THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1946

The Budgeteers Face Inflation

THE somewhat staggering requests for appropriations being laid before the Advisory Budget Commission in Raleigh this week provide an indication of the size of the fiscal headache in store for the next Legislature. The difficulty is that none of these requests can be dismissed as unreasonable. With the exception of the proposed Medical Care Program, there is no call for the inauguration of new State services or for undue expansion of old ones. Even the teachers, whose request for a badly needed salary increase is somewhat more modest than that proposed by some newspapers, make it clear that they are simply trying to hold their own.

This is an important consideration, for it throws new light on what at first seems to be the impossible task before the Budget Commission. Inflation, so far, has been a two-way street; rising costs, particularly in the matter of salaries, have threatened to curtail the activities of virtually every State agency, but at the same time inflation has sent State income rising to an all-time high, leaving in residue the biggest general fund surplus on record.

It seems likely that most of these strictly inflationary expenses, even the increase in teachers' pay, can be met with the increased income from existing levies and the surplus now on hand. We recognize, of course, that salaries, once raised, aren't likely to come down again in proportion when the State's income falls off, as it inevitably will. The effect may be only to postpone a day of reckoning, but it should bring some comfort to the budgeteers who are currently wrestling with the problem.

The Medical Care Program, of course, represents the inauguration of a new and expensive State service, and poses a grave problem in financing. But here too there are mitigating circumstances, for the State will only be called to pay roughly one-third of the cost of the proposed system of medical centers. Even if this requires enactment of a special levy to support it, it cannot be postponed. As *The Raleigh News & Observer* points out, history demands that the matter of public health take precedence in State planning in 1946, as education did in 1880 and roads in 1920.

In this connection, we have noted a tendency on the part of opponents of the University of North Carolina Medical School to take advantage of the mounting budget figures as an argument in favor of stripping that provision from the Medical Care Program. This, of course, is only a later development of what seems to be a subtle and continuing campaign against the school. Even the arguments brought forward by this newspaper in opposition to the Chapel Hill site for the Medical College and hospital have also been offered in flat opposition to the project.

This, of course, is absurd. We believe the health program would be better served if the medical school and its teaching hospital were located in one of the state's major cities, preferably this one, but as we have stated before it would be far more desirable to have the school at Chapel Hill than to have no school at all. Indeed, the school seems to us the very cornerstone of the Medical Care Program; North Carolina's two excellent private medical colleges are not training enough doctors, nurses and technicians to meet the State's needs, and there is little point in establishing medical care centers if they cannot be adequately staffed. Furthermore, the teaching hospital's initial cost of about $5,000,000 is only a small percentage of the total amount involved in the Medical Care Program.

The Budget Commission's task is certainly not an easy one. It must increase current appropriations in order to maintain present services at their pre-war level, and to make possible certain needed expansions (for instance, the SBI and the State Highway Patrol have wholly justified requests for increased personnel and equipment), and at the same time turn its attention to its most urgent new business, the Medical Care Program. We wish the gentlemen well, and rest with reminding them that this is a season when the State's welfare may be seriously jeopardised by either undue conservatism or undue liberalism.

Eisenhower For President?

CONGRESSMAN MILLER of Minnesota, who launched a one-man MacArthur for President boom in the middle of the war and even seemed to have the General sold on it at one time, is at it again. This time, however, the interest of such G.O.P. stalwarts as Colonel Robert R. McCormick seems to have cooled. The Colonel's reason is age; MacArthur will be 68 when the next campaign rolls around, and even though he appears to be as well preserved as any man in the country, he is still pretty far along for residence in the White House.

Arthur Krock of *The New York Times*, who takes a somewhat more dispassionate view of these matters than the usual Party official, also notes that some of the General's "traits of character" might disqualify him. He refers, we suppose, to the General's stupendous arrogance, which made him far more unpopular with his troops than any other major American commander. These traits are also being questioned from a strictly military viewpoint; Hanson Baldwin, also of *The Times*, has written a now-it-can-be-told article on the fall of Corregidor in which General MacArthur is painted as more of a heel than a hero.

But even with General MacArthur out of the running, Mr. Krock feels that we may very well have arrived at a point in our history where the people would welcome a soldier in the White House. The bad taste left by Ulysses Grant's tenure in the White House has vanished, he believes, and even though only one professional military man has been nominated since Grant (General Hancock, by the Democrats in 1880) the chieftains of both Parties are keeping a speculative eye on the copious crop of brass-bound contenders.

The Democrats, of course, in all probability already have a candidate for 1948, but Mr. Krock thinks there is at least a possibility that Mr. Truman will be so discredited, or so disgusted, by conventiontime that he will withdraw from the race. If this happens, two generals, Marshall and Eisenhower, are quite likely to have the inside track for the Democratic nomination. And of these Eisenhower is more probable, for General Marshall is in the same age bracket with General MacArthur.

The most curious thing about this is that the Republicans are also reported to be deeply interested in the possibilities of running General Eisenhower as their candidate. Professional soldiers are political eunuchs, and nobody, it seems, knows whether the General is a Republican or a Democrat. For all practical purposes he is unaffiliated, and would be free to accept the nomination of either party if it were offered.

This seems to us a rather remarkable tribute to General Eisenhower. Such a question would certainly never arise in connection with General MacArthur. Although he also is devoid of political background, MacArthur is assumed to be a Republican by nature, and certainly the Democratic Party, which still professes concern with little "d" democracy, wouldn't touch him with a pole. Of all the big Brass, only General Eisenhower seems to have the qualifications that would make him acceptable to the extreme elements of both parties.

This is largely idle speculation, we suppose, but there is something encouraging about it. The country certainly could do much worse than choose the present Chief of Staff as its next chief executive, for no matter what party label he happened to wear he would remain an able, sensitive citizen who has demonstrated not only that he has faith in his country's democratic ideals, but that he understands them.

Abbott's A Man Of His Word

FURMAN BISHER, who keeps his ear against the proper knothole out at Griffith Park, reported yesterday that old Spencer Abbott won't be back with the Charlotte Hornets next year. This intelligence, we gather, is being received by the local baseball brigade with mixed emotions. Win (which he did most of the time), lose, or draw, the old manager somehow was never popular with the Griffith Park crowds.

Maybe it was because the fans were never popular with Spencer Abbott. He's getting a little crochety, and he resented the hoots of derision that went up when he went stumping across the diamond to lay down the law to one of his stable of young pitchers.

Be that as it may, it seems to us Charlotte was extraordinarily fortunate in having Spencer Abbott on board during this first season of post-war baseball. It wasn't only that he had a winning baseball team. More important, perhaps, was the manner in which he managed to build a fire under his oddly assorted bag of players, using the wisdom acquired in one of the longest careers in organized baseball to build a team that won the crowd's affection even if it had none left over for him. His 1946 Hornets broke all attendance records at Griffith Park, and left the club on a sound financial footing, and with an assured following.

Bisher reports a sizzling outburst from Abbott after a mid-season game in which he had taken a particularly rough going-over from the boys behind third base. "I'll give those damned so-and-sos a pennant and shove it down their throats," he roared. He did too, and even if it's a minority opinion, we'll be sorry to see him go.

One hears from old Kentucky that the well-known physical wreck, Andy May, has announced his candidacy for another term in Congress, unless he's talking through his oxygen tent.

In lively Paris, the Russian penchant for walking out of meetings is once more in evidence. Three huffs and a dudgeon, and Molotov has had his daily constitutional.

Plans to reach the moon fail to say which one. It will be remembered the songwriters have fixed up 48 states with a private moon apiece, as well as special wiring jobs for Miami, Honolulu, etc.

In the next round-table on "Parenthood Versus a Career" let's remember to call in the Californian who is a father for the first time at 54.

'We're Agreed Then, That There Is Such An Animal'

The Pictish Demons

To Understand The South....

TO UNDERSTAND the people of the South, you must look at their origins. There are English in Virginia, Huguenots in Charleston, French and Spanish in New Orleans, and Salzburgers in Georgia; but the great mass of the South, especially the Southeast, is Gaelic.

It is not literally true that, to the average Southerner, no battle, except King's Mountain, intervened between Bannockburn and Shiloh. But a glance at the telephone directory of almost any Southern city, except Richmond and Atlanta will show the predominance of Scotch names.

Subtly their thoughts color the thoughts of the South. Strange Pictish demons walk through the swamps and pine forests. The involuted talk of the Scot has left its mark upon the Southern idiom where every kinsman is a cousin. The loyalty to tribe and clan and family is as fierce and enduring as on the day when the Bruce hurled his gillies against the proud Edward.

It is small wonder that witch doctors of the South resorted to the fiery cross of the clansmen as the symbol of their sheeted parody. And the rhetoric of the South is endowed with a Gaelic fire that sometimes burns brightly without illuminating any object about it.

Nowhere is Southern thought more curiously paradoxical than in the field of civil rights. The South, in the frenzied years of the turn of the century, enacted none of the weird statutes against aberrant political and social thinking such as led to persecution in the Middle West.

Indeed, the only statute ever passed in Georgia that sought to interfere with freedom of thought and speech in any way was held unconstitutional by a Georgia jurist, when, after 50 years on the statute books without a prosecution, it was brought to light and an indictment returned under it.

The South has had its share of demagogues. The demagogue is recognizable by three obvious traits. He promises a vague Utopia in which milk and honey shall flow more opulently than in the New Jerusalem. He is flanked by a company of jackals who pluck the corpses of the State's treasury to dry bones. He selects as an object of attack some religious or racial group that is weak and relatively defenseless, and loads upon its back the sins of the people.

To a demagogue on the Pacific Coast, the scapegoat very likely will be the Nisei. Were he lived in Germany, before he put a bullet through his brain, his scapegoat was labeled "Jew"; his soul goes marching on in Boston, where he suppresses books, and overturns monuments in graveyards, and writes filth on the walls of synagogues, and waylays little Jewish paper-carriers on their way home at evening. In the South he hates "niggers."

But wherever he lives he fears schools and colleges and teachers and students. He feels that they are engaged in a single gigantic conspiracy against his rule, his person and his way of thought. His instinct is both sure and accurate; they are.

There was a day in the South when the educator was assailed for heresy, but after Poteat of Furman challenged the bigots and summoned the shade of Roger Williams to his defense, that form of attack lapsed. But the racial brand of demagogic attack continued.

Since the educator deals in a circumambulatory terminology, too often understandable only by his colleagues, it is easy for the demagogue to accuse and almost to prove him to be an advocate of miscegenation upon the basis of recommendation that Negroes be provided with sanitary privies.

The vision of an industrialized South has been received by Southerners with mixed emotions. The cult of industry is served by many who have no hesitation in proposing to turn the already exploited South into a mechanical slum, although there is force in their retort to the agrarians that cotton farming, especially in the one-crop areas, is a form of mass production indistinguishable from widget-making.

The South will not become, of course, either a single great factory of the habitation of 30,000,000 cheerful peasants engaged in subsistence farming. Neither idea has attracted the Southern mind, which rebels against either form of monotony.

The South is one of America's last remaining frontiers. Its development is consequential not only to the millions who live there but to the other 110,000,000 Americans who are citizens in a common country.—Governor Ellis Arnall of Georgia in the forthcoming book "The Shore Dimly Seen."

Ways And Means

DOMESTICALLY speaking, no section of the country is more dissatisfied as a whole with the activities of the Democratic party in recent years than is the South. But if an election were held today, it is likely that as usual no section would be more unanimous in its support of that selfsame party.

I have a feeling that Southerners once more had better be considering ways and means of getting an opposition party into operation, unless they want to find themselves voting for Henry Wallace as the Democratic Presidential nominee in 1948. Whether one likes the idea or not, most of the labor and liberal vote is going to be lined up for him. Mr. Truman will doubtless be regarded as the candidate of the conservatives when he seeks re-election. He also will be considered the candidate of those who advocate a realistic, "tough-appearing" foreign policy. Admittedly such a foreign policy risks war, as indeed most foreign policies do. But Mr. Wallace will appear as the avowed friend of the Soviet Union, our chief competitor in this post-war world, and as a man who can "get along with the Russians." The combination of an appeal that he can avoid war plus a promise to put into operation recently inactive New Deal reforms will make him an almost unbeatable candidate.

If he and Mr. Truman should kill each other's chances in the convention, there is a possibility that Chief Justice Fred Vinson might emerge as a compromise candidate. But people like Byrnes and Byrd will not even be considered. Such is the reward for party loyalty.

So unless Southerners want to vote for Mr. Wallace, with the possibility of Claude Pepper as his running mate, they had better look around for a second party.

Admittedly it is a bad situation. The Republican Party can never be strong or popular in this area, for there are too many bad connotations associated with it from Reconstruction days. Yet there is a far closer tie between that party and most Southern Democrats, economically, socially and constitutionally, than there is between those Democrats and the Northern wing which dominates the Democratic Party today. Certainly the Republicans seem much more the champions of free enterprise, a sound fiscal policy, and a stricter regard for constitutional principles.

Third parties seldom get anywhere. But if we won't accept the Republican group and we don't want to follow the present Democratic leadership, we may have no choice except to try to set up an organization which more closely follows Jeffersonian principles than does the party now in power. This would get us nowhere in 1948, except to divide the strength of the Democratic Party, but it might pay dividends in time.—NICHOLAS P. MITCHELL IN THE GREENVILLE NEWS.

Marquis Childs

World Co-Operation

STOCKHOLM.

WITHIN a few days, groups from all over the world will begin to assemble in Zurich, Switzerland, for the international congress of the co-operative movement. They will make great sacrifices to come to the first world congress of co-operators since 1937.

The Nazi revolution and then the war interrupted the once-powerful current of this movement toward economic democracy. In its truest and strongest manifestation, it has had the non-political objective of uniting consumers in ownership of the means to produce what they must buy and sell.

Co-operation suffered from the political absolutism of the left and the right where the state took over and became supreme in every department of life. But both in Russia after 1917 and in Germany after 1933, the all-powerful state discovered it was impossible to stamp out the co-operative movement entirely. The distribution system built up on a democratic basis was so effective that it survived revolution and dictatorship. But the dictators in both countries succeeded in transforming the movement so that it was merely a branch of the Government and no longer independent.

STILL SURVIVE

There is still a nominal co-operative system surviving in the Soviet Union from the extensive development that existed before Bolshevism. These state-controlled co-operatives will send a delegation to Switzerland but, as co-operative leaders elsewhere know very well, their independence will be so limited as to be practically non-existent.

One of the most important delegations at Zurich will be that from the United States. In the past decade, American co-operatives have doubled in size and in the volume of business they do on a co-operative basis. Among the American delegates will be Murray Lincoln of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, who on both the practical and idealistic side has done much to push co-operation.

Another American delegate will be Howard Cowden of Kansas City, Mo., who has played an important part in developing co-operative refining and wholesaling of petroleum products for distribution to retail co-operatives throughout the United States. American co-operators now own oil wells and refineries.

TO PROPOSE PLAN

Cowden is a member of a special committee which, at Zurich, will propose a plan for the formation of an international oil co-operative. This would be a bold move, since the oil trade is costly and involves large investments. But while the start would inevitably be modest, many co-operative leaders are confident that the plan is workable. Still, in many parts of the world, co-operation is a big business. The turnover of English and Scottish wholesale securities is measured in hundreds of millions of pounds annually. An international oil co-operative that could supply these consumers would have a ready-made market of sizable dimensions.

Such an organization has political potentialities that we cannot afford to ignore at a time when so much pressure is directed toward promoting political absolutes of black and white. Our State Department has declared in favor of some form of organization which would give all nations equal access to world oil reserves. This is a recognition of two things—first, of the idealistic aim of one of the planks of the Atlantic Charter; and second, of the source of war and imperialistic rivalry inherent in competition for the oil reserves in the stray corners of the earth. It's possible that a world oil co-operative might be a compromise solution which would avoid the dangers of outright ownership by various governments.

PRACTICAL METHOD

We will have to explore such possibilities if we are to prevent a clash between two absolutes. Good intentions and earnest declarations of faith are not enough. That is the eminent virtue of economic co-operation. It offers a practical method of progress toward wider control in sighter of the patterns that determine how men live. It is in direct contrast to the philosophy which holds that one pattern is predestined to prevail throughout the world without regard to human differences, human likes and desires.

Because it lacks the deceptive simplicity of a formula for saving the world at one stroke, many scorn it. But nevertheless, the co-operative is still a living force, capable of growth and expansion.

Peter Edson

Beware, Mr. Anderson

WASHINGTON

SECRETARY of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson had better watch out. President Truman has just endorsed one of his speeches in full, and for any Cabinet member—well Henry Wallace discovered—that's bad.

What Secretary Anderson said was that the new livestock and meat price ceilings were going to stand. The President backed him up. All the arguments they advanced were intended to show why price controls should be kept on, and how everything was going to be all right if they were.

Meat is now the No. 1 political issue of the campaign, way ahead of Henry Wallace and foreign policy. The Administration line on meat seems to be that if meat prices can be held down until after election, there won't be any wage increase demands and strikes until after election, and therefore the Democrats will have a better chance to win the election.

GOOD ARGUMENT

It's a good argument if it works, but in this presentation there has been no effort to find out what might happen if price controls on meat were now taken off. That's horse meat of another color.

Nearly everyone must admit that if meat price controls were now taken off, there would be an immediate rise in price. It should be fairly obvious, however, that if price controls are taken off when there is a short supply of meat animals, prices will go way up. If controls are taken off when there is a bigger supply of meat animals, the prices shouldn't go quite so high, or at least they shouldn't stay high for so long a time. Timing is, therefore, all-important in meat price decontrol.

When the argument is made that the July-August meat price holiday cleaned out the livestock supply, it is correct as far as the feedlots are concerned. But it does not cover the animals on the range or on the farms and not disposed of to the feeders. They're an unknown quantity.

Every chart and statistical table the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has on tap shows that the season when most livestock come to market is October to January. The figures also show that livestock prices have always reached their annual peak in August and September. From then on livestock prices start going down, reaching their low point along in January, then starting up again.

Fall is when bad weather and the end of grass drive the cattle off the range. About a third of them go to the feedlots for three to six months' fattening. Two-thirds—the better animals—go directly to market.

NO FEED SHORTAGE

Fall is when the Spring pig crop comes to market, too. Corn is harvested beginning in October, and this year there is a whopping big 3,400,000,000-bushel crop waiting to be cut. Corn harvest is the end to the feed shortage which limited pig production from 1944 on.

The big corn crop should lower corn prices. Lower corn prices should mean lower livestock and meat prices, as well as a larger number of pigs raised for slaughtering next Spring.

Lifting price ceilings on cattle and pigs now—letting the prices go up—should bring more animals to market this Fall. The bigger crop and the abundant corn should also encourage the feeders to fatten more animals faster.

On the other hand, keeping the ceilings on should be only an incentive to the stockmen to carry their animals over the Winter, keeping off some of the market because they know price ceilings are coming off June 30 and the prices then will go even higher.

CONTROL RUINED

If price controls had been kept on right straight through and if the farmers had known that controls were going to be kept on, all the arguments now being advanced by Truman, Anderson, OPA Administrator Paul Porter and others would be true. But when Congress permitted the controls to go off during July and August, they ruined price control for good.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Blandy Deplores Cancellation Of 3rd Test

WASHINGTON

IT WILL probably be denied, but Vice Adm. William H. P. Blandy and several of his top associates are boiling mad at the cancellation of the third atomic bomb test.

This was the test which the scientists predicted would really show the world the true power of the A-bomb, and which would have shown modern navies to be completely obsolete.

Unfortunately the reports of the colossal damage done by the first and second bombs were only made public piecemeal, days after the explosion took place, so that the public never got a clear picture of the fantastic destruction caused by the bomb.

Admiral Blandy and his sides have now made a confidential report which shows that more than half the men who would have been aboard the Bikini fleet would have been instantly killed; while more than 60 per cent of the survivors would have been permanently disabled or died of wounds.

Test No. 3—underwater—would have been even more horrible. That is why men like Blandy who have been doing everything possible to educate the public to the truth about atomic energy are so pretty well disgusted. One example of the mistaken conclusions which the public got as a result of bombs No. 1 and 2 is the case of the "Pig 311."

"Pig 311" is the porker supposed to have been placed aboard ship near the center of the explosion to demonstrate the effectiveness of bomb radiation on humans. After the second test it was reported that "Pig 311" had been hurled into the water by the explosion, had swum around 36 hours, and managed to survive with no sign of illness.

Scientists who checked this story, however, discovered that "Pig 311" had never been near the explosion and the incident had not occurred.

It never leaked out but when Admiral Blandy was about to hold a press conference aboard the USS Burleson which brought the surviving animals of the Bikini test back to Washington, an aide suggested that Blandy pose with "Pig 311" as evidence that the porker survived the terrors of the A-bomb.

"I will not be a party to any such hoax," replied Blandy, angrily. "We all know that 'Pig 311' never left this boat."

In the press conference which followed, "Pig 311" was not mentioned.

Real fact is that Blandy and his aides wish their superiors shared their realization of the A-bomb's devastating power.

Note—The bombs used at Bikini are mere beanbags alongside future bombs capable of destroying a hundred-square-mile area.

McKellar's Budget Balancing

SENATOR KENNETH McKELLAR'S conference with President Truman on flood-control spending wasn't as congenial—or as fruitful—as the gentleman from Tennessee intimated to the press.

Truman promised to "review" his executive order, under the War Powers Act, by which he slashed the $500,000,000 appropriation for rivers and harbors and flood control by two-thirds. This "promise" was largely a face-saver for McKellar, so he wouldn't have to tell the newsmen that he had been turned down cold in his efforts to get the order rescinded.

Actually, he was turned down cold. Furthermore, he caught an indirect lecture from the President for preaching economy for others while raiding the treasury himself.

Plainly irritated by demands from the Tennessee Senator and several members of Congress who accompanied him that the anti-pork-barrel order be rescinded, Truman said:

"Several of you have been after me at one time or another to balance the budget, but when I begin it—as in this case—you step on my toes."

As an afterthought, Truman added that those who were most vocal about balancing the budget usually wanted it balanced in some other state.

McKellar's Blushes

OBVIOUSLY the President had in mind a recent speech in which McKellar rapped him for the order blocking the rivers-and-harbors pork grab and challenged his right to issue the order.

The Tennesseean flushed as he listened to this lecture and looked for a moment as if he'd been beaned with a croquet mallet. When he got his tongue into gear again, he sputtered something about being "heartily in accord" with balancing the budget.

He added, however, that the rivers-and-harbors project shouldn't be docked more than its proportionate share.

Truman made no promises about voiding his order, except to say that he would be glad to "review" it. He repeated that it was necessary to balance the budget, partly because of its effect in maintaining the high prestige the United States enjoys among the other nations.

If the job had to be done at the expense of rivers and harbors, he was prepared to do it, he said, despite the bricks that might be thrown at him.

"The President usually has to take the bricks," he concluded, "and I can take them."

Note—The White House eventually may make some slight concessions on certain reclamation projects which the Budget Bureau now admits were cut too sharply, but that's all.