# THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1946


## Unity Can Also Mean Inaction

THERE may be those in North Carolina who believe that school teachers do not deserve the pay scale proposed by the teachers of the South Piedmont District at their Charlotte meeting, but if so they have yet to speak out. Instead there has been a blast of roundabout criticism of the South Piedmont teachers on the ground that they have broken the North Carolina Education Association's united front by insisting that the NCEA-sponsored 20 per cent increase is not enough.

This sentiment has been voiced now by several newspapers, and the comment of *The Statesville Record* is typical. The South Piedmont district, in *The Record's* view, "flew the coop, denounced the 20 per cent and said they were stopping nothing short of 40 per cent . . . We say that it was most unfortunate, untimely and regrettable, and it is to be hoped that teachers generally will not suffer. They are in need of increases."

Certainly the book-keeping of some of the 40 per centers represents a spectacular flight from reality, based as it is on the assumption that the increase in the State's estimated income is permanent. We doubt seriously if the Legislature can meet the South Piedmont District's demands without increasing taxes or turning to the Federal government for aid. And this may very well make a 40 per cent pay increase in the next biennium impossible; it does not, however, make the higher pay scale unreasonable.

The argument that the teachers by asking for more than 20 per cent are likely to get less strikes us as ridiculous. The South Piedmont District, by demonstrating that the NCEA's 20 per cent request is quite conservative, has, we think, actually strengthened the NCEA's position. The rebellious teachers made the point, with which even their critics in educational circles agree, that the teachers' pay scale must be brought abreast of that prevailing in comparable professions if the schools of the state are not to suffer irreparable damage. That, it seems to us, is the heart of the matter, and, even if the financial problem thus posed is insoluble at the moment it nevertheless should be laid before the Legislature and kept there until a solution is found.

Politicians, once in office, make a fetish of unity, for unity guarantees an absence of that political conflict which threatens their own security and peace of mind. It is quite natural that the hard-pressed gentry at Raleigh would like to see the teachers united behind a demand for a 20 per cent pay increase, which they might be able to meet quite handily without any undue strain on their swollen budget. But the effect of that would only be to put off coming to grips with North Carolina's most pressing educational problem—the establishment and maintenance of an adequate pay scale that will guarantee a competent and stable teaching force in the public schools.

## Ghost With A Golden Voice

REPUBLICAN Chairman Carroll Reece, who is directing a good, clean campaign designed to identify all Democrats with the Communist Party, has come up with a loud cry of "foul" because the Democrats are broadcasting transcriptions employing the voice of the late Franklin Roosevelt. This, says Mr. Reece, is an unsportsmanlike attempt to take advantage of the oratorical gifts of a dead man.

We can understand, of course, how Mr. Reece would be aghast at this latest technological advance in the science of politics. The prospects are frightening, indeed —not only are the Democrats thus able to bring back the golden voice of their greatest vote-getter, but, perish the thought! they might even dig up recordings of campaign speeches made by Herbert Hoover and Alf Landon, the Republicans' outstanding vote-losers.

The Republicans have always charged, even when Mr. Roosevelt was still alive and untransribed, that his radio personality constituted an unfair political advantage. The absence of that smooth and lilting, "My friends . . ." from the airways this Fall has been the occasion, indeed, for an official Republican celebration in Philadelphia at which the Honorable Joseph Pew announced happily that a G.O.P. victory had been insured by the fact that "the Pied Piper is no longer here to charm the rats . . ." Hearing those pear-shaped tones from beyond the grave would be enough to prompt stronger Republicans than Mr. Reece to beat their foreheads hopelessly against the nearest wall.

Being of a sympathetic nature, we are pleased to be able to offer Mr. Reece and his cohorts a few words of comfort at this critical juncture. The oratorical gifts with which Mr. Roosevelt was so richly endowed, helpful though they may have been, were only one of his minor political assets. There have been other, perhaps greater orators who lost out in spite of their ability to charm the birds down out of the trees. William Jennings Bryan, for instance, who never managed to get down off his Cross of Gold. Winston Churchill whose great eloquence could not turn back a tide of post-war reaction against his party. Thomas E. Dewey, who studied for the opera and brings to the microphone as mellifluous a baritone as any politician in the business.

We suggest to Mr. Reece a possibility that has apparently never occurred to any of the Republican high command: There is a chance that Franklin Roosevelt's enormous popularity stemmed from what he said, not from his manner of saying it.

## The Restrained Cave-Man Technique

WE are a sometime reader of the breathless dispatches from Hollywood, and we can take them or leave them alone, but we were struck by the account of the recent elopement of Artie Shaw and Kathleen Winsor. Mr. Shaw we recalled as a handy man with a hot clarinet, but until we came upon the box score of his past marriages we had never identified him as a Casanova.

This, we are informed, is the fifth time Mr. Shaw has taken a bride in his 36 years. With the possible exception of his first wife (unnamed in the story we saw, and described only as a New York nurse) Mr. Shaw's mates have been reigning beauties handily equipped with large incomes. Lana Turner, the sweater-girl, was number two, Jerome Kern's lovely daughter was number three, and North Carolina's curvaceous Ava Gardner number four. His latest, of course, is the author of *Forever Amber*, a doubtful novel which has certainly complicated her income tax problems. We remember the beautiful Miss Winsor kindly for a remark she made when an interviewer asked her if there was any element of autobiography in the career of her remarkable heroine, Amber. "Do you think," inquired Miss Winsor sweetly, "that I would have had time to write the book if I had led Amber's life?"

We studied a photograph of Mr. Shaw at some length, seeking a clue to the charm that won these five beauties, but to no avail. His great success, we decided, must stem from his manner. And buried in the story of his latest marital venture we found an account of the dissolution of his last marriage that, we think, explains all. In seeking a divorce Miss Gardner explained to the judge that it was Mr. Shaw's custom to "belittle me when I talk, and ridicule me when I remain silent." This technique, which can be labeled restrained cave-man, may pall in time but obviously it would add a certain piquancy to courtship.

Mr. Shaw, of course, has no patent on it. Reading Miss Gardner's testimony we were reminded of the tale of the elderly farmer who explained to his cronies at the village store his method of keeping his wife content and in her place. "I'm going home now," he said, "and if supper ain't ready I'm going to raise cain. And if it is I ain't going to eat it."

## Another Voice

## The Lament Of A Lame Duck

SENATOR RAYMOND E. WILLIS, Republican, Indiana (until 1947) has been reading a mournful roll hereabouts of things bad and Democratic. There is scarcely any sin which he does not impute to the present Administration. We have space only for a few of the cardinal ones —the five things which, as the Indiana Solon said in Asheville Monday, have grown grown larger and more menacing—

The national debt, the number of broken homes through divorce, the percentage of juvenile delinquency, the amount of Government propaganda, and major crimes.

The tremendous national debt, accumulated in time of depression (which the Republican Administration did little or nothing to head off) and in time of war, had a somewhat sizable stimulus from the deficits of the Hon. Herbert Hoover. As many Republican homes have been broken, we suppose, as Democratic ones. Juvenile delinquents are too young to vote. Government propaganda—well, what is "propaganda," Senator? The wave of "major crime" has us stumped, but we are willing to blame Mr. Truman if the Senator will own up to Mr. Harding, who also had a crime wave on his hands after an earlier war.

What makes this tirade rather amusing is Senator Willis' thesis, repeated over and over, that the Democratic Party is guilty of "demagoguery." And what makes it faintly out of date is that Senator Willis himself was retired as a back number last June by his own Indiana Republican Party in nominating convention assembled. —*Asheville Citizen.*

Among the lately deceased is a famed mynah bird, which called "hello, darling" and whistled at any cute dish as she passed. Plainly someone had contributed to the delinquency of this mynah.

---

Russia, toughening up in its attitude toward defiant Turkey, looks more and more like the formidable character with an ax in the background of the Thanksgiving cartoon.

*Harold Ickes*

## More On Pipe Lines

WASHINGTON

WITH householders paying practically $20 a ton for coal, with higher prices in prospect in view of Mr. John L. Lewis' present threat of still another coal strike, the reluctance of the War Assets Administration even to consider selling the Big and Little Big Inch pipe lines for use as pipe lines to carry natural gas to the Eastern seaboard is, to put it mildly, somewhat more than strange.

It is even more curious in view of the fact that the best bids for the pipe lines run from 80 to 100 million dollars (cash), or even higher, for gas as compared with smaller bids by some 20 or 30 million dollars for oil. Moreover, the oil bids seem to be based on the thoughtfully generous theory that the oil promoters will pay these 20 or 30 million dollars less if good old Uncle Sam will lend them what they need at a negligible rate of interest.

There is a suspicion in some quarters of a desire to sell these pipe lines to a certain bidder who pretends that they would be used for oil. There might be such a token use for a couple of years followed by bankruptcy in order to wipe out the debt to the Government and then a frenzied appeal to permit their use for gas. Certainly, no other use would represent business sanity or be economically sound.

GAS LOST

With no profitable outlet for natural gas, drillers for oil allow it to escape into the air, or simply let it burn. Travelers through the West and Southwest see the gigantic flares lighting the night sky for miles.

Nor is the gas that is lost insignificant in amount. The Bureau of Mines estimates that each year some 684,000,000,000 cubic feet are lost. In the State of Texas alone, close to one billion cubic feet are dissipated every day—the equivalent of 150,000 barrels of oil a day.

Actually, enough gas is lost in the oil and gas fields each year to heat from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 homes. The use of the Big and Little Big Inch lines for the transportation of natural gas would make possible the saving of an appreciable amount of this gas. This would mean much to our oil reserves, already greatly reduced by the record-breaking demands of the war.

Furthermore, the strange, self-imposed policy of the War Assets Administration that the Big and Little Big Inch should be sold only for the transportation of oil disregards the fact that gas can be moved only through pipe lines. Unlike oil, it cannot be moved in tankers.

ANOTHER ARGUMENT

Another factor which appears to have escaped the consideration of WAA is the effect that oil-use of the lines would have upon the employment of the existing large tanker fleets. The use of the Big and Little Big Inch for oil, even if it were not economically unsound, which it is, would necessarily relegate a large number of tankers to idleness and decay, thus undermining the nation's security.

Only one man in these United States boasts the power and has exhibited the disregard of the public welfare that presumably would be necessary to make the War Assets Administration and its able administrator, Mr. Littlejohn, thus fly in the face of all logic and economic realism. That man is John L. Lewis, the dictatorial chief of the United Mine Workers, who has no regard for the public, as is proved by his threat to call another strike. For all that he cares, we may be charged $50 a ton for coal, and even lose a war, just so long as he can crack the whip from the driver's seat. Incidentally, Mr. Lewis might explain to the American people just what his connections were with Nazi Germany at the beginning of the war and when he undertook to defeat President Roosevelt in 1940.

UNANSWERED QUESTION

Mr. Lewis and his railroad and power allies are of course unwilling that coal should have competition from natural gas, but why the WAA should be willing to yield to the machinations of the man who did not hesitate to sabotage the war program is a question that remains to be answered. Of course, it would not be Mr. Lewis but the people who would have to dig into their pockets to pay the enormous cost of the waste involved.

*People's Platform*

## The Problem Of Sugar

CLIFFSIDE

Editors, THE NEWS:

REGARDLESS of its composition, the 80th Congress will have several important domestic problems with which it will have to grapple firmly and with dispatch, if it would avoid a drastic turnover in 1948. One of those problems is the sugar supply for the American consumer.

Over two years ago, Hon. Clinton P. Anderson exposed the folly of the Washington administration's collaboration with the British Empire in discouraging production by the sugar plantation owners in Cuba and other areas in the islands of the Atlantic, and revealed to those who took the trouble to read his report that the basic reason for the shortage in sugar was the inadequacy of the Government's purchases from the sugar growers. No OPA or bureaucratic squirming can successfully get around that basic fact.

And now comes the news from Fulton Lewis, Jr., who has debunked more governmental control nonsense than any other broadcaster or news reporter, that the Washington administration is apparently planning to dump the whole sugar bowl problem into the lap of the United Nations Organization. Why that organization should have a thing to do with it, has not been explained, but the fact is that within the organization is another organization titled "Food and Agriculture Organization," which was apparently commissioned by the UNO to investigate the sugar needs of the world, and the FAO has just published its recommendations which call for 12 per cent less sugar consumption than we consumed in an average pre-war year. When the estimated increase in population in America is considered this means that the committee acting for the United Nations Organization recommends that, as of 1950, American sugar consumption be cut 30 per cent from pre-war consumption, which in other words means to keep it where it is at the present moment. This, of course, is proposed to be implemented by continued governmental control and rationing.

When the 80th Congress convenes it will be high time to crack down with emphasis and speed upon this whole proposition, and the control of this nation's economic needs restored to Congress and other governmental forces of this country. There is decidedly where the United States, as one of the members of the Security Council, could rightfully exercise its veto power, and the UNO be thus told to attend to its own rightful function of preventing future wars instead of meddling in domestic economic affairs of member nations.

Meantime, voters should make it known in no uncertain terms to 1946 Congressional candidates that unless they tackle this problem with emphasis and speed when they reach the halls of Congress, they will be summarily dismissed two years later.

—A. F. STRETTON.

### Under Two Flags

WAYNESVILLE

Editors, THE NEWS:

SINCE the discovery in 1942-43 that in the eighth grade children in the public schools were being taught that on May 20, 1775, on our state flag, is probably untrue, there has been a great deal said about it in the newspapers and in club meetings. The publicity thus given caused me to refresh my memory as to the authenticity of the date and the meaning of a state flag.

It was not until 1861 that the people of North Carolina began seriously to think about the need of a flag. When the secession convention met on May 20, 1861, Col. John A. Whitford, a member from Craven County, introduced the bill since known as the Ordinance of Secession that proposed to take the state out of the Union of States and to unite with the Southern Confederacy of seven states that had shortly before been organized at Montgomery, Ala. The ordinance was unanimously passed.

On the same day, Colonel Whitford was made chairman of a committee to have the first state flag made. William G. Brown, of Raleigh, was chosen to submit a design. The design was submitted and carried by vote. It consisted of a red field, or Union, on the left with a white star in the center, and the date, May 20, 1775, above the star, and the date, May 20, 1861, below the star. The two horizontal bars to the right of the Union, the upper one blue and the lower one white completed the flag. This flag was ratified by the State Legislature on June 22, 1861.

The dates signalize the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence and the Ordinance of Secession. The flag was carried at the head of North Carolina troops during the Civil War and was continued as the state flag until March 9, 1885, when the present flag was adopted. The author and designer of this second flag was Johnston Jones, a member of the Legislature of that year. He introduced the bill on Feb. 5, 1885, giving as his reason for a new flag that the one of 1861 was a battle flag and we needed one that signalized peace. The bill was voted into law on March 9, 1885.

The one passed at that date and now honored has some of the features of the first one—a blue field, or union, instead of red, the letter N to the left of the star and the letter C to the right of the star. Above the star a scroll with the inscription May 20, 1775, and below the star the scroll with the inscription April 12, 1776, with the two horizontal bars, the upper red and the lower white. The two dates signalize the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence and the Halifax Resolution of that date instructing the North Carolina delegation in the Continental Congress to vote for national independence.

Thus the North Carolina Legislature has gone on record as honoring the Mecklenburg Declaration on the two flags and again in 1907 when the act was passed ordering the flag to be flown in or about every public building in North Carolina including every public school.

It is my information and belief that North Carolina people want still to honor this flag and have their children to study its history and honor it.

—W. C. ALLEN.

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

*Samuel Grafton*

## Tories On Warpath

NEW YORK

THE weather (speaking globally) has not been favorable for conservatism these past few years; but of all the conservatisms in the world, American conservatism has certainly been the luckiest. In a world in which Socialism is increasingly a fact, it is not, in America, even an issue. It is as if a high wind, racing across the planet, had parted to sweep around America; and in these circumstances one might expect that American conservatism would sit quietly on its little chair, shaking as gold, hoping to continue not to be noticed.

But political dynamism does not work out in that way. It is precisely in America, where conservatism has been least challenged, that it is most actively on the warpath. It has just won a tremendous victory against price control, and here again, one might expect it to relax for a bit, and let its victory cool off, and try to enjoy it.

WAGNER ACT NEXT?

But no; it is mobilizing once more, this time for an attack on the Wagner Labor Relations Act; and Washington gossip has it that this will be the next point of pressure against Mr. Truman. The President is being told that unless we can in some way limit strikes, we shall have a depression; and he may go along, because of his well-known habit of saying no, no, no, no, louder and louder, then suddenly ending with a weak little yes.

Whatever the arguments, the drive could hardly be timed more tactlessly. The American workman sees prices going up, as inflation makes almost every seller (willingly or unwillingly) a master of the disappearing coin trick. The workman also sees the beginnings of an attack on rent ceilings. He hears, too, that there is going to be a recession. In these circumstances his labor union becomes his last resource, and when he sees a campaign opened against that, also, he must really have the feeling that little men are after him.

Then again, business has won its victory against price control on the simple and austere ground of freedom. How can it turn around, and, in speaking to labor, alter the slogan to read: "more freedom for us, more controls for you," without creating a moral confusion, and starting ideological Roman candles popping in all directions?

PART OF PICTURE

But the drive is on, and one has a feeling that it is part of a picture which must be painted in dark colors. It is as if American conservatism had absorbed into its body all the aches and sorrows suffered by its fellow-conservatisms abroad, and was fighting back for them, here. Listening to conservative speeches, and noting the strong conservative tendency to relate the most innocent developments in social progress to the world revolution, one has the feeling that conservatism murmurs, as it advances: "Tsk tsk, for what happened in Russia. Take that, for what is happening in France and England!"

But this isn't Russia, or France, or Britain; and it is somehow tragic to see America becoming the citadel of a world conservatism, fighting here, mainly because it has no other place to fight, the battles of its lost brothers; mounting a kind of counter-revolution, rather irrelevantly, against a people which has never made a revolution. Conservatism is trying to win back its own, in the one place in all the world where it has never lost it.

BELATED EXPRESSION

Only in this light can we fully understand the curious, hungry offensive which conservatism is generating, in the fond belief that it is fighting defensively. The agitations which have swept world rightwing sentiment for half a century find now a belated and inappropriate and dangerous expression. It is like a montage of broken bits of film to give a working stiff, say in Peoria, reaching for a buck for butter, only to have it denied, in part because, 30 years ago, there was a revolution in St. Petersburg and Moscow.

*Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round*

## Lewis Wants Coal Weighed Before Washing

WASHINGTON

IT was heralded in the headlines last week-end that the chief subject of discussion by the Cabinet was the threatened coal strike. This was false.

Actually, President Truman gave the impending coal strike only a few brief seconds. He opened the Cabinet session by stating that, since Secretary of the Interior Krug was absent from the city, the subject of coal would be taken up at another time.

Meanwhile, Government lawyers are at odds over the interpretation of the contract John L. Lewis signed with the Interior Department last Spring. Attorneys for the Labor and Justice Departments are privately critical of Interior Department lawyers. They say the coal contract is loosely worded and full of loopholes.

However, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Warner Gardner, who helped draw up the contract, claims that under its terms Lewis has no right whatsoever to call a strike. He says privately that Lewis is merely looking for a chance to cause embarrassment on the eve of elections. The contract provides for discussion between Lewis and the Government of technical matters only, not wages and hours.

The technical matters Lewis has thrown into the Government's face are, first, that the coal is weighed at the tipple after it is washed, not in coal cars before washing. Washing at the tipple means that the ash and rock is sorted out so the coal weighs 4 per cent less. This, Lewis claims, reduces the miners' welfare fund of 5 cents per ton.

In a scant five months, however, the welfare fund has already reached $7,000,000, and the United Mine Workers are so wealthy that they have purchased one of the largest office buildings in Washington, in addition to buying the swank University Club as oak-paneled headquarters for John L. Lewis.

Grievance No. 2 against the Government is failure to give miners allowance for vacation pay when they leave the job before the end of the year. Here, however, Krug has already accepted an award in Illinois in favor of the miners. Thus, only one issue, washing coal at the tipple, remains to be settled.

For this, John L. Lewis threatens to close down the entire coal industry.

Note—Real fact is that Lewis has always wanted to negotiate a contract in November, on the eve of cold weather, rather than in the Spring, on the eve of warm weather. Obviously his negotiating powers are much greater when people face shivering homes. Also, he is not averse to stirring up a little industrial uncertainty just before elections.

### Pat Hurley's Language

DOWN in New Mexico, a battle of the languages is going on between Patrick J. Hurley, Hoover's ex-Secretary of War, and Senator Dennis Chavez in their race for the U. S. Senate.

To appeal to New Mexican voters it is almost essential to speak Spanish. New Mexican courts, for instance, are bilingual, with both Spanish and English official.

Senator Chavez, of course, is equally at home with either language. Hurley is not. However, Chavez has pulled a new trick on the ex-Oklahoman.

"You want somebody in Washington who speaks your language," Chavez tells his audiences. "But I want you to know that I also speak Pat's."

Whereupon, Chavez proceeds to recite the Lord's prayer and the Ave Maria in Gaelic.

Pat Hurley, of course, while making quite a play of being Irish in Catholic New Mexico, speaks not one word of Gaelic.

Note—At one time, Pat did not make such a great show of being Irish. His father was born O'Hurley, and kept that name all through life. His son found that being Irish was no political asset in Oklahoma, and dropped the "O."

### Averell Harriman's Baby

HE would like very much to forget it, but Averell Harriman, the well-meaning new Secretary of Commerce, has found a troublesome problem child on his doorstep. Though head of Union Pacific Railroad and director of the Illinois Central, Harriman, as Secretary of Commerce, now has to help pass on the ticklish question of raising railroad rates.

The problem child was found on Harriman's door-step when he first took office. The man who put it there was Acting Secretary Al Schindler, who had to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the Commerce Department's view on railroad rates.

High railroad officials, conferring with Schindler in a secret meeting, told him they had been promised a rate increase by the White House. Accordingly, they asked a 25 per cent raise.

Commerce Department transportation experts, on the other hand, advised Schindler that: The rails will handle 54,000,000,000 fewer ton-miles in 1947 than in 1943, and 6,000,000,000 fewer passenger miles. Despite this, they will employ 107,000 more people.

Schindler's net reaction: If anyone came to me with a proposal that they hire more people to handle less business, I'd fire them right away.

Whereupon he signed a statement putting the Commerce Department on record against the 25 per cent increase.

This was the Commerce Department's official position when Harriman and Schindler took over his new job, and so far he has not officially changed it.

### Private Railroad Ally

EVEN though Harriman can't go to bat for the rails, he, however, they have a stalwart ally in the Cabinet—John Snyder. When Snyder was reconversion director, railroad men say he promised that, if they would give labor a wage boost, they in turn would give a rate boost. This was never publicly admitted, but it was why railroad executives informed Schindler they had a private commitment from the White House.

Though they are both from Missouri, Snyder forgot to pass this word on to Schindler, and now it's going to be difficult for new Secretary of Commerce "Rail Car" Harriman to reverse him.

Note—When Harriman was asked by the press whether he believed in enforcing the Anti-Trust Act, he declined comment. One of the Justice Department's biggest Anti-Trust cases is against Harriman's Union Pacific; but even so, it is unusual for a Cabinet officer to refuse support for a law which is on the statute books and which is a vigorous policy of the administration of which he is a member.