THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

69th Anniversary Year

THOMAS L. ROBINSON ..... Publisher
J. E. DOWD ..... General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH ..... Executive Editor
WILLIAM M. REDDIG ..... Editor

THURSDA, MAY 6, 1948

Threat To Press Freedom

A TRANSPARENT effort to establish Congressional censorship of news is being made in a bill approved this week by the House Rules Committee.

This measure would require all executive departments of the Federal Government to provide the committees on demand whatever information the committees decide they need. A majority vote of the committee would determine whether the information, or part of it, should be made public. Heavy penalties are provided for enforcement and they would apply to newspapermen, committee members, Government employees or any other individual obtaining knowledge of the information and disclosing it "in any manner whatever not provided by law."

Offered as a security measure to prevent leaks of confidential information, the proposed law simply would enable Congressional committees to control the release of information to suit their own partisan political purposes.

This legislation was drafted by the House Expenditures Committee, headed by Rep. Clare Hoffman of Michigan, a Republican who has distinguished himself as a reactionary, a witch-hunter and one of the small-time tyrants of the House. Demand for the law come from a Congressional group that has recklessly employed the Red smear tactics against individuals, in and out of the Federal Government, who do not share the rightist sympathies of Mr. Hoffman, Rep. J. Parnell Thomas and others of their ilk.

Hoffman's bill would give Rep. Thomas' Un-American Activities Committee dictatorial authority to proceed in its campaign. It needs this to overcome the resistance of the Truman Administration, which recently made a stand against the high-handed Congressional investigators in the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, head of the Bureau of Standards and an eminent atomic scientist.

The Thomas Committee demanded that the Department of Commerce release to it the FBI report on Condon but the Administration refused on the ground that the report contains information which must be kept secret for security reasons. If Congress had the power sought in Hoffman's bill, the Committee could obtain and handle the confidential information on Condon entirely as it saw fit, and the record shows the Committee is expert in distorting the facts. It could do the same in all other cases as well.

Operating for the avowed purpose of defending democracy against Communism, the Thomas Committee already has given too many demonstrations that its members have slight understanding or regard for constitutional and democratic principles. The threat to freedom of the press that now comes from the Congressional committees is an outright totalitarian challenge which should move the American public and the Republican command to call a halt.

Costly Substitute For Draft

REP. LEO ALLEN, the Illinois Republican who heads the House Rules Committee, apparently is willing to do anything for national defense except to sacrifice the political advantage of the Republicans.

In lieu of a draft bill or a Universal Military Training program — both politically unpopular with large and vocal groups—Mr. Allen proposes a bonus plan to stimulate volunteer enlistments. There is no assurance that this scheme would provide the number of volunteers required by the services in meeting our security needs. There is, however, every assurance that it would lower the quality and efficiency of our armed forces, since the Allen plan itself provides for a reduced standard. The services would be required to accept recruits having a score of 70 or higher in the Army's General Classification test, which determines adaptability and ability to learn. The services now turn down men scoring less than 80.

It would require an estimated $1,500,000,000 a year to make the Allen experiment. If it proved a failure, as seems likely, it would increase our already heavy defense bill by just that much. We would then have to institute the draft or UMT. Thus both money and precious time, to say nothing of the energy involved in the enlistment campaign, would be wasted.

Allen, in his key post on the Rules Committee, has long blocked UMT to placate the numerous opponents of that proposal, and has delayed action on the draft bill which the Senate approved. His substitute for both has obvious appeal to a large part of the electorate. Only the people immediately concerned with the preparedness problem will be deeply disturbed by it, and the taxpayers may fail to note its extravagant and impractical features in time to register forcible protest.

The point is that America needs the draft or UMT now in order to establish an adequate and orderly system of training for our defense establishment, and to demonstrate to the world that this country understands the preparedness problem and has the patriotic determination to do its duty. Adoption of Allen's substitute would serve as a demonstration that national security is a secondary consideration to winning the election, and that the country has neither the intelligence nor the intestinal fortitude to do the needful.

Good News From Florence

THE FLORENCE, S. C., *Morning News* this week held open house in its new $250,000 plant. The handsome white masonry structure is on Irby Street just south of Evans. J. M. O'Dowd, publisher, J. A. Rogers, editor, and their staffs have many reasons to be proud of the new home.

A 32-page press was recently installed and five new typesetting machines are on order. Air conditioning equipment will soon be installed.

In a front page anouncement, the newspaper dedicated itself to "community expression, to provide leadership through careful dissemination of worthwhile news, to applaud where approbation is due, to criticize where criticism is needed, and through the function of the entire newspaper organization to reflect progressive, optimistic, confident community philosophy fulfilling the function of community conscience,"

In this issue were four photographs exposing conditions at the Florence County prison camp. Prisoners are crowded into iron cages and food is served on a rough board table with no shelter from the weather.

A news article describes the arrest and harsh treatment of a Negro youth for failure to have on his person a driver's license. The incident, says Managing Editor Thomas R. Waring in a dispatch to his newspaper, *The News & Courier*, Charleston, "served as a text for condemnation of all brutality in police methods and especially lack of consideration for racial relations."

We congratulate the people of Florence on having a newspaper which serves the highest ideals of a free press and is a medium for that vigilance which is the price of liberty. The new plant is proof of the region's support.

From The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

Confusion On Pike's Peak

HOW it happens that the bones of Brig. Gen. Zebulon Montgomery Pike lie interred in the Federal cemetery at Sackets Harbor, N. Y., the condensed biographies of this explorer do not tell. He has been dead now almost 135 years. But a lively controversy is stirring over whether the general's bones shall be transferred from Sackets Harbor to the well-known peak in Colorado which bears his name. A great-great-grandson, resident in Texas, favors the removal. A great-great-grandnephew, resident in New York, opposes it. The Mayor of Sackets Harbor succinctly informs all Coloradans who are planning a Sinai-like interment for the general that it will take place over his dead body—the Mayor's, that is.

Why General Pike should be buried atop Pike's Peak is about as obscure as why he is buried in Sackets Harbor. Born in Trenton, N. J., killed in a foray against the British at Toronto in 1813, the General passed by way of Pike's Peak during one of his many explorations of the West in 1806. But he did not, as many of the 'Fifty-niners in the gold rush of that year thought, climb the peak. That was left to Dr. Edwin James who ascended its 14,000-foot majesty seven years and a few months after General Pike's demise.

General Pike's contribution to the opening of the West was a great one. But he had hard luck in his explorations. As an adventurous first lieutenant, serving with the restless frontier Army, he led an expedition to determine the headwaters of the Mississippi. He missed his aim by more than spitting distance. Later he sought the headwaters of the Arkansas and Red Rivers, only to be hustled off unceremoniously to Santa Fe by the Spaniards. In a blinding snowstorm, he climbed what he thought was the tallest peak, but it turned out to be another peak 150 miles from the present Pike's. The mountain he actually mastered is now known as Long's Peak.

For General Pike's name to adorn a peak he *didn't* scale and for a peak which he *did* scale to carry the name of somebody else, is confusion enough. His fame deserves to be spared the additional falsification that the Colorado Springs tourist industry would perpetrate by making his grave the dramatic point of interest on a peak which already carries his name without historical warrant.

A local man says it looks to him like a man ought to get stronger with the years. After his children are grown it takes more to keep them and then, the first thing he knows, there are the grandchildren to look after.—*Lamar (Mo.) Democrat.*

'Boots! Boots! Boots!'

People's Platform

Federalist Inconsistency

Editors, THE NEWS:

CHARLOTTE

BEING inclined to charitably assume that Mr. W. M. Alexander harbors no conscious intent to be offensive when he allows his enthusiasm to gain superiority over reason to the extent that he mistakenly deems everyone either "confused" or "naive" who disagrees with the World Federalists' project for effecting peace and the abolition of war, reference to his recent article shall be respectfully confined to a brief resume of a mass of inconsistency, which not only indicates a direct conflict of opinion but likewise betrays a limited knowledge relative to the subject under discussion.

Mr. Alexander appears positive that "world government" provides "the only method . . . to attain . . . durable peace." This however is directly contrary to another protagonist who is not so certain and consequently alleges that peace can "probably" be effected through world government. A third argues that the way to peace "lies in the inner hearts of men." And a fourth simply begs the question.

Mr. Alexander further contends that the UN, "no matter how much you adapt it—cannot prevent war." In contrast, another says: "The UN can be used as a basis for peace."

Finally Mr. Alexander arrives at the conclusion that "wars are caused by armament races . . . fear and distrust among nations." A fellow Federalist however contends in opposition that "the immediate causes of war" are primarily "economic, religious and ideological." Still another declares: "The cause of war . . . is nationalism."

Such glaring inconsistency warrants recollection of an ancient and recognized law in the rule of evidence which stresses that the more important is the fact to be established, the greater must be the evidence to support it. Moreover, if the witnesses fail to agree as to the alleged facts; if they contradict each other in important essentials, there remains but one alternative—reject the testimony as being irreconcilable and hopelessly false. Hence the Latin maxim: "Falsus in uno; falsus in omnibus." (False in one thing, false in all things).

The critical reader of the recently published World Federalist articles almost immediately detects a distinct atmosphere of socialistic theme (this aspect is admitted by one adherent), amid a maze of probability, illogic and supposition, that ultimately invites the suspicion that there there is something here far deeper and more sinister than at first meets the eye. And as penetrating analysis delves deeper, there evolves the abrupt conclusion that these sinister aspects unmistakably join with a conspiratorial plot to destroy the magnanimous and essential spirit of nationalism.

Vigorously assailing the majestic superiority of "sovereign nations" and advocating the Marxian-inspired social deterioration of "co-operative economic planning," the World Federalists brazenly assert that "Russia does not want war." Which is perhaps best answered by repeating that Russia does not want war if she can swallow up the world without it, but realizing that resistance to her current, unprovoked and unjustified aggressive expansionism is inevitable, she is feverishly engaged in armament manufacturing, international espionage and military regimentation unprecedented in her entire history. If this doesn't spell war, then new definitions must be found for the term.

The Federalists further contend that in the event of another war "the atomic bomb will be used," and that civilization will retrogress to an era paralleling the antediluvian age. But as there exists nothing beyond wild and morbid supposition to support the fanciful notion, it may be dismissed as ill-founded speculation and relegated to the labyrinth of gloomy imagination along with similar guessing games respecting the use of noxious gases in the last military adventure.

Frankly and candidly, it has long been a personal conviction that the greater portion of talk, with its accompanying conglomeration of "ifs" and "buts", concerning the "probable" use of the atomic bomb in a future war, was largely an effort on the part of designing factions to prey upon ignorance and create a fear complex in the mass mind and stampede credulous, neurotic humanity into a trend of thought and action advantageous only to a pusillanimous minority, who prefer peace, pacification and predicament to the inimitable gifts of national sovereignty, cultural superiority and the rich harvest of uncharted destiny.

—A. W. BLACK.

Keeping The Sabbath

Editors, THE NEWS:

CHARLOTTE

TOO many of us are spiritually dead. Each of us, although in a different category, is responsible for the spiritual welfare of the citizens just as much as we are for their social and economic welfare.

Each of us, individually, should endeavor to let our lights so shine that the weak and the timorous might be shown the path to the saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.

How many churches sanction conduct of their God's Day for secular business and entertainment? How many church members are government officials who are secularist, who sanction the violation of the Fourth Commandment by granting permits for Sunday baseball and football, rodeos and picture shows, and the sale of beer and wine? How many church members are owners or operators of amusement and business places that are open on Sunday? How many churches sanction the conduct of its officers, deacons, elders or layman who are violating God's day?

There was a great contrast between two church radio programs that I heard on a recent Sunday morning. One of them was an ordination service where an official of one of the largest Sunday amusement organizations was ordained a deacon. The other was a sermon preached by a well-known preacher against Sunday baseball, movies, etc.

Any church whose desire is to become the church of Christ with Christ as the head will be interested in members who are re-born Christians and have a passion for the salvation of the lost. Political or social influence, money, or merely the increase of church membership will not be considered.

Psalm 67:5,6: "Let the people praise thee, O God; let all the people praise thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless us."

Proverbs 14:34: "Righteousness exaleth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

—WARREN W. WOODS.

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—thereafter 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

Peddling A Fantasy

NEW YORK

ALL recent British and American proposals for Palestine are based on the idea of establishing peace without granting independence. Whatever tortured forms the new plans may take, they all come down to some effort to persuade the Jews not to be free and not to care.

Whether the offer be one of trusteeship (as we Americans have suggested) or of oversearship by some neutral power (as the British have urged) it is, in the end, always the same, a suggestion to the Jews that they give up independence and be pleasant about it.

Now this would be a fantastical enterprise for anybody to be engaged in, but it is especially bizarre on the part of two free nations, such as the United States and Britain. We are really saying to the Jews: "Ah, Independence isn't so much." The matter behind our acts, then, is one which we ourselves don't really believe in, and can't really believe in; we are offering to the Jews and thus to the world, a proposition to which no existing power on earth could for a minute make us subscribe.

OUT OF CHARACTER

Actually we cannot even visualize, we cannot even conceive of such a thing as a denial of independence joined with peace and contentment. Where, indeed, does such a combination exist? Where has it ever existed? All our difficulties in relation to Palestine stem from the fact that we are trying to peddle a fantasy, and when, with solemn mien and statesmanlike bearing we try to persuade the Jews to accept such a future we are as out of character as if we were suddenly to try to convert another people to ancestor worship.

And that is why we and the British look so bad in these premises. We offer the Jews a proposition which we ourselves regard as inherently inacceptable on grounds of principle. And when we completely fail to sell them polygamy, or sun worship, or whatever curious idea it is we are offering, we strike our palms against our foreheads, and wonder why we aren't doing better, and we dream up still more arguments in favor of the bizarre dogma we are pushing, and we sweat and squirm as we offer them.

The British strike magnificent poses and rush their troops out of Palestine, then they strike equally magnificent poses and rush them right back (and they will have only themselves to blame if the world says they do so because the Jews have refused to surrender and because the Arabs are losing)—and they wouldn't have to do any of these things, or look so nervous, if they would once and for all square themselves with that love of independence which is said to lie at the bottom of the British character.

And we ourselves would not seem so feeble and inept before the United Nations if we would simply decide to act on the maxims of what we are, as a free people, and stop trying to tell the Jews that independence would be bad for them.

A GREAT UNIVERSAL

For independence is not an idea on which you can pick and choose your position, pro or con; it is one of those great universals which one must accept and approve out of hand, like Spring, young love, sunshine and the look of high blue water. The reason we and the British are careening on this issue is that we are off balance; we can't make it look good because it can't be good. We shall never attain peace without independence in Palestine because it is unattainable.

Until we can demonstrate that people don't mind not having freedom we had better give up our Palestine policy as a bad job, and go on to something practical and constructive, like squaring the circle, or building a railroad to the moon.

Marquis Childs

Principle At Stake

WASHINGTON

IN this era of flood-tide prosperity, it is hard to remember the past. Perhaps that is because so much has happened in the crowded years between 1938 and 1948.

From 10,000,000 unemployed to 60,000,000 jobs! That is the jump in a single decade—the decade that saw America's productive capacity nearly doubled in order to win a global war.

In the new era, the New Deal of the '30s is customarily referred to in sulphurous language. The phrase is uttered as though it had been the slogan of the devil himself. And you can find stout-hearted members of the Union League Club who will prove just that.

A DISTORTED PICTURE

The young who have come of age in the war decade must have an odd impression of that dim and distant day. Their more vociferous elders would have them believe that a sinister figure named Roosevelt sent his cohorts about the country to clap decent citizens into jail. The chains rattle and the ghost of Roosevelt is something to scare babies with.

That picture is slightly distorted. It happens, of course, that the distortion is useful to those who would chip away the reforms of the New Deal. They are hard at work with their little pickaxes on one stratum in particular right now.

But before going into that, I would like to pull down one point about the New Deal that is conveniently ignored. In their most charitable mood, the detractors explain the whole thing away as the misguided puttering of a lot of do-gooders.

There was, it is true, a deep and very real strain of idealism in the New Deal. In spite of the smearing by the scoffers and the jeerers (some of them very highly paid), it had a broad humanitarian base. Year after year, 10,000,000 Americans had no way to earn their daily bread, and millions of their fellow citizens felt that this was unjust and unfair even though they happened to be more favorably circumstanced.

Basic to the concept of the New Deal was the theory that purchasing power should be got into the hands of the unemployed and the underpaid so that they could buy the products of industry. The idea—and this is the point it seems to me important to make—was to try to save free enterprise in spite of the tendency of the free-enterprise system to throw millions out of work.

One of the last pieces of so-called New Deal legislation was the minimum-wage act or, as it is officially known, the Fair Labor Standards Act. The act put a floor under wages. It provided that workers, except for those in certain exempted classifications, should not be paid less than 40 cents an hour.

THE PRINCIPLE COUNTS

The floor was pretty low, or so it seems when measured in terms of today's buying power. But the principle was there—to make sure that no one was paid less than enough to maintain the bare minimum of decency.

Now two proposals have been brought forward to change this law. One, introduced by a group of Democrats in the Senate, would raise the minimum rate so that it could be fixed by industry committees at from 75 cents to $1. The amendment would also increase the number of workers covered by the law.

The other proposal comes from Sen. Joseph Ball of Minnesota. It would raise the minimum wage to 70 cents but with so much business-government red tape that those most familiar with the working of law say it would have little effect on the wage side.

Wage & Hour Administrator William R. McComb has testified that the Ball amendment would remove from the provisions of the law many workers now protected by it. In other words, it would chip away at the floor under the national wage level.

THE DANGER

You can argue that this is not very important in a boom. You can even make the cynical argument that it is a good thing to have the people priced out of the market since there are scarcities.

But there is no guarantee that this flood-tide of prosperity will last forever, and here lies the danger of chipping away at laws that were intended to make the free-enterprise system work. No one denies the danger of excessive state control. Great Britain seems to be moving in that direction, with the Socialist Government relying more on theory and ever-multiplying regulations than on natural human incentives. But there is also peril in taking off all the brakes and letting the machine run wide open downhill.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Fascist Argentina Becoming U. S. Ally

WASHINGTON

DESPITE the many slaps Argentina gave the United States at the Bogota conference, Gen. Humberto Sosa Molina, Argentine War Minister, is coming to Washington to discuss details of an agreement by which Argentine armament plants would be licensed by the United States to manufacture a number of the latest American weapons.

Sosa Molina is coming on the joint invitation of the National Defense and State Departments. Accompanying him are Gen. Manuel Savio, director of Argentine arms factories; Gen. Felix Urdipilleta, former Minister of the Interior, and various other high-ranking officers.

Conclusion of this deal will mean that, for all practical purposes, Juan D. Peron's Fascist Argentina has supplanted Brazil as our chief South American ally. It will also be a personal triumph for pleasant, persistent Gen. Carlos von der Becke, former Argentine Chief of Staff, who has spent almost two years selling Washington officials on the plan.

Von der Becke first arrived in Washington in June, 1946, and laid the arms-licensing proposal before Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. He gave him no encouragement, although there was much favorable sentiment and attempted pressure on lower levels of the War Department.

Now Secretary of State Marshall, who always thought well of the idea, has become convinced that it should be put into practice, and has brought Gen. Omar Bradley around to his view. As usual, Marshall's decision was based strictly on strategic considerations, without regard for the ideological or political angles. Undoubtedly, the effect on Brazil and other staunch friends of the USA will probably be disastrous.

Exit John Snyder?

DESPITE all the denials, it looks more and more as if Secretary of the Treasury Snyder is leaving his job in the Truman Cabinet to join the Giannini's Bank of America, largest bankers in the USA.

Big, bluff, genial A. P. Giannini was in Washington the other day at a significant luncheon. Luncheon host was Eric Johnston, dynamic head of the motion picture producers, and a director of Giannini's bank. Other guests included Paul Hoffman, head of the Marshall Plan; Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, A. P. Giannini, Walter Brunschweiger, Giannini's executive vice-president, and Roland Pierotti, Giannini's Washington representative. John Snyder seemed to feel right at home among all the Giannini's.

When Tom McCabe was appointed chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, replacing Giannini critic Marriner Eccles, the venerable West Coast banker was given credit for getting Eccles out. Though he denied this, it was interesting to note that last week in Washington, Giannini and the man who replaced Eccles as Federal Reserve Board Chairman, Tom McCabe, huddled alone in Johnston's office.

NOTE—President Truman, though making a public commitment to appoint Marriner Eccles vice-chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, so far hasn't come across. Some people are attributing this to the strong hand of the Giannini's via John Snyder.

Speculating Tax-Dodgers

THE honeymoon appears to be over for those commodity speculators who have been manipulating their "long" and "short" trading accounts to evade income taxes.

The Internal Revenue Bureau has started an undercover probe of more than 600 speculators and their use of a loophole in the tax laws by which they convert short-term purchases and sales (transacted within six months) into long-term (over six months) accounts. By this simple device they escape taxes on 50 per cent of their net profits.

All the speculators have to do to reap this windfall is keep their accounts "open" on their books longer than six months. They do this simply by instructing their brokers to delay payments.

The Commodity Exchange Authority, which tipped off the Treasury Department about the tax-dodgers, estimates that last year they knocked down around $5,000,000 in unpaid taxes.

Merry Mortician

ACTING Senate Leader Kenneth Wherry, the merry mortician, recently had the chaplain pray twice and start the middle of a legislative day in the morning instead of in order to bring up a bill that had not been carried on the Senate calendar its full time. By starting a new legislative day, the bill was given one extra day on the calendar, thus making it available for passage.

Afterward, when Wherry was razzed by his colleagues and accused of using the chaplain to cloak this unusual parliamentary maneuver, Sen. Kilgore of West Virginia cracked:

"You can always depend on an undertaker to have everything on time for the obsequies."

GOP Merry-Go-Round

SPEAKER JOE MARTIN'S friends claim they've made a deal with the the Dewey crowd to switch all of New York's 97 Dewey delegates to the Speaker if it becomes clear Dewey can't make the grade. . . . Gov. Driscoll of New Jersey will be the favorite son of the New Jersey delegation on the first ballot in Philadelphia. On the second ballot, the boys will switch to Stassen. . . . Pennsylvania Republicans are split wide open. The powerful political machine of Joe Pew, Sun Oil Co., is now reported definitely though quietly for Stassen. However, Sen. Ed Martin is for Taft. In the end, Stassen will get most of the Pennsylvania delegates after the first ballot. . . . In West Virginia Stassen is expected to take over the entire delegation. . . . Gov. Dewey is staking a lot on the Oregon primary. . . . However, Stassen's stock is rising and he may come out the favorite. . . . In brief, Stassen will go to the Philadelphia convention with far more delegates than evgr expected, though he will probably be euchred out in the smoke-filled rooms.