THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 1947

Of Change And Continuity

WHEN for nearly twenty years a man heads an organization, especially if it happens to be the large and complex organization that is this newspaper; when he battles with it through the major trials of war and depression and scarcities; when he suffers a serious illness, yet returns resolutely to his duties—

And when, in time, finding it imperative that at last he divest himself of his heavy responsibilities, he does so retaining the admiration of the men and women who have been his associates for all or a part of those years—

Why, then, we think it may rightly be said that the man has proven himself in the end, as in the beginning, to have been worthy of his position of leadership and trust, and to have deserved the esteem in which he is held by all who know him.

That no one may be uncertain whom we mean to single out for tribute, we name William Carey Dowd Jr., publisher of The Charlotte News, who in the next day or two gives over to a younger and more vigorous man. It is one of the ironies of his profession that Mr. Dowd should be mentioned in these columns only as he finally severs his life-long connection with THE NEWS. The laws of modesty and anonymity he has always observed only now may be suspended to note here the high regard and warm affection his associates have held, and will continue to hold, for him.

THE NEWS, from its founding in 1888 until today, has been a family enterprise, owned first by the elder William Carey Dowd, and later by his children. It has been, always, more of an institution than a business; its owners have regarded it first as a public trust, second, as a means of livelihood. The corporate structure of the newspaper changes now, but the basic principles upon which it was founded, and upon which it has flourished, do not. This was guaranteed when sale of the newspaper was arranged, reluctantly, after it became evident that Mr. Dowd could no longer carry the burden of its management. His successor in the publisher's chair was carefully chosen; Thomas L. Robinson shares in full measure the convictions that have motivated W. Carey Dowd Jr., and beyond that he is superlatively trained and equipped for the responsible position he assumes.

Schooled in the exacting methods of *The New York Times* as it was run by the late Adolf Ochs and his right-hand man Louis Wiley, Mr. Robinson is immediately at home in any newspaper's advertising, circulation and news departments. For some weeks now, while the processes of the sale were being disposed of, Mr. Robinson has been in Charlotte. Already he has begun to acquire an acquaintance in the community and a knowledge of its activities.

After Mr. Robinson is officially installed as publisher of THE NEWS, the proprieties will forbid personal comment about him in these columns. In this little interlude, however, while THE NEWS eyes him speculatively and he eyes THE NEWS, an interim forecast may be in order. Tom Robinson has previously demonstrated his capacity as a great and well-rounded publisher; he has made it plain that THE NEWS under him will be a worthy continuation and enhancement of THE NEWS as it was under the predecessor W. Carey Dowds, Sr. and Jr.

'The Art Of The Possible'. . . .

WORLD WAR II was a great leveler, and when it ended only two nations — the United States and Russia — retained the capacity for global war. This hard military fact has shaped international relations not only for this nation and the Soviet, but for all nations. The first, best hope was that the two giants could maintain and improve the degree of co-operation they had achieved in the face of a mutual enemy. It was upon this hope that the United Nations was founded; with the consent of the only potential aggressors mankind could move into a new era in which international differences would be settled by law, if either balked the world would slide quickly into the familiar, deadly pattern of power politics.

Well, the world has begun to slide and the old pattern is re-emerging. No man now can successfully put his finger on the point at which Russo-American relations (and man's recurring dream of peace) began to deteriorate; it is too soon for any man to divide the blame between the two giants, although uncritical patriotic in both countries have never stopped trying. Perhaps it was an inevitable historical process, or an act of God. In any event the thing has happened, and it happened at a time when James Francis Byrnes of South Carolina represented the Western giant in the council chambers of the world.

The historians will have to decide whether Byrnes could have altered the pattern of 1946, and whether he really tried. Certainly he has had long practice in bowing to the inevitable; politics, as he successfully practiced it all his life, he called "the art of the possible." As Secretary of State he did what it seemed possible for him to do, and he did it well. Once he had accepted, as the great majority of his countrymen had also accepted, the proposition that genuine co-operation with Communist Russia is impossible, he moved with his customary vigor and skill into the battle of the green baize tables. In according him its accolade at Man of 1946, *Time* could say of him: "By patient, purposeful tinkering with the details of the satellite treaties he managed to get over to the Russians and the world that the United States had planted the weight of its power in the path of the Russian advance."

A year and a half ago Jimmy Byrnes inherited the remnants of one shattered world. Stepping out of the State Department in accordance with the demands of his failing health, he turns over to his successor two worlds. Measured against the ideal represented by the United Nations, this is a tremendous failure; measured against the realities as Jimmy Byrnes saw them it represents a great victory.

• • •

NOBODY, certainly, can quarrel with President Truman's choice of George Marshall as successor to Mr. Byrnes, unless he also chooses to quarrel with the basic foreign policy the Administration is pursuing with the consent and blessing of the Republican Party. There is no reason to object to a soldier in the State Department at a moment when every diplomatic decision is based on a military potential.

Moreover, the usual criticisms brought against the professional soldier do not apply in the case of General Marshall. As wartime Chief of Staff he demonstrated a dedication to democratic ideals, and an impressive flexibility of mind. He is one of those Americans who grew great in time of crisis, a man who measured up to the every demand, military and otherwise, made by one of the most exacting assignments in our history.

We may regret the circumstances that make a soldier an acceptable Secretary of State in this time of tentative peace, but we cannot ignore them. And if we must have a military man, Mr. Truman couldn't have selected a better one.

Another Point For The Cynics

THE cynics have always insisted that you couldn't make a lottery conviction stick in Mecklenburg County, and Superior Court has just provided additional evidence to support their theory. What started out months ago as a great and stirring effort to smash the town's thriving gambling syndicate wound up this week with a plea of *nolo contendere* and a pair of $2,500 fines.

In between the alarums and excursions in Police Court and the dull thud in Superior Court there occurred a series of events worthy of a B grade movie. One key witness disappeared after announcing that he had received threats against his life. Another made a hurried trip to Mexico or Cuba (the State isn't certain). Newspaper reporters received mysterious phone calls from South Carolina. And when Carl Vann, the man who furnished the most damaging evidence in the preliminary trial, was finally brought back by force there followed as fine a comedy of errors as we can recall. First Vann refused to testify on constitutional grounds until the State withdrew an indictment pending against him in another case. Then he was stricken with a heart attack. And after a doctor found him able to take the stand he suddenly professed so complete a lack of faith in God Almighty it made his oath on the Bible meaningless.

Vann's third swing was a home-run. Judge Nettles accepted this profession of infidelity as a disqualification, thus setting a precedent, if we understand it correctly, that should prove invaluable to our prosperous criminal element. If a man doesn't care to testify in court all he has to do is identify himself as an athiest, and he therefore receives automatic immunity from the perjury laws; he can lie to his heart's content and the law can't touch him.

We leave it to our peers to decide who gets credit for this travesty — Solicitor Whitener, who kept a witness in the Stacks case in escrow for seven months on the off chance that a conviction might be reversed by the Supreme Court, but couldn't seem to think of any way in the world to hold onto his lottery witnesses: Vann's attorney who displayed a marked genius for spotting loopholes; the Judge who had reason to believe Ferguson and Smith guilty enough to fine, but not guilty enough to go to jail; or maybe our whole legal system.

All we know is that the cynics are still batting a thousand per cent, and if you want to put a couple of bucks down on the butter 'n eggs you shouldn't have any trouble locating someone to take care of the transaction for you. We wouldn't be surprised to see the runners wearing sandwich boards from now on.

An explorer reports ground whale meat is like hamburger. Parents who entertain the Friday night junior-high mob would be wise to figure on the whole whale.

A man wounded 70 years ago in battle receives the Purple Heart from a thoughtful Government. The usual citation goes with this, to refresh the hero's recollection.

'Where Did You Get That Pink One?'

People's Platform

Fat And Sassy

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

MAY I let off a little steam on the "prominently spread disastrous treatment of the GI War Brides"?

In the afternoon's paper, there is an article concerning this, and it states that it is played up in the English papers. Why do they not play up the instances where the English girls leave their husbands after finding that all America is not milk and honey? And after they find that America is not the gravy train that lots of them came over to find? This is not about all English brides. Just the ones it fits. I am a single girl and do not object at all to an American marrying an English girl, not if they make him happy. I hope that some of the GI's have done them dirty. But one of the complaints was that the American Red Cross only gave them $4 a day. Did they ever try working? I'm sure there are lots of part-time jobs in New York. I'm sure, too, that there are lots of hotels in New York that do not cost $80 per week. I know I couldn't afford that, and I see no reason our Red Cross should find it for them, when there are good accommodations to be had for less money.

Another beef! About the shabby treatment they get in New York. How do clerks know they are War Brides? Do they ask, "Are you a War Bride? If you are, I'm going to ignore you, if not, I'll wait on you." I don't believe this. And how do passersby know that they're needed as War Brides? They don't have tags on them, do they? We Americans have been kept waiting, in restaurants, stores, and everything else we wanted for almost six years, but we don't think it's because we're one definite class of people, it's because the clerks are busy, the business establishments are understaffed.

By the way! I lived on less than $4 for several years, and I'm still fat and sassy. Ate every day too.

—DISGUSTED WORKING GAL.

(NOTE: Red Cross officials in New York say they have assisted no more than 30 stranded war brides since the war ended, and even in these cases assistance didn't include an $80-a-week hotel room.—Eds., THE NEWS).

Youth For Christ

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I RECALL seeing comment in the local press and the poster on N. Tryon St. about the "Youth for Christ Movement", and I wondered if anyone had brought up the question as to whether or not this is the same organization mentioned in the anti-Semitic Gerald L. K. Smith's, "The Cross and the Flag" for November 1946.

Smith writes: "I have helped the Youth for Christ Movement financially, and I am proud of it. It is a great movement. I am for it, and I shall continue to support it."

I was just wondering. —DAVID HILL.

NOTE: We don't know. But whether Gerald L. K. Smith has contributed or not, we have detected no trace of anti-Semitism in the Youth for Christ Movement.—Eds., THE NEWS).

Logic

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I NEVER was a Bilbo man; always thought that Mississippi could do a lot better, but when I read THE NEWS during the recent investigation of this gentleman where a Russian Jew imigrant with eight or ten years in this country behind him was so interested in the Senator's defeat that he was willing to invest twenty thousand dollars in it, right then I decided that there must be something to Bilbo and it might surprise you, Mr. Editor, to know how many of your countrymen share this opinion.

—T. F. DAVIDSON.

(NOTE: It doesn't surprise us, but it does depress us; under Mr. Davidson's system of logic he would have to support Josef Stalin because Adolph Hitler tried to run him out of office.—Eds., THE NEWS.)

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.

Quote, Unquote

IN all my experience I have never heard—one labor leader speak a single word of justification for a jurisdictional strike.—John Stelle, former National Commander of the American Legion.

The UN is judged too much by what happens in the Security Council, in which there is enough done despite differences to prevent the flame of war.—Miss Mabel Head of Cleveland, vice-president United Council of Church Women.

The care of the aged and chronically ill must not be left to the old man with the long white beard and the scythe.—Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp, former Food and Drug Administrator.

Booms and depressions can be eliminated—but not by Gogernment alone. Both labor and management are needed in free America. They have got to learn how to get along.—Irving M. Ives, Republican Senator-elect of New York.

Times are evil because men are evil. It is necessary that men should become good again so that times may also become good again.—Pope Pius XII.

I think it's clear: we simply have to find the solution (to peace) or perish—Dr. William G. Penney, British physicist at Bikini.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Gen. Clay Forced Change Of Command

WASHINGTON

INSIDE fact about the shift of U. S. commanders in Germany is that the stage was set for the change shortly after Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay visited the National Association of Manufacturers in New York six weeks ago.

Shortly before that, the Senate War Investigating Committee (the old Truman Committee) had sent its chief counsel, George Meader, to Germany and he had come back with a preliminary report highly critical of what went on in the U. S. occupation zone.

General Clay, then in the United States, was much upset by this report and talked to Secretary of State Byrnes about resigning. He felt that Gen. Joseph McNarney, top commander of U. S. troops in Germany, was the man really responsible, though he, Clay, as head of the Military Government for Germany, got the blame.

On top of the unfavorable Meader report, General Clay addressed a meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers and afterwards sat down at an off-the-record meeting of NAM leaders including some of the top moguls of American industry. Their solution for the future of Germany was simple. They told Clay that they should be permitted to get in touch with their opposite numbers in Germany industry—the I. G. Farbens, the Opels and the other big industrialists who helped build up Hitler's war machine.

If allowed to do business with the German cartels, the U. S. industrialists told Clay, they would have Germany back on its feet in no time.

This shocked General Clay. Later he told Secretary Byrnes and his superiors in the War Department that he would retire from the Army immediately and go back to his old home in Atlanta if any such deal was carried out.

Furthermore Clay told the NAM members at their off-the-record meeting that the German people did not believe in or understand free enterprise and that Germany could only continue under strong government control.

In the end, Secretary Byrnes strongly supported Clay and urged the War Department to relieve General McNarney. The War Department agreed. It is significant, however, that before the change was finally agreed on, the State Department sounded out some of the GOP leaders on Capitol Hill. They agreed, too.

Russian Lend-Lease

SECRETARY of State Byrnes has sent a third note to Russia demanding immediate settlement of Russia's seven billion dollar lend-lease debt. And since the first two notes were completely ignored, this time Byrnes instructed Ambassador Bedell Smith to deliver the note personally either to Stalin or Molotov.

In the end, Smith saw Molotov, informed him he had received orders to hand the note personally to the Russian Foreign Minister because the first two notes were still unanswered.

Molotov replied that he was not aware of the previous failure to answer. This caused Ambassador Smith to state in rather blunt language that the lend-lease settlement had dragged on for six months and Secretary Byrnes wanted it given immediate attention.

Molotov said he would take it up with Premier Stalin, and that ended the interview. It is still too early to expect a reply.

Reorganization Stand Pat

IT didn't leak out of the secret GOP caucus, but Speaker Joe Martin took a firm and decisive stand against any change in the LaFollette-Monroney reorganization of Congress.

"Republicans cannot afford to back away at the reorganization setup," Martin warned when Representatives W. Sterling Cole of New York and George Bates of Massachusetts, ranking Republicans on the Naval Affairs Committee, wanted to hold out against amalgamation with the Military Affairs Committee.

"Even though you think there might be changes for the better," the Speaker continued, "you must remember that the bill was passed by Congress and has become law. If we go in there and try to tear away the consolidation of committees, the people of the country are going to think we wanted reorganization only in order to get ourselves bigger salaries and are ready to junk the rest of the bill." (The bill increased members' salaries from $10,000 to $15,000.)

Bates and Cole then took the floor, each delivering a grandiose eulogy on the history of the Naval Affairs Committee though sadly agreeing not to carry their fight to the floor of the House.

Good Neighbors Cool

ONE of the best friends the USA ever had south of the border, ex-Foreign Minister Oswaldo Aranha of Brazil, arrived here this week in what to him may have seemed like a homecoming. For, as Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, Aranha knew this country better than any other recent Ambassador, perhaps better than many Americans.

He traveled from coast to coast by auto, visited U. S. cattle ranches (he is a cattle rancher himself), attended Republican and Democratic political conventions, never missed the Kentucky Derby, and coined this diagnosis of Democratic-GOP campaign tactics: "The Republicans promise Santa Claus to both the righ and the poor; the Democrats promise Santa Claus to the poor with the rich man's money."

While Aranha's current visit to the USA may have seemed like a homecoming from a personal viewpoint, from a broader point of view it may not. For, in the years since he served as Ambassador and Brazilian Foreign Minister, the United States has largely reversed Roosevelt's keen interest in Latin American affairs. And while we have been arguing about Trieste and the Danube, our former good neighbors have started turning in other directions.

Aranha is scheduled to speak in Cleveland this week, and if he talks straight from the shoulder, he will disclose that the Communist vote in Latin American countries has jumped alarmingly; that the old wartime bond between the United States and Latin America has cooled, that the USA cannot buy friendship with Export-Import Bank loans, and that we really will have to work at good-neighborliness if we want to keep the best international asset we have—the Pan-American bond of unity.

Marquis Childs

Mr. Truman's Choice

WASHINGTON

IN preparing his message on the State of the Union, President Truman recognized that he was in a spot. He would face a Congress that was indifferent, if not hostile; a Republican Congress looking to final victory in 1948.

There were two choices. He could write a spirited, fighting message reaffirming the objectives of his predecessor. Or he could make the best of a difficult situation in words of caution and compromise.

Given the President's temperament and background, the latter choice was inevitable. His speech before Congress had a curiously dry, academic sound. He was saying to the powerful opposition in the legislative branch of the Government, "I'll be good if you'll be good." Behind the earnest, uninspired phraseology was a wistful hope.

LABOR PROGRAM

The speech was academic because his recommendations are doomed to be ignored. The most detailed section of the message dealt with recommendations for improving collective bargaining and for bettering the relationships between management and labor. One recommendation was for a commission, to be named jointly by Congress and the President, which would study these problems and, not later than March 15, suggest steps to be taken.

But Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, the man who will really run the Senate during the coming year, has already made his labor recommendations through a small policy group that includes Senator Joseph H. Ball of Minnesota and Senator H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey. After brief hearings, a stiffer version of the Case Bill will be passed and sent to the White House. When that happens, the President will have a really difficult decision to make.

The President's recommendations for social and economic legislation were phrased in general terms. He is for vigorous enforcement of the anti-trust laws. He is for broadening the immigration laws to admit more homeless and displaced persons from Europe. He is for a bill providing adequate medical care "to all who need it, not as charity but on the basis of payments made by the beneficiaries of the program."

Where he comes nearest to colliding with the Republicans is in the two paragraphs of fiscal policy. While he does not put it in so many words, the President makes it plain he is against any tax cuts. He goes further and wisely urges that the wartime excise taxes due to expire June 30 be continued through the coming fiscal year.

WEAK SPOT

The largest section of the message deals with housing. The President talks about an "aggressive" program as though he himself had not scuttled the controls that might have made low-cost veterans' housing possible.

In reality, the situation President Truman faced a year ago and the situation he faces now are not so different.

A year ago, he delivered a long message, wrapping up the Budget and the State of the Union in one package. In that message of January, 1946, he made 21 recommendations for specific legislation. As he was careful to point out, most of those same recommendations had been made before.

Now look back at the record of the year just ended. With minor piecemeal exceptions, only two of the President's recommendations were put into law. One was the full-employment bill, which was enacted in a watered down form. The other was the law providing civilian control for atomic energy. This had tremendous backing in public opinion. It was passed finally, thanks to the zeal of Senators McMahon, Vandenberg and Millikin, and of Representative Thomason of Texas.

In the light of this record, with supposedly Democratic majorities in both houses, what happened on Nov. 5 was seen to be merely a confirmation of a condition that already existed. The Republican victory ended a fraud and deception.

GOP RESPONSIBILITY

We can see now very clearly that the responsibility in the next two years will be a Republican responsibility. In the words of the Prayer Book, for those things that ought not to have been done, blame will rest on the GOP. Likewise the credit for constructive steps will go to the party in power in the legislature. We have a Republican Government.

That is the real meaning of the President's message. That is the State of the Union today, and it may be that history will show that Mr. Truman was right to recognise the reality.

Samuel Grafton

President's Message

NEW YORK

SINCE we live in a terminological culture, in which a great part of the process of thinking consists of giving names to things, it is perhaps important to put an identifying label on the President's message to Congress. Is it liberal, is it conservative, what is it? It is a little hard to say, because it is a kind of mixed product; it might be called a liberal speech which has been put through a conservative mangle. The marks of our recent conservative shift are on it; and while parts of the Roosevelt vision are still there, it is like a dream which has been edited by a man who does not believe much in dreams.

NEW CENTRISM

Perhaps, then, this is the first state paper of a new American centrism. There has never been much of a center movement in American politics, which is usually a politics of the right, except for brief moments, when it fractures itself against a depression, or something, and is temporarily replaced by an improvised left. But in the Truman message we have done something different, a strange combination of conservatism without animus, and liberalism without the glow.

The difference between the old liberalism and Mr. Truman's new centrism is quite clear. The new centrism is not anti-labor, but it is not at ease with labor. Mr. Truman does not speak for labor; he speaks to, at and about labor; there is now a space of clear daylight between the President and the labor movement. Surprisingly enough, it is not in the President's moderate recommendations for restrictions against certain forms of striking that the change shows up, so much as in a certain air of lack of identification with labor, a bothered impatience with its wage problems, conveying the implied wish that labor will go away somewhere and keep quiet until he gets his work done.

The new centrism says good things about housing and health, but it is like a mumbled recitation of maxims from a copybook; it says what it says without much quickening of the breath or lifting of the eyes. It does not share the Roosevelt vision of the affirmative; it does not indulge in grand phrases about the third of the population that is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed; it operates rather more in the spirit of one who is willing to pay a somewhat larger price for the privilege of not making many changes, than of one who, by instinct, loves and longs for change.

All this does not imply that the President's position is invalid; the message may go down in history, in a dull way, as the charter of a new middle movement. It is a movement which is perhaps big enough to include a Dewey and (except possibly for certain attitudes on labor) a Taft. And the development of a center would be a step toward political maturity in our republic, in which rightist, primitivist, has too often had a clear field; it would not inspire many songs, but it would help to draw a line between the reasonables and unreasonables.

COMPROMISE NEEDED

A great deal depends, of course, on events. If Mr. Truman fails to fight for his moderate program against those who really do fall to right, his position will become only a kind of sugary conservatism, losing its faint special character as a philosophy of the center; and if the Republicans heedlessly swamp his requests, they, too, will have helped to obliterate a new and useful political growth. We could use a center in American life; but it remains to be seen whether conservatism, to help constitute one, will be willing to move to the left say even one-tenth of that painful distance which official liberalism has marched to the right of recent months.