THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON.....Publisher
J. E. DOWD.....General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH.....Executive Editor
C. A. McKNIGHT.....Editor

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1949

SENATOR HOEY AND THE AFL

THE American Federation of Labor political strategists who have ticketed Senator Clyde R. Hoey for defeat in North Carolina's 1950 election may have overlooked two or three things.

1. The Senator's great popularity among people of all economic brackets and political faiths;

2. The comparative ineffectiveness of organized labor politics in Tar Heelia; and

3. The political intricacies of the Hoey and Graham candidacies.

The Shelby man, whom Drew Pearson likes to describe as the "swallow-tailed Senator", is a remarkable vote-getter. For decades, now, he has been making speeches and teaching Sunday School classes all over the vast length and breadth of North Carolina, and it is entirely probable that he has met and shaken hands with more Tar Heels than any man alive today.

As an orator he has no peer. And though the more progressive elements in North Carolina democracy have not always agreed with his basic conservatism, they have never been able to establish any motive for his actions other than his sincere desire to maintain the traditional American opportunity for the individual which enabled him to rise from the position of printer's devil to such eminence.

No one knows just how many votes the national AFL, and, for that matter, CIO political organizations can swing in North Carolina. By and large, the working men in North Carolina are political independents who don't like to take their voting orders from either their employers or their labor czars.

If they are miffed over the Senator's vote in behalf of an improved Taft-Hartley Act, they should remember that his views are more in keeping with prevailing North State opinion than those of his fellow Senator, Dr. Graham. The fact that the Scott-dominated House of Representatives failed, by an overwhelming margin, to repeal the state statute banning the closed shop is the best indication we have that North Carolina believes in the basic objectives of the Taft-Hartley law.

Finally, the AFL intervention may find little encouragement from North Carolina Democratic Party chieftains, even the progressive Governor Scott. Speculation about the 1950 races has been rife, much of it wide of the mark. But it is pretty apparent that the Scott forces will hesitate to put a candidate in the field against Senator Hoey for fear that Senator Graham will be opposed in retaliation.

This is not the first time that North Carolina has sent to Washington two Senators of different political, social, and economic views. A good many Tar Heels will be very pleased to leave things just as they are, thank you, despite the wishes of the AFL.

TEST OF INTEGRITY

IN that field of activity sometimes referred to as the great game of politics, there is a school which holds that it is wiser to remain non-committal on controversial matters than to take a courageous stand on the right side.

This school seems to have been dominant in the case of proposed revision of the discriminatory Displaced Persons Bill of 1948.

Practically everyone, including Democrats and Republicans, appears to realize that the 1948 bill is uncharitable, to say the least.

President Truman has held it to be "anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic." The Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons—with such leaders as Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Herbert H. Lehman—has worked tirelessly for revisions to it.

The villain of the project, the man who has been sitting on the lid of the traditional American melting pot, is Chairman Pat McCarran (D-Nev.) of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He has refused to bring the Displaced Persons legislation to the Senate floor for a vote.

A move is underway now—and it's a drastic move—to take the legislation away from the loaded committee and bring it up for a vote. Administration senators and some Republicans have engineered a move to discharge the Judiciary Committee from consideration of the DP measure. Republican Senator Ferguson is ramrodding a new attempt this week, and since McCarran is over in Spain getting chummy with Dictator Franco, there is a chance that it will succeed.

We do not know what the Senate will do with the legislation if it does have an opportunity to consider it, but we do know that much light will be shed on the integrity of the members of the Senate by the vote on consideration.

It will be watched closely.

ON ALCOHOL AND COLDS

IT was the American Medical Association, we seem to recall, that first exploded the favorite old myth about the efficacy of alcohol in treating snakebite and thus forced the nation's fishermen, hunters and campers to find some other excuse for carrying a nip along on their excursions.

But the AMA has now partially restored itself to favor in the eyes of the nation's tipplers by condoning the use of "reasonable doses" of alcohol in aborting the plain, ordinary, common cold.

Explains the erudite AMA *Journal*, alcohol causes "peripheral vasodilation and re-establishes circulation in chilled cutaneous and mucosal surfaces" which, translated into English, means that it sends a rush of blood into cold skin or nose lining and thus helps ward off an oncoming cold.

Never ones to advocate the internal use of alcohol—despite our long-standing differences with the Drys over the issue of control — we nevertheless might be tempted to ponder the long-range implications of this belated benediction, if we thought it had any long-range implications.

It doesn't. Those who have been nipping, cold or no cold, will keep right on; and it is unlikely that any abstainers will be enticed by the AMA revelation.

Don't go looking for any moral in this little discussion. There isn't any.

GREENSBORO'S LACK OF DISTINCTION

OUR neighbor up the road, the *Greensboro Daily News*, gets a good deal of pleasure out of life from time to time by needling the Queen City and its newspapers *(See Below)*.

We wouldn't for the world deprive the *Daily News* of this source of entertainment, for we love that very strange combination of Texas bravado and New England conservatism which makes the Queen City so delightfully inconsistent and affords an easy mark for journalistic jibes.

But the sly reference to a "one-bomb town" deserves a carefully enunciated "tut, tut." Why, even Atlanta could be destroyed to all intents and purposes by one well placed atomic bomb, according to four Emory University professors who were quoted in Sunday's *Atlanta Journal*.

It's a rather grim subject to be humorous about. But we seem to recall that Greensboro recently had to discontinue a couple of fire stations and otherwise curtail municipal services because of decreasing tax revenues.

Could it be that Greensboro is omitted from the A-bomb target list because the Politburo considers the Gate City one of these "decadent, capitalistic, bourgeois" cities which doesn't need an atomic bomb to speed it along the downgrade?

From The Greensboro Daily News

CHARLOTTE'S DISTINCTION

CONGRATULATIONS, we suppose, are due Charlotte for "being singled out as an important atom bomb target for the Russians." The *Charlotte News* seems rather set up about it.

It cites an article in the *U. S. News & World Report* which puts Charlotte in a list of 92 cities in the United States which have more than 100,000 population and are within range of Soviet suicide planes. Also it quotes civic boosters as boasting: "Charlotte must be the most important city in the Carolinas. It's the only place worth being bombed."

There are several files in this ointment, however, which underprivileged North Carolina cities may be forgiven for pointing out. In the first place the U. S. News indicates that Charlotte is a one-bomb target, which sounds suspiciously like the modern equivalent of what in the pre-atomic age used to be called a one-horse town.

In the second place, when the bombs begin falling, suppose Stalin, either for lack of bombs or out of pure devilishness, overlooks Charlotte. What would the red-faced citizens of the Queen City do about it—ask him for abandonment and non-support? The boosters could, we suppose, get a guarantee from him in advance, but even so they would have no assurance that it would be worth the paper it was written on. There seems nothing for them to do but wait and hope.

If a hick town is designated by the custom of everybody calling everybody else Tom, Dick or Harry, or Kate, Susie or Margie, then we are 99 and 44-100 in favor of the hick town. — *Pittsburg (Tex.) Gazette.*

One of the biggest damned fools in this world is the man or woman who goes quizzing around to try to find out what people say behind his back.

Lamar (Mo.) Democrat

Men can be a damsite more chivalrous to a pretty woman than they can to an ordinary woman.—*Grenada County (Miss.) Weekly.*

'You Got A Cold In The Head Or Something?'

Problems Of Coal Industry

Miners Face Uncertain Future

(Reprinted from U. S. News & World Review)

WASHINGTON

JOHN L. LEWIS is chalking up a major-industry record of 17 strikes, almost two a year, in the years since 1940. No other labor leader is able to match that industry-wide record.

Out of those strikes, Mr. Lewis claims these gains:

Miners' wage rates have been lifted from 88 cents an hour in 1940 to $1.85 an hour. In 1940, however, the miners were paid only for time worked. Now, miners are paid for time spent traveling to and from their jobs in the mines.

Take-home pay is up, too. Earlier this year, the miners were averaging $73 a week in earnings. In 1940, their average pay was $24.71 a week. Boom times have helped to raise these earnings, because miners in recent years have been working more hours in a week than they did before the war.

A welfare fund is another big gain for the miners. They are now promised $100 a month on retirement, and are entitled to health and hospital benefits. But it costs big money to operate this fund, and payments have been suspended until income catches up with outgo. The fund was financed at the start by a royalty of 5 cents a ton on coal, but royalties are up to 20 cents now and probably are going higher. Mr. Lewis is asking a boost to 30 cents.

Paid vacations also are counted among miners' gains of recent years. These add up to $100 a year per miner.

* * *

THERE is another side to the story of coal, though. This side concerns the future of the industry and of individual miners.

Price of coal at the mine is double the price of 1942. Coal at the mine now is valued at $4.90 a ton, on the average. In 1942, it was valued at $2.36. The labor cost that goes into mining a ton of coal also is almost twice as high as it was in 1942, up from $1.57 to $2.96. All of this adds to the price that consumers must pay for coal, and has started many of them looking around for substitute fuels.

Other fuels, as a result, have been gaining steadily on coal for many years. In 1900, for example, coal made up 94.9 per cent of all mineral fuels then in use. Since that time coal has been losing until now it has only 44.3 per cent of the market for mineral fuels.

Costs that keep climbing are forcing mineowners to look around for ways to save money. They must take a second look at welfare costs to see whether the industry can continue to support a fund of this size without running into further trouble.

The 100 million dollars or so a year that the fund takes in from a 20-cent royalty is not enough to keep it solvent. Some persons familiar with the fund's operations believe that a 50-cent royalty is needed if the fund is to meet its commitments. This is a cost that must be assumed in large part by consumers in a higher price for coal.

* * *

MINERS themselves are now having to revise their planning for the future. A year ago they were working steadily, taking home big pay checks and looking forward to a secure life on retirement. This year, they have been out on strike three times, and, since July, have been working only part time when not on strike.

All of this idleness threatens to reduce the average miner's earnings to around $2,800 for 1949, as against an average of $3,563 in 1948. The $2,800 figure assumes that the miners do not go back to work on a full-time basis before October 31 and receive an average of $14.60 per working day for the rest of the year. On top of this loss of income, miners no longer are sure of getting their pension checks regularly after they retire.

Jobs in the mines, too, have been declining for several years. Total employment now is down to around 463,000, whereas it totaled 784,621 in 1920.

What is happening to coal, in relation to other fuels, is shown by examples.

Railroads are shifting from steam locomotives, powered by coal, to Diesel and electric locomotives. The Pennsylvania Railroad, for example, announced recently that it is operating Diesel-electric or electric locomotives on all principal passenger and freight trains. Recent reports show that railroads had 1,561 Diesel engines on order Jan. 1, 1949, against 72 steam locomotives. Steam locomotives are being scrapped at a record rate, but there still are more than 32,000 in use on Class I railroads.

Heavy industries and some utilities, too, are shifting from coal to oil, gas or water power. Artificial gas made from coal is losing out to natural gas in many industrial areas of the East.

Homeowners, increasing number, also are making the switch from coal to oil or gas furnaces. Oil-burner sales are far above last year. Dealers who have started selling oil burners after being in the coal-stoker business for years report that oil burners are outselling stokers by a wide margin even in areas where it is cheaper to buy coal.

Entertainment over strikes and continuing price increases are prompting more and more householders to switch to oil or gas. There is a developing feeling that they cannot depend upon coal as a fuel. Oil-burner dealers say John L. Lewis is the best salesman they have.

Coal, however, still stands high on the list as fuel for big industry. There is no substitute for coke in the steel mills. Utilities, despite some shifting to other fuels, used 18 per cent of the coal consumed in this country last year. Coal, too, has great promise for the distant future as a source of oil. There is no known limit to the amount of coal available, and the Government is counting on this vast supply to provide synthetic oils if present sources of natural oil run dry.

* * *

THE big, unanswered problem of the coal industry is to find a market at present prices for the enormous amount of coal that it is able to dig in a year. Demand is slipping far below the level of recent boom days.

Miners, on a three-day week, found they could turn out almost enough coal to meet current demands. The shorter week made very little impression on stock piles. Mr. Lewis then found he had to put the men on a "no-day" work week. That was a sure way to create a shortage that would bring pressure from the country for a settlement of his dispute with the operators.

For the miners, an accounting of their gains over the years shows that these gains are real only so long as the men are working full time. The miner who works three days a week at a higher pay scale often is little better off than he was when he worked a full week at a lower pay scale. His welfare benefits, too, are not too sure when the fund from which the benefits are paid is not stable enough to keep them coming at an even flow.

Some miners, taking stock of life under Mr. Lewis over the years, are beginning to grumble over the way the fund is being operated. The vast majority, however, are found to be as loyal to him as ever. The welfare fund now is described as their one big interest. It means more to them than a raise in pay. The average miner is 55 years old and is looking toward a pension in a few years. He will fight for the $100-a-month security that has been promised to him, even if his striking reduces his chances of getting that security by cutting the income of the fund.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Admirals Dislike Loss Of Navy Friends

WASHINGTON

IT'S been a long time since the U. S. Navy hung the son of the U. S. Secretary of War, John C. Spencer, "at the yard-arm of the Brig Somers for insubordination and attempted mutiny," but there's always been a certain amount of insubordination in the Navy not unlike that flaring in the headlines today.

There is no case when the admirals, through their mouthpiece, the Navy League, called their commander-in-chief, Herbert Hoover, "abysmally ignorant." There was the case when the admirals, led by Hilary P. Jones, sabotaged Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson on eight-inch-gun cruisers. And there was the bitter attack on Stimson's war record, carried on subrosa by the admirals.

There was also the leak of a secret naval document regarding dirigible bases by Adm. Joseph M. Reeves, not unlike the leak by Capt. Crommelin today. And there was the shameless way in which certain naval admirals to the Coolidge Naval Conference in 1927 conspired with William Baldwin Shearer, lobbyist for American steel manufacturers and shipbuilders, to defeat the policies of their commander-in-chief, Mr. Coolidge.

Looking back over the last three decades, the Navy has battled much more vigorously against its Republican commanders-in-chief than against the Democrats. This is partly because, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, a former assistant naval secretary, there was almost nothing the Navy wanted that it could not get.

Even regarding uniforms, FDR bowed to the admirals. Because of the scarcity of textiles during the war, his Secretary of the Navy, the late Frank Knox, had banned a new blue-gray Summer uniform. Whereupon, Fleet, Commander Adm. Ernie King walked into the White House and reversed Knox in five minutes.

One reason the admirals are so irate today, of course, is that their inside drag with the White House is no more. Not only was Harry Truman an artillery captain during World War I, but his very close friend, Maj. Gen Harry Vaughan, is interested in the Army, not the Navy.

The Admirals Still Leak

READING a book written seventeen years ago, I came across this paragraph:

"Leaks are among the admirals' most effective means of propagandizing. When a White House decision has gone against them, when the State Dept. is carrying on a negotiation which the admirals oppose, when they fail to get their full appropriation, then the safest and best strategy is to leak.

"They do this to the press or to a discreet member of Congress. Both channels are effective. A furore is stirred up. The President or the State Dept. is pictured as stripping the country of its defense and baring its Fosom to the enemy—and after all the furore has subsided, the admirals usually find themselves on top."

That statement, written by this columnist in 1932 in the book "More Merry-Go-Round," is equally true today. It is true regarding the Captain Crommelin leaks; and it is true regarding the leak to Congressman Van Zandt, the naval reserve officer who so grossly libeled Secretary of Air Symington under the safety of Congressional immunity.

Admirals' Day In Court

THE public has lately forgotten it, but twice the Navy has been given complete and lengthy hearings by Congress, and each time Congress ruled against the Navy. Following which the admirals refused to accept the Congressional decision.

In 1946-47 Congress held protracted hearings regarding unification of the armed forces. The Navy was vigorously opposed. One of the admirals testifying against unification at that time was Adm. Gerald F. Bogan, who, apparently forgetting his own testimony, wrote a letter, recently leaked to the press, in which he complained the Navy never had a hearing.

However, after months of hearings and after listening to anyone who wanted to testify, Congress voted for unification. In a civilian form of Government, it is the Congress, not the Navy, which is supposed to have the final word.

Again last Winter further hearings were held on unification. Again Congress listened patiently to the admirals, but again Congress voted against them, tightened unification.

Cavalry And Battleships

ADMIRALS Bogan, Radford and Denfeld now complain that morale in the Navy is low. That is true.

However, during the 1946-47 hearings, Congressmen proposed that naval officers have the right to transfer to the Air Force or any branch of the Army with equal pay and rank—or with even greater pay and rank—if justified. This provision was inserted because it was foreseen that battleships and surface vessels, now easy targets for atomic bombs, would be put out of commission and there should be some place for naval officers to go.

The situation was considered similar to that in the Army when cavalry and horse-drawn artillery became outmoded. Cavalrymen and any other officer in an outmoded branch of the service were permitted to transfer to the expanding Air Force, sometimes with a promotion.

But when Congress proposed that naval officers be allowed to transfer to the Army or Air Force, the admirals opposed. At their behest this provision was taken out of the unification bill.

That is the real reason why morale is low in the Navy. The inescapable fact is that the battleship is woefully out of date, and the Navy would even like to lay up the Missouri if President Truman would consent. Thus naval officers have no other branch of the service to which they can transfer. No wonder they are discouraged.

Joseph & Stewart Alsop

Grain Among Chaff

WASHINGTON

THROUGH no fault of the Air Force, there is an important grain of truth among the volumes of dusty chaff that are being so angrily blown about the Capitol by the embatted naval aviators. Our defense has not been balanced since the war; it is not balanced today, and if present plans are followed, it will not be balanced for a long time to come.

This is so because our civilian political leaders have chosen to gamble on the deterrent effect of our strategic aviation and our stockpile of atomic weapons. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have not recommended this gamble, any more than they have approved Adm. Radford's fantastic project for defending ourselves against a non-naval power by investing the bulk of our resources in the Navy. The gamble has been chosen as the easiest way out of a dilemma.

The dilemma is, of course, whether to meet the challenge of Soviet rearmament, with all the attendant effort and expense; or to avoid the effort and expense, and not meet the challenge. The gamble on strategic aviation plus an atomic stockpile represents an attempt to escape both of the dilemma's extremely uncomfortable horns. By the standards of modern war, it is only moderately expensive to maintain the necessary groups of B-29s and B-36s and to push forward with the atomic energy program. Yet it can be (and is) argued that the Soviet Union never will risk aggression, while the masters of the Kremlin know their country "can be put back into the fourteenth century in a matter of weeks."

The main reason why we have drifted into this immense gamble on a simple deterrent, is probably the most obvious reason. In the past four years, only three leaders of the Administration have really believed in re-arming in earnest. But Robert A. Lovett is now in New York; Averell Harriman is in Paris, and James V. Forrestal is in Arlington Cemetery. They alone asked, "What needs to be done?" The question asked nowadays is, "What can be done?" which, being interpreted, means, "What is it convenient to do?"

In part, it is understandable why the underlying question of all policy-making is being rather differently phrased nowadays than in the past. Even under Lovett, the State Department staff was always primarily political - minded. They regarded the world-contest with the Soviet Union as chiefly a political contest. They feared that the defense effort would be competitive with the gigantic efforts needed to build strong economic - political foundations under the free world. They came perilously close to deprecating such purely strategic developments in our foreign policy as the Atlantic Pact.

Now, moreover, although in Dean G. Acheson we have a Secretary of State of the greatest attainments, it is not possible for Acheson to take the part that Lovett did in American defense planning. Indeed, it is hard enough for Acheson to protect his own field of policy-making from unwarranted incursions from the defense establishment.

Meanwhile, at the defense establishment, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson has wisely and courageously sought to break the shockingly wasteful habits of the armed services, which have done so much to prevent straight - thinking about defense problems. But Johnson lacks the ripe politico - strategic experience of a Lovett or a Forrestal; and he is also immensely ambitious. Thus he is inevitably tempted to go beyond true economy, and to make the false economies that look fine now but may cost, later on, untold lives and incalculable treasure.

Finally, there is the Bureau of the Budget, with its great influence and its natural professional deformation. There is the Chairman of the Economic Advisory Council, Dr. Edwin Nourse, with his peculiar doctrine that America, the wealthiest nation the world has seen, is not rich enough to defend herself. And there is the Secretary of the Treasury, John Snyder, with his great influence on the President, and his firm commitment to the doctrines of business-as-usual.

In view of this array of influences on the side of not doing what obviously needs to be done, we should perhaps thank God that at least we possess the deterrent of the B-36s and the atomic stockpile. Anyone who knows the state of the defenses of the free world, knows that we have very little else. And at any rate, a deterrent is something.

On the other hand, it is difficult to forget that the world was once before confronted with a giant power, frankly aggressive in intention, and re-arming with all possible speed. On that occasion, Stanley Baldwin was the man whom the dilemma bleakly confronted. Baldwin chose to do only what it was convenient to do. Before long, the aggressor had achieved decisive strength. Fear begot weakness, and weakness begot the appeasement of Neville Chamberlain. But appeasement achieved nothing but shame. And the ultimate horror ensued.

Henry C. McFadyen

School Problems

(Mr. McFadyen is principal of the Albemarle High School.—Editors, The News.)

* * *

DO you want to know the toughest problem the schools are up against? It is not lack of buildings, or kids that throw spitballs, or parents who fuss because their child did not get into the honor society.

The problem that teachers worry about and talk about the most is how to keep up reasonable standards when every class contains a pretty good sized group of children who cannot ever reach them. Teachers would like for a passing grade to mean something, but every year every high school presents fine-looking diplomas to boys and girls who don't know who discovered America or what year he did it. Every year the elementary schools send up to the high schools swarms of children who cannot put down a decimal point or four figures and add them up correctly.

Eventually these students leave the school and go into jobs. Then one day an employer stops the principal on the street and says, "I've got one of your graduates up here in my office, and for goodness sake, she can't even divide. Why don't you teach them something?"

Well, the simple truth is that there are a lot of things you can't teach that girl, and long division is one of them. She just does not have the ability to learn it. Because she was a high school graduate, the man who employed her assumed that she had mastered the rudiments of mathematics. The trouble is that people outside the school still have the notion that possession of a high school diploma indicates that the graduate knows something.

I do not mean to sound pessimistic. Students who have made good grades during high school do know something. The girl who makes the valedictory address at the graduation exercises (and it still happens) would amaze you with her knowledge of everything from how to make a button hole to the charter of the United Nations. She will go off to college or into a job somewhere and be a credit to the school.

This is to say that I think the schools do a pretty good job on their capable students, but that the schools have had to let the bars down mighty low to make it possible for some of their students to get out the door at all. At this point you may ask just why it is necessary to let everybody out the door. The answer is that they can't be kept in school forever, and the only way to get them through is to pretend they passed their courses. I don't think anybody is foolish.

We believe very strongly in this country that everybody is entitled to the same kind of chance at an education. We even have laws that say a child must go to school until he is sixteen. It doesn't matter whether he is able to learn anything or not.

I am not suggesting that these children of low ability be thrown out of school at the end of the seventh or eighth grade to wander the streets and get into trouble. But I am saying that the schools don't yet know just what to do with them and for them. And I am asking the public to recognize this problem and to understand why it is that school often is too easy for those children who were fortunate enough to be born smart.