledged on the ballot. Additional unpledged candidates are filed in several congressional districts.

Gen. Alexander Honors American

NAPLES—(AP)—Gen. Sir Harold Alexander in the name of King George VI today honored Col. Donald D. Hoover, Indianapolis, Ind., for his "exceptional efficiency and keenness" as a censor, making him an honorary officer of the military division of the order of the British empire.

Hoover once worked on the Washington staff of the Associated Press and was assistant city editor of the Indianapolis News.