THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher — J. E. DOWD, General Manager — HARRY S. ASHMORE, Associate Editor

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1947

'You Tell 'Em, Kid—I'm A Sovereign Power Myself'

Britain Has No Choice

ON November 27, 1945, four months after Britain's Labor Government had assumed power, Winston Churchill offered in Parliament a motion of censure on behalf of the Conservative Party. The motion was defeated by a vote of 381 to 197.

This week Winston Churchill launched another frontal assault on the Attlee Government, designed to unseat it, or at least force a Labor-Conservative coalition. His timing was shrewd. Britain was shivering in the midst of an acute coal crisis, food was as short as it had ever been, the nation was wracked by strikes, the disintegration of the Empire was far advanced. But once again Churchill's motion of "no confidence" was defeated, this time by a vote of 374 to 198. In a year and a half of genuine hardship, marked by the fumbling of the Labor Government, the opposition had picked up just one vote.

In a very real sense the vote in Parliament reflected a lack of confidence in the Conservative Party. With all his customary eloquence, Winston Churchill had presented an impressive bill of indictment. The Socialist formula for placing basic industries under Government control, he thundered, is "a crime against the British state and people, the consequences of which have hampered our recovery, darkened our future, and now endangered our very lives." Certainly many Britons must agree with Mr. Churchill; it is incredible that so conservative a people as the British could generate any real enthusiasm for socialism. Why then, did the Parliament, far more responsive to popular pressures than our own Congress, fail to respond to the old hero's eloquence?

The answer lies in the Conservative Party's failure to offer a substitute for the socialism it deplores; as did the Republicans in America, the Tories are trying to beat something with nothing. There is far more unreality in their approach than there is in the most grandiloquent dreams of the socialist planners, for they steadfastly refuse to recognize the fundamental changes that have taken place in their country. They are saying, in effect, "Return us to power, and we'll give you the sort of government you had before the war." The British people, gazing at the physical ruins of their nation and feeling the clutch of their failing economy, understand that the sort of government they had before the war brought them to their present plight. Theirs is a bankrupt nation, and it is hardly reasonable to expect them to appoint as receivers the politicians who bankrupted it in the first place.

The socialist program in Britain is no revolution, in the sense that a revolution represents a popular uprising. In the light of events taking place a few miles across the English Channel, it is a conservative program—offered, and accepted, as a substitute for complete centralization of power in the state. It is a desperate sort of compromise, designed to safeguard individual rights while granting the British Government power to compete with the totalitarian nations that now dominate most of Europe. The Labor plan may not work. So far it has not worked. But the average Britons must weigh that chance against the certainty that the road to the past recommended by Mr. Churchill leads only to a dead-end. It is not surprising that he still supports the Attlee Government after a year and a half of bitter privation; so far he has been offered no other choice.

Is There No Common Interest?

THE argument preceding the Supreme Court decision upholding the right of foremen to belong to labor unions is more interesting in many ways than the decision itself.

The case, like most labor litigation these days, grew out of the Wagner Act. The National Labor Relations Board had held that all employees, whether working in a supervisory capacity or not, are entitled to join a labor union. Management had protested on the ground that this violated the close working relationship between the owner and his foreman; labor union membership, it was argued, would ally the foreman with the worker and turn him against management's interests.

The Supreme Court upheld the NLRB decision, making the point that all employees are presumed to be working in the interests of management. To forbid foremen membership in unions would certainly have the effect of recognizing that the interests of management and union are not only different, but opposed.

The sad truth seems to be that in many cases—perhaps most cases—both management and union bosses believe this to be true. The relationship between worker and employer is thus reduced to its ultimate economic simplicity—the employer seeking to keep costs down by paying minimum wages, the worker using his bargaining power to obtain maximum wages.

The argument over whose fault this is is like the argument over the chicken and the egg. Labor unions were organized to protect workers against unscrupulous employers; employers are now turning to the law for protection against unscrupulous labor bosses. But the process has led inevitably to a steady deterioration of labor relations.

The assumption that the interests of labor and capital are ultimately identical, whatever immediate differences may divide them, is part of our national faith. Neither can prosper at the expense of the other, for in the end they must stand or fall together. That was the principle the Supreme Court upheld, and it is an important one. If we abandon it completely, as we have come close to doing in the past, we shall have to revise the whole theory of free labor relations, recognizing the presence of an inevitable conflict between worker and owner which can be kept in bounds only by the use of the sovereign powers of government.

That may be necessary now, as many on both sides are arguing. But if it is, this is a sad day for all of us, for employer and employee alike will have to yield still more of their traditional freedom.

Council Is In The Middle

CITY COUNCIL is caught squarely in the middle of conflicting demands for permanent assignment of the Armory basement. The difficulty is that both demands are valid, both causes deserving of support.

The Park & Recreation Commission has a *de facto* claim. It is in possession of the basement with its Teen-Age Club, a highly successful enterprise that has provided wholesome entertainment for thousands of Charlotte youngsters and has even turned a modest profit in the process. Everybody talks about juvenile delinquency, but the Teen-Age Club represents one of the few concrete steps being taken here to combat it.

The other claim is made by the National Guard. The Armory basement has always housed local Guard units, becoming available to the Teen-Age Club only when the Guard was called to active Federal service during the war. Now the 378th Combat Engineer Battalion is being reactivated and needs a place to establish its headquarters and store its equipment. The Armory basement, says its commander, is the only suitable place.

An attempt at compromise was made by a City Council committee which offered facilities at Morris Field to the Guard, but it has failed. The Guardsmen argue, with justice, that the location is too far out of town and is totally unsuitable.

The Teen-Agers argue, with equal justice, that their need for a central location is just as great as the Guard's.

Solomonic wisdom won't provide an equitable solution to these conflicting claims; it is impossible for both parties to share the basement. Somehow Council must find adequate quarters for the displaced group, whichever it may be. It would be unthinkable for the City to fail to meet its clear obligation to the Guardsmen and to the Teen-Agers.

Another Voice

Ban 'Lanterns On The Levee?'

THE late William A. Percy's "Lanterns on the Levee" was a gentle, revealing portrayal of an earlier way of life on the Mississippi Delta and of the humanitarian spirit of its author. It is, deservedly, considered a classic; it has gone into many editions and will continue to be printed and read for many years to come. Will Percy purported to speak for no one but himself. This he did gracefully and with rare skill. He was not concerned with whether his opinions were those of the multitudes, or that some of them did not fit into a changed world. "Lanterns on the Levee" was his story alone.

But now comes a witch-hunt, directed against a dead man and his life story. The Teachers' Union (CIO) of New York has demanded that it be banned from school libraries, along with other books which it considers unfair to Negroes and containing offensive statements about the Negro race. We'll pass over the fact that in his own, great-hearted way, Will Percy was fairer and more compassionate toward all people, Negroes included, than anyone we know. Even if that were not true, the demand of the union is as dangerous as it is asinine. If any organized group can come along and by political pressure succeed in having books banned because of their opinions, the shelves of every library in America will be thinned out.

We haven't noticed, moreover, any demand by the New York Teachers' Union for the banning of books which present ideas in extreme opposition to Will Percy's. That would be the fair thing to do — if there is anything fair at all in book-burning tactics.

And the final irony is this. New York City is supposed to be the center of American liberalism. As such it climaks many dangerous illiberal groups which masquerade as democratic organizations. Yet, on the library shelves in Mississippi — college and public and private — are books which are as repugnant to many Southerners as Will Percy's book apparently is to these assorted, protesting crackpots.

They'll probably end by banning Will Percy's book. We say ban and be damned. "Lanterns on the Levee" will be read long after this idiotic book purge is forgotten.—*Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times.*

People's Platform

Eagle Versus Bear

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

THE world situation is so wonderful that it is hard to refrain from comment thereon.

Two powers with opposite ideals and concepts and contradictory purposes and interests, burgeon a condition of world politics that will vary as the balance of power rests with Russia or the United States. And thus will be determined the future world supremacy of Communism or Democracy. The guns are silent; the destiny of the race will be determined in this generation and the next in the minds of men. Upon the stage stand, with preeminent power, the American eagle and the Russian bear.

Isolationism takes its place among the relics of history and America becomes the hope of mankind wherever men strive to be free. Only nations with vast expanse of territory — in this atomic age when populations can be destroyed in an instant, and communication travels like rays of light — play a part in world dominion. China, Brazil and India, because of inferior technology and wealth; because they have not achieved scientific method; or because of weak governments or lack of unity in their populations are, and will be, unimportant in shaping world policy during the present period of decision. France and Italy are gutted of their substance and are bankrupt; Germany is destroyed. The shadows of sunset are falling upon the British empire, whose navy rules the wave; whose imperial edict made the conditions of life for the nations under palm and pine. The star of America is in the ascendent. Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa are gathering under the wings of the eagle; and our South American policy takes on primary importance. (Witness the trip of Truman to Mexico as a straw in the wind).

And now the Russian bear stands with one foot upon the prostrate form of Germany, which she would absorb, and peers into the lands of the nations of western Europe and licks her chops, and leers at England, and turns again and growls in the East, and blows the hot breath of infidelity and Communistic tyranny upon the lands of the Orient, and prowls among the colored races of the Antipodes. Far must we fling the spirit of America; man must not pass under the dark shadow of serfdom; he is not the property of governmental power. Russian history does not justify her rule over her own people, for, aside from her czars and her aristocratic overlords, there has not been during all the centuries a free man in Russia. And now with dire intention and ominous power clank the shackles preparing in the Kremlin for the enslavement of the hearts and souls of men. But now the American flag waves around the earth; it cannot, and it will not, wave in a world of slaves.

There still sounds in our ears the requiem over silent graves of youths whose bodies lie on the hot plains of Africa, under the snows of Germany, on the historic plains of Italy, and under the red poppies of France; and these were sacrifices made in the high ideal of America to immortal history and unending time. Shall we forget?

Across the oceans from continent to continent, and from island to island, and from race to race, and from clime to clime, echoes the scream of the American eagle and those forces which would choke the hope of man stand back and cower, and use the weapons of indirection and fear. We listen and hear the whisper of the spirit of Hampden, Cromwell, Burke, and Washington, Patrick Henry, Jefferson, Hamilton and in memory and tradition and history we recall their spirit in the words of Lincoln. We heard reverberations of that spirit from the gory and fatal fields of the First World War and later in Africa, and Italy, and France, and Germany and from the scattered islands of the seas, and now in peace the spirit of America sounds from the ramparts of the world and thunders down the ages of the yet unborn.

Our blood should tingle for us to know that America today stands at the beginning of a world crisis in which we or one other power will determine the course of the nations, and the condition of mankind, in future centuries. And again the sobering weight of responsibility impels us to the most severe conformity to all the imperatives of honor, humanity and justice. The only cloud upon the horizon of America's future is the disintegrating and demoralizing force of materialistic greed; we should learn more how to live, and less how to get.

In all the world there is no physical power that can successfully challenge the high destiny of our country; there is no impediment to America's future unless we develop a weakness in the innate character of our people. If, at this point in human history, we wish to be the champion and symbol of the higher ideals of mankind, and we are —now, we must be the exemplar of those qualities and things to which the highest type of mankind aspire.

Today our immediate interests and our physical selves are in America, but our hearts, and the hearts of a free world, and those who wish to be free, are in Moscow with General Marshall.

So it is.

—HOYT H. EAVES.

Tom's Friends

NORWALK, CONN.

Editors, THE NEWS:

IT seems as if Governor Dewey's friends in Congress are arranging special appropriations, in the Federal budget so as to compel the Chinese to legalize the traffic in opium.

I think it is about time that superior intelligence was rewarded and the low state of public morality be not described as morality by J. W. Martin Jr. and John Foster Dulles.

—JOSEPH A. MARTIN.

Marquis Childs

Too Little, Too Late

WASHINGTON

ENEMIES of peace and stability — as they were our enemies in war, the gremlins TOO LITTLE and TOO LATE have contributed to the jam over wheat that is reflected in the soaring price of this basic grain. Before a bumper crop of Spring wheat comes on the market, we may see wheat at $3 a bushel. It touched $2.80 in Canada.

TOO LITTLE and TOO LATE have valuable allies in the weather that has plagued Europe during the past several years. First the drought in the Mediterranean area worked serious harm. Then a prolonged and almost unprecedented drought cut deeply into the food resources of Eastern Europe.

The Russian habit of secrecy and concealment kept word of this from the outside world. In the Rumanian Province of Moldavia, the peasants have eaten their seed grain, which is an ominous portent of worse hunger to come unless steps are taken to provide new seed. In Yugoslavia and the Ukraine, the level is one of acute hunger which is not far from starvation.

FEARFUL WINTER

On top of all this came Europe's fearful Winter of cold and snow. This has greatly curtailed the harvest of Winter wheat and it will delay the Spring planting. Flooded fields are almost a certain consequence of the terrible Winter.

But when all this and much more is said about the misfortunes of the weather, TOO LITTLE and TOO LATE must still take part of the blame.

Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson is a cautious man whose timidity has repeatedly worked to prevent the kind of bold decisions that were called for by the desperation of the times. If Anderson had made purchases of grain sufficient for relief commitments last Fall, when a bumper crop was flooding onto the market, Government necessity would not now be a factor in forcing up the price. This was argued out in at least one White House conference several months ago.

Anderson based his cautious policy on two grounds. First, he said he did not want to be caught with high-priced grain in the face of a downward swing of the market. With another year of record American crops, it hardly seemed possible that there could be a scarcity of wheat. Second, he pointed to the embarrassment that would result if the Government bought too much grain.

Back of this was a firm resolve that Anderson made last Summer. He was determined not to set a fixed quota for America's grain commitments abroad. Privately the figure of 250,000,000 bushels of wheat was used. Some of Anderson's top associates insisted that this would be far too small.

NO CORN, PLEASE

For some time it has been clear that wheat commitments would be inadequate. Efforts are now being made to augment the wheat with corn to bring the total up to perhaps 400,000,000 bushels. But European food habits have ancient roots and it is impossible to alter them overnight. The attempt to use a mixture containing more than a certain amount of corn flour has brought strenuous resistance and even rioting from Italians, for example.

Anderson's associates are also looking to wheat purchase to be made out of the early harvest in Texas and Oklahoma to relieve the present pressure. The promise is once again for a record harvest of Winter wheat. That has been a remarkable feature of the world food picture—the long series of record harvests in America. If we had had a crop failure in any one year, the consequences for hungry people in Europe would have been disastrous.

The margin is so slight. At one point during the Winter, the Department of Agriculture failed to obtain the quota of flour and wheat essential for Italy. When this oversight was discovered, policy-makers suddenly realized that the chain reaction would begin with rioting and disorder and that the end might well be a Communist dictatorship throughout the Italian peninsula. At this point, grain ships intended for Germany were rerouted in midocean to Italian ports.

BREAD ADVANCES

In New York and other cities the price of a large loaf of bread has advanced from 14 to 15 cents, and that of a small loaf from 10 to 11 cents. How much this has to do with the rise in the price of wheat is debatable. But at any rate this rise can be used as a justification. And the prospect is that the pressure will continue rather than diminish.

Samuel Grafton

Dangerous Precedent

NEW YORK

ONE OF THE consequences of our new Greek policy, for which we had better watch out, is that it puts any weak nation anywhere near the Russian fringe in the position of being able to blackmail us. All it need do is holler that it feels faint, and that the Reds are coming, and we shall be bound, by policy and precedent, to begin writing checks. It should not be forgotten that Hitler used this fainting-spell technique many times, and received all manner of concessions from the Western democracies by means of it, including the tacitly conceded right to build an army.

ONLY BEGINNING

That is only the beginning; any reactionary government in Europe or the Near East can also use our new policy to make us support it against its own people. Let it but announce that domestic opposition is Communist (when, in point of fact, it may not be Communist at all, but only vegetarian, or anti-vivisectionist) and we shall come running again, slipping and tripping in our haste to get there in time to save civilization. Our policy inevitably lines us up with the reactionary right wing in Europe, with people who are not really our kind of people at all.

If I were the right wing leader of a small state near Russia, I would consider that the new American policy could be used to keep my budget balanced for the next 50 years, and also to keep opposition-ists in the circle right next to me seating me for approximately the same length of time.

I would feel that I had an insurance policy, issued on terms so liberal that any act of oppression or stupidity on my part must necessarily be condoned and forgiven. Whenever aid from America threatened to stop, I would either throw a faint and say the Reds were coming, or I would make a few friendly gestures toward Russia, enough to scare the Americans and to start the dollars flowing again.

All this is a natural consequence of that early division of the world into American and Russian spheres which we so glibly talk about, and so casually accept. That division gives certain countries between Russia and America a new kind of bargaining power, almost a power of extortion; they become, in a strange way, freer than we are, because we dare not say no when they present their requests. We start with one or two Eastern European and Near Eastern states; before very long time we may reach a stage at which to leave any nation near Russia out of it when we give the money away may come to seem a conspicuous exception, almost an indication that we don't care about the future of that particular country. What we now give as a gift may be demanded of us as a right within half a dozen years.

THE ALTERNATIVE

It will be said that even if all this is so, we are without alternative; we must prevent the absorption of Greece by Russia and rule whatever dangers are involved, including the danger of making this a ridiculous and unliveable world. It seems to me there is an alternative, and that is to make the matter a United Nations matter at the earliest possible moment. If Greece is real fear of Russian absorption of Greece, direct or concealed, let that be made the basis of a formal charge, and let the new American policy be disproved; let us oppose Russia with law, not with dollars. If military installations are needed in the Near East, let us ask for them for United Nations installations. Let us understand that every millimeter we retreat from this formula and every United Nations way is going to look like a mile when we try to win it back.

Nothing that has happened in the last ten years is so truly frightening as the casualness with which the American people are accepting a formula for an unworkable world, walking into it as if it were a Summer stroll under a clear blue sky.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Eventual World Revolt Is Soviet Goal

(Ed. Note—This is the second of Drew Pearson's columns on the background problems faced by Secretary of State Marshall in Moscow).

WASHINGTON

IT goes without saying that the most important ingredient to a successful conference in Moscow is Russia's desire to get along with the United States.

Regarding this there are varying schools of thought. One school—that of Soviet satellite diplomats whose views were presented in an earlier column—is that there is a cleavage of opinion inside the Kremlin regarding lasting friendship with the United States.

This may well be true. However, the view of this columnist, who has watched Soviet-USA affairs over a period of many years, is that the core of the Politburo, despite some differences of opinion, have never lost sight of their main goal.

That goal is not war. Russia is not prepared for war, doesn't want war, won't be able to fight a war for five to ten years. Furthermore, her leaders don't think war is necessary.

The main Soviet goal is something else. To understand it, let's take a detailed look at Russian policy during the past six months. This may be the best way to understand General Marshall's very difficult problem at Moscow.

Henry Wallace Fired

LAST September there appeared to be a change of Soviet policy. It began immediately after Henry Wallace published his letter to Truman urging better relations with Russia, following which he was fired from the Cabinet.

The storm of anti-Russian criticism which broke in the American press during the Wallace incident undoubtedly worried the Kremlin. Also it removed Russia's one friend from the Cabinet. Prior to Wallace's exit, Moscow could expect that U. S. policy toward Russia would be divided. After Wallace's exit, they knew it was united. They knew the entire nation was almost 100 per cent behind the Byrnes-be-firm-with-Russia policy.

Accordingly, Moscow executed one of its famous somersaults. Stalin gave out a press interview that he saw no reason for anything but peace with the outside world. Foreign Minister Molotov began sounding a softer note at Paris. Later he came to New York on a British passenger vessel, mingled with fellow passengers, was courteous with newsmen, acted almost like a human being.

In New York also Vice-Commissar Vyshinsky made a show of attending a Catholic Mass. At sessions of the Foreign Ministers Council, Soviet policy seemed less belligerent. The Russians even agreed in principle to the all-important U. S.-proposed policy of permitting international inspectors to visit atom and munitions plants on Russian and other foreign soil.

Many American observers were elated. They felt that Russian policy had really changed, that the Kremlin had decided on friendship with the United States, not-bickering friction, and that we in turn should forget our alarms and worries.

Soviet Policy Unchanged

THIS, of course, was exactly what the Kremlin wan— They wanted the United States lulled into security. They wanted to cut the ground out from under Russian critics and from those who urged a powerful U. S. Army-Navy.

But meanwhile if you examined carefully the facts beneath-the-surface, there appeared to be no actual change of Russian policy.

For it was an inescapable fact that while Molotov was being conciliatory in New York, the Moscow press and radio were pouring out a steady stream of anti-American vitriol to the Russian people. It was an inescapable fact also that Russian commanders in Korea were thumbing their noses at a formal agreement to co-operate with the United States in governing Korea, that the Soviet was ignoring previous promises regarding the evacuation of Manchuria, doing its best to stir up trouble in Greece, pressuring Norway to get an Arctic base in Spitzbergen, and working night and day to undercut the United States with its own neighbors in Latin America.

But, most important of all, Soviet Ambassador Gromyko during this period of so-called conciliation was stalling on atomic energy. After muddying up public opinion by paying lip service to the principle of international inspection, he proceeded to back-and-fill, talk and delay, until the American public was too confused to know what to think. All it was sure of was that atomic energy is a very complicated subject.

Finally, Gromyko showed his true colors only two weeks ago by flatly rejecting what everyone thought he had accepted in principle—international inspection of atom and arms plants. Incidentally, he did this just after information was received in this country that Russia had developed a small atomic bomb of her own.

In other words, during the six months since Henry Wallace left the Cabinet, Russia has executed a very clever, very conciliatory right-about-face on the surface. But beneath the surface her policy has remained exactly the same.

Russians Playing For Time

THAT policy, in brief, is not war but eventual world revolution. What the Russians are playing for is time. Not only could they not win a war even if they wished, but they figure that if they wait long enough, they won't have to fight a war at all. Revolutionary elements in other countries will do the job for them.

That's one reason the Russians favor a centralized Germany. They figure that in the long run their propaganda, their agents, their system of boring from within can take over Germany. Time, confusion and chaos will play into their hands.

Actually, however, time can also play on our side—if we are smarter than the Russians and if we make the USA an example of orderliness in a disorderly world.

All this boils down to the following:

What we do now, during the crucial postwar period, is going to shape the course of the world for years to come.

It is not war or big armies or navies that we have to worry about for the next five or ten years; it is the problem of becoming an example to the rest of the world, of making the USA the best-run, most humanitarian country in the world.

It is the problem partly of strikes, less profits, and not bogging the road.

And it is also the problem of a continuing wise, forthright, but generous foreign policy.

Finally every American has got to try to consider foreign affairs as absorbing as the sports page or the murder headline.

That is one man's opinion of our best and perhaps our only chance to outsmart the Russians at their own game.