

When Is A Democrat Improper?

REPRESENTATIVE BRYSON of South Carolina is an orator with a silver tongue and a catholic taste in quotations. Last week, when asked if he thought Sidney Hillman rather than Robert Hannegan might have inspired a telegram from Democratic headquarters urging Party officials to select "proper candidates," he turned to the scriptures and said: "It was the voice of Jacob, but the hand of Man." To the next breath he added a bit of military obscenity: "The situation at Party headquarters seems to be SNAFU."

Well, SNAFU is as SNAFU does, and Representative Bryson and other Southern Democrats are preparing to clear up the situation at a caucus today, which Mr. Bryson thinks might end in a request for the resignation of Bob Hannegan as Democratic Chairman. It is somehow amusing to find Mr. Hannegan, a Missouri ward-heeler, thus branded as an agent of the PAC in the same week he is treated to a heavy-handed indictment by Harold I. Ickes, who says he is an arrogant and short-sighted practical politician unworthy of the leadership of a liberal Party.

Today's caucus, indeed, seems to be a

measure of the hyperstentility of the Southern Democrats. They arose in fury just the other day when a Party publication labeled their practically unanimous vote for the Republican Case bill a vote against the people, and now they are even more excited over the Party's mild "proper candidate" telegram, which they regard as a back-handed slap at incumbent Congressmen.

There is a delicate question involved here. It is obviously the Party Chairman's business to further the election of Congressional candidates who will vote with the Democratic Administration rather than the Republican opposition. What would Representative Bryson and his colleagues suggest Mr. Hannegan use rather than "proper" when he tries to meet his obligation to hold the Party in line? Would "loyal" suit them any better?

If there is to be a final division of the Party it seems to us it might as well be between "proper" Democrats and "improper" Democrats. We read no gratuitous slur into the last title; it strikes us as an adequate designation of a Congressman who accepts the benefits of the Democratic majority and votes with the Republican minority.

Bureaus Can Be Efficient

It would be the last to insist that the successful operation of one Government bureau disproves the popular indictment against bureaucracy in general, but the latest financial statement of the Home Owner's Loan Corporation is worthy of note. HOLC, a New Deal agency set up in 1933 to forestall wholesale foreclosure of home mortgages, reports a net operating profit of \$22,000,000 for 1945 after meeting all its own administrative expenses, property losses, and other fixed costs.

Now, HOLC was never intended as a money-maker, and it violated every sound banking practice when it began taking over mortgages on houses whose owners could no longer meet their payments. Capitalized with \$200,000,000 of Federal funds, it was expected to lose all of that, and some gloomy observers predicted that it would lose a lot more before the panic ended. HOLC did take a loss of \$337,000,000 from property abandoned by owners, but by the end of 1945 it had managed to whittle its debt down to \$200,000,000. By 1952, when it is scheduled

for liquidation under the legislation that established it, it will have regained its original \$200,000,000 capital and will even show a modest profit on the operation.

The job HOLC has done could not have been accomplished by private capital. The risk was too great, and the profit will, of course, represent a negligible return on the investment. There was no conflict with private bankers in the beginning, for HOLC worked to their benefit as well as the home-owners. There are bankers who would like to see HOLC go out of business now, turning its sound mortgages over to private capital, even though such procedure is no more than a roundabout method of gouging a subsidy from the Federal treasury.

The record of HOLC makes cheerful reading in these delirious times. The Federal Government, through devices like this, has deflated its inflation by placing its trust in the American people, making loans on faith. That trust was not betrayed then, and there is no reason to believe it would be now if the Government would only employ it in its current battle against inflation.

The Book Publishers' Gamble

AMERICAN book publishers have long enjoyed a freedom of expression unique even in a country that prides itself on its free press. They have been granted immunity to the unwritten rules of good taste that prevail in newspaper and magazine offices, and they boldly print those familiar four-letter words that, so far as more conservative publishers are concerned, are confined to the spoken language.

Aside from an occasional skirmish with the Board of Censorship in Boston, and a run on the knuckles from the Legion of Decency, the book publishers haven't run into any serious censor trouble in years. They have, indeed, been defended vigorously by their colleagues in the publishing business who are most proud of their own operations. Some of the most conservative newspapers in the land have broken a lance in support of literary liberty, with the possible exception of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, we can think of no major literary work that has suffered serious expurgation in the past three decades.

That literary freedom, or license if you prefer, has always seemed essential to us, even though it has been conferred upon the artist and denied the journeyman of our own craft. The writer of genuine literary skill must also be possessed of extraordinary intelligence and sound judgment. When he decided, as most of them do some 30 years ago, that it is necessary to reveal truth, he was obliged to order show his characters whole, there was no logical basis for objection.

But freedom of expression is a privilege, and like most privileges it carries with it definite responsibilities. Serious writers have, and do, recognize them. Joyce, setting out to follow a stream of consciousness, may cross the line of good taste, but his excursions are incidental to his major purpose, and those who seek pornography in his work are required to wade through endless passages that must be, to them, exceedingly dull. Joyce, of course, in the celebrated example of good taste, is less than a statue; the same result: Sinclair Lewis, examining the career of an unfaithful wife in *Cass Timberlake* and nonchalantly attempting to write a best-seller, offers little reward for the salacious, and his excursions are all his more lurid passages with satire.

But if the serious writers still meet their duty it appears that the publishers have forgotten it. We have at hand a questionnaire from Sheridan House announcing the fifth large printing of *Errol Flynn's Showdown* and the sale of the book in its native Sweden. Mr. Flynn is a right, Mr. Flynn has hardly earned his money as an artist through his movie career, so seriously has no standing as a novelist. *Showdown* is his first product, and it is a bit of a surprise that Mr. Flynn

himself is noted for his own amorous exploits, and these are the attributes that are being exploited successfully in his book's promotion. Other examples of irresponsibility are all too available—a book called *The Manatee* promoted on the basis of its author's bosom and an undraped picture of the notorious *Forster Amber*, an item called *Duchess Hotspur* which embodies passages so lurid they unintentionally achieve burlesque.

The line between literature and pornography is difficult to define, but we have an idea the book publishers had better set themselves to the task, and soon. There may be good money in some of the strange products they're bringing out these days, but there is also good money in French postcards if you care to conduct your business in an alley. They are asking for censorship, formal and legal, or the "voluntary" variation that has strangled the heart and soul of radio and the movies, and they are cutting the defensive ground from beneath their own feet, and the feet of the newspaper and magazine editors who are their traditional allies. Let them remember, before it is too late, that the judge who refused to ban *Ulysses* did so because the work itself demonstrated that Joyce was trying to do something more than sell his novel. Suppose that trial were repeated today, with *The Manatee* as its subject. The prosecution could explode the literary defense by simply introducing the publisher's newspaper advertisements and the *Forster Amber*, and the press agent retained to promote the book, as a witness.

The publishers are gambling with more than money. A mass of great literature, just now beginning to appear in America, is the stake.

In Austria the Russians are reported trying to live off the country, a feat which no one has accomplished in style since the late Napoleons.

They think plutonium with the nerve extracted can be made a useful member of society, but we wonder. They were saying this 25 years ago of near-ber.

Having jolted Americans, Russians and Grammarians during the visit here, Mr. Churchill returns to his staid countrymen who have learned to laugh him off except in dire emergency.

People's Platform

Heading For Pandemonium

HERE is a copy of a letter I have sent to Representative Samuel Ervin:

Here are some angles to this OPA controversy that may be overlooked in the heat of the argument. Since President Truman blew the lid on wages, price rises have, of course, become inevitable (the guy that invented the theory that wages can go up without prices following ever had some imagination). And, generally, these increases have been granted at or near the raw material level—as in the case of steel, cotton, yarn, ester, etc. Obvious, each such increase results in a deluge of requests for increases from fabricators, converters, etc. It is not the OPA that is the trouble, but the rising magnitude and complexity of this situation and that before long the chaos will be so general as to break the whole system down.

Apparently the OPA realizes it is on the defensive for it is turning from defending prices in general to defending the cost of living index. This will relieve some distress, but if they stick to their "net worth formula," they still will be warring on profits more than on prices. Anyway you take it, what the OPA needs is a change in attitude. And the only way to cause that is to scotch their cost absorption theories and vote for the amendment that recently lost out by a close vote in the Senate that would guarantee cost plus a fair profit for all production.

Beyond this, the OPA should stop trying to squeeze profits by allowing a price increase at the raw material level and then delaying the increase in the finished articles. Just as price control began at the raw material level so it should end there. And finally, the OPA should lift their controls on those thousands of items that make little or no difference anyway.

Anybody who wants price control should realize that the OPA is not giving it to us. Their crude against profits kills much production by turning manufacturers into more profitable firms. Their crude against profits kills much production by turning manufacturers into more profitable firms. Their crude against profits kills much production by turning manufacturers into more profitable firms.

THANK you for your Editorial "A Year Without Roosevelt." You have always been fair and just in your editorial writing, and I am sure that you can be said of some of our contemporaries.

Yes, Mr. Roosevelt is gone and how we miss his advice and his help. He was a man who was safe to say that had he lived much of the bickering and hard feelings between the Great Powers, during the past year, would never have developed. We miss his steady hand.

Drew Pearson's • Russians Dislike U. S. As Home Of U. N.

Merry-Go-Round

INSIDE reason why the Russians are pulling wires to have the capital of the United Nations moved back to sleepy Geneva is that America has been too powerful a champion of the smaller nations.

So the Russians have been working behind the scenes to coral votes in favor of the Geneva transfer and can count on Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland and France. However, they can't count on the British, who once favored a European capital, but now are 100 per cent sold that American opinion is one of their best allies.

The Russians also can't count on the Latin Americans. In the old days, Pan-American diplomats loved idling in Paris most of the time and turning up in Geneva a few days of the week. Today, however, Paris is one of the most uncomfortable places in the world. Geneva is short of food, and New York is far more pleasant.

The Russians, who originally favored an American city as the U. N. capital, now consider this a serious mistake. They dislike the fact that American newspapers publish columns and columns of front page news on every move made by the Russians, and they figure that American newsmen at Geneva would sit idly by in the Swiss cafes drinking beer or spend week-ends in the Swiss Alps.

In Europe, they also believe, no photographer or newsmen would have energy to trail Ambassador Gromyko on his famous and circuitous trip around New York City when he almost stopped in at the Security Council meetings, but didn't.

If the Iranian question had been discussed at Geneva, instead of in New York, the Russians figure it never would have attracted so much attention and the Soviet would have come off with a complete victory.

his kindness, his wisdom, and his tolerance. And the little children, the little crippled children of Warm Springs, Georgia, miss him, too, and have not forgotten him.

I also wish to tell you how much I enjoyed the articles on the Jew in Palestine by Mr. Ralph McGill of the Atlanta Constitution.

Surely the time has come for our nation to join with Great Britain and other nations in making that ancient homeland of the Jews a haven for the victims of Nazi oppression who are now homeless and destitute.

—MRS. EDNA C. HENDRICKS.

Underground Report

SINCE many people have inquired about the nature of our digging operations opposite Liggett Drug Store on Trade Street, it was our thought that this work would be of interest to bus commuters and others who travel down E Trade Street for board buses again at the same old spot at Liggett Drug Store instead of the present temporary spot at Market Street.

It is contemplated that this section will again be opened to traffic and the pavement restored by Thursday afternoon.

This work was necessary to install a new sewer line to drain the new deep basement at Liggett Drug Store. Some of the cuts were 14 ft. deep. Most of the people were unaware of the fact that this work was tunneled down E Trade Street for a distance of approximately 150 ft. This was done to get the required fall and connect into the old sewer which was installed about 1899. The present sewer opposite Liggett is about 8 ft. deep, about six feet too high to accommodate the new basement at Liggett.

The work was performed by the writer and I would like to mention that the various departments of the City of Charlotte as well as the Police Department were very co-operative and helpful in performing this work under the most adverse traffic conditions in the City.

—C. M. HEFFELINGER.

(NOTE: On behalf of the sidewalk superintendent of Charlotte, as well as the bus-drivers, we herewith thank Mr. Heffelfinger for this inside insight into the inner workings of the Square.—Eds., Tins News.)

The People's Platform is available to any reader who cares to mount it. Communications should be sent to the editor, Tins News, 100 N. 1st St., Charlotte, N.C. It is 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.—Eds., Tins News.

George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College, has played right into Russian hands. Prior to U. N. occupation, President Shuster had not been using his buildings as a meeting place for the Russians, but he has been meaning and groaning that he wants them back in order to set up a housekeeping department for his lady students, apparently the only U. N. girls in the world. He has little opportunity to keep house.

Marked on a disapproving U. N. delegate, New Yorkers seem to react that their inconveniences people. To some extent, so does peace.

Jews in Germany KINDLY, mild-mannered Ben Cohen, counselor of the State Department, was approached by a delegation of American Jewish leaders to make his home in Germany. He was told that the Jews in Germany are still unable to find permanent homes. They wanted Cohen to help them migrate to the United States and other countries.

Cohen expressed his great sympathy, but said: "I can't do it because I can't use my position for any personal cause. I must decline my effectiveness on other things." The Jewish delegation replied: "Can you think of anything more effective than to rescue 100,000 hapless Jews in Germany?"

Cohen, however, refused to budge. NOTE—Chief difficulty regarding the future of Jews in Germany is that Hitler hated war so deeply, inland, and during a period many years to come the life of a Jew in Germany would be almost unbearable.

No Army Race Prejudice A NEGRO former master sergeant in the Army, Marlon F. Green, testified before General Doolittle's "caste system" committee that he had seen little or no racial prejudice and discrimination in the Army. When General Doolittle inquired about this, Sergeant Green replied: "I don't know."

Finally, the proposal reached the President's Council on War Relocation. The proposal was obtained in his presence with Secretary of Agriculture Clayton K. Anderson. The proposal was discussed with the Council on War Relocation. The proposal was discussed with the Council on War Relocation. The proposal was discussed with the Council on War Relocation.

They talk with an almost mystic awe of something called the corn-hog balance. The balance of the corn-hog balance is the amount of grain available for shipment to Europe. Therefore it is important for millions of European Europeans as well as for politics and profit here at home.

While he was still head of the Office of Price Administration, Chester Bowles promised farmers there would be no decreases in hog prices before September 1 of this year. That commitment was part of the effort to increase meat production.

But now the pendulum has swung the other way. The objective is so that grain can be released for shipment abroad. Hogs are being kept on the farm today until they fatten to 70 and 80 pounds, which is very fat even for a hog.

So that he could stick to his promise and still start a movement of hogs toward the packing plants, Bowles came up with an ingenious plan. He proposed that farmers be paid a premium above the ceiling price for lightweight hogs.

At the same time, a small premium would be paid on 50,000,000 bushels of corn. This could be done by Government subsidy at a cost of not more than \$15,000,000. The corn could be routed into channels where it would serve as animal feed and thereby release wheat for export.

Bowles was well aware that this was the last of a series of moves toward higher price demands. Therefore he proposed to counter it with an announcement that after September 1 the price of hogs would be reduced.

Among others he consulted was Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace, one of the high priests of the corn-hog balance. Wallace knew it was a sound idea—on paper. But he expressed good-natured doubt as to whether Bowles would have the nerve, in the face of the public's solid opposition, of the farm bloc, to announce the reduction in hog prices which was the key to the plan.

Bertram Benedict

Democratic Caucus

THE meeting of the House Democratic caucus today is unusual in that it was called, not to consider pending legislation nor to set the party machinery in motion, but to discuss the whole situation of the party. Probably in this setting-down-the-house session no votes will actually be taken. Caucus sessions are secret, and the proceedings are supposed to be confidential.

The House Democratic caucus always has been the best meeting of each session to make the party nominations for Speaker and other officers of the House, and to elect the Committee on Committees. This latter body nominates the Democratic members of the committees of the House; then another caucus is held to ratify the choices. Several more caucuses may be held on organization matters, but caucuses on legislative matters have become less frequent than formerly.

THE rules of the two-party caucus of the House and of the two of the Senate are all different. In fact, the House Republicans call their meeting a "conference" and not a caucus. A member is not considered bound by caucus decisions unless he attends himself to the caucus meeting. Even when the caucus used to play a leading role in the selection of the Speaker, certain party "mavericks"—for instance, the late Senators Borah and La Follette—were known for their never attending a party caucus.

In the House Democratic caucus, the members of the party are "rescued" from their decisions if he points out that in his election he was not bound by the caucus. If a local party organization, or by other prior commitments, he is pledged to a different course than that demanded by the caucus. He may be rescued, but the caucus is not bound by his decision.

When the Speaker was shorn of most of his dictatorial powers in the revolt against "Cannonism" in 1911, the House caucuses took over many of the powers that had been vested in the Speaker. President Wilson's first term saw much use of the Senate and House Democratic caucuses in putting through legislation. The caucuses discussed legislative proposals while these were still in formative state, and the caucuses were the final form in which they were supported by the Administration.

PLANS EFFECTIVE The minimum of Democratic insurgency when bills finally came to a vote. After Wilson's caucus was "disappointed" and disuse, partly because it was held in secret, partly because it was accused of trying to steam-roll dissenters.

The present caucus of the Democratic Representatives is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives.

THE caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives.

THE caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives.

THE caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives. The caucus is being held in the House of Representatives.