THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1949

BUMPER CROP OF CHILDREN

IT MAY take a while for Dr. N. L. Engelhardt's estimate of Charlotte's school needs to sink in. When it does, the people of this city will realize they have a monumental project on their hands.

Dr. Engelhardt, consultant for the City School Board, estimates that the City school enrollment, now at 20,000, will hit 30,000 by 1960. That's an increase of 50 per cent in ten years. It means adding in the next decade half again as many classroom facilities as we now have.

No one knows how much money it is going to cost to give this bumper crop of youngsters the modern educational facilities they need. Certainly it will run into the millions for the City of Charlotte alone, not counting the accumulating needs for the County area.

Dr. E. H. Garinger, City School Superintendent, has already said a bond issue of "several million dollars" will be necessary next year. Present school facilities — even including the new classrooms provided by the current $4 million building program — are already inadequate.

Something will have to give, for Mecklenburg County, charged by law with the financial responsibility for new school buildings, doesn't have the borrowing capacity to meet the impending school needs. In September, the County's indebtedness was $8,446,750 and its constitutional limit was $11,985,093. This presented a leeway of only $3,538,343.

That borrowing capacity will slowly increase in coming years as the County retires bonds and as the total property evaluation (which determines the limitation) goes up. But it is unlikely to increase fast enough.

As we have pointed out before, there are three ways out of this dilemma:

1. An expanded "pay-as-you-go" school building program. This is immediately reflected in a higher tax rate, though it has the advantage of saving interest charges on bonds.

2. The assumption by the County of old Charlotte school district bonds in the amount of some $660,000. If the County would take over these bonds, as most N. C. counties have done, it could legally borrow up to 8 per cent of its assessed valuation instead of 5 per cent at present. The borrowing capacity would then jump from $11,985,093 to $19,176,150.

3. A general revaluation of all property in Mecklenburg County to bring it more in line with present-day values. A more realistic evaluation would automatically boost our borrowing capacity.

Before much longer the economy-minded County Commissioners will have to face this problem. A whole generation of children will be condemed to substandard facilities and equipment unless a solution is found.

PRIVATE PENSION DEFECTS

IN THE flurry of interest over Labor's 1949 drive for better private pension funds, many of us have lost sight of certain fundamental defects in such welfare programs. It remained for the analytical *Washington Post* to point up some of these shortcomings:

1. Good pension systems must insure uninterrupted payment in bad times as well as good. Pensions forced on financially weak concerns provide no such assurance.
2. Millions of workers employed by concerns that cannot afford the extra cost of financing pensions are not covered.
3. Private pension plans restrict the mobility of labor, since workers entitled to pensions are unwilling to forfeit their rights by shifting to unpensioned employment.
4. Older workers are handicapped in finding employment in concerns that pension their employees according to length of service.
5. Accrued liabilities are always high at the inception of private pension plans when many workers with long years of service are close to retirement age. Failure to provide for them may result in claims that will bankrupt pension funds.

The *Post* prefers an expansion and liberalization of the contributory Federal social insurance system. It contends that private pension systems "can never be an adequate substitute for this kind of protection."

There is one trend in the new Ford and Bethlehem systems which somewhat ameliorates these shortcomings. That is the provision that the company's contribution will be reduced as Social Security benefits are increased.

This may mean that the power and influence of industry will be added to the pressure of unorganized, unpensioned workers to bring about the very liberalization of the Social Security plan that the *Post* desires.

If there is any one aspect of the "welfare state" that most everyone can agree on, it is the necessity for revising the Social Security schedules to bring them in line with existing costs of living.

FOR WANT OF A LAW

IF WE may be permitted to paraphrase Ben Franklin's worn maxim about the nail and the shoe, we would merely observe that for want of a law the case against a State examiner who peddled driver licenses for $20 each was lost. And for want of a case against the former examiner, Joseph C. Holmes of Louisburg, the whole system of license examinations has been placed in jeopardy.

Holmes had been charged with ten different counts of receiving a gratuity for issuing driver's licenses. He was tried in Louisburg Friday. An assistant attorney general from Raleigh and the State's chief driver's license examiner were there to assist the County Solicitor in prosecuting Holmes.

But he was acquitted by a jury for the very simple reason that the only law under which he could be tried was a 1913 master and servant statute. It did not cover license examiners. Two witnesses testified that they bought licenses for $20, and Holmes had admitted selling licenses before he was relieved of his duties last September.

In addition to pointing out the legal loopholes, defense attorneys made much of the fact that North Carolina had not been defrauded since Holmes sent $2 of the gratuity to Raleigh and counted the remaining $18 as a tip. Perhaps the State Treasury was not defrauded, but the thousands of North Carolinians who venture forth on the public highways under the assumption that the drivers they meet are duly qualified were certainly endangered.

The remedy is easy. The next General Assembly must put near the top of the agenda a strict law imposing heavy punishment on any license examiner who would abuse the trust and confidence placed in him.

MIND AND BODY

THERE ARE still a few survivors of that once good-sized element of the medical profession who look down their noses at psychiatry, but for the most part physicians all over the world have come to realize that an understanding of the basic principles of psychiatry is as important to the general practitioner as a scalpel is to a surgeon.

In the medical schools of the nation there is an increasing interest in psychiatry. Men who formerly held out against the teaching of such psychiatric pioneers as Freud and Jung are enthusiastically joining the medical men who have, for many years, been of greater value to their patients because of their use of psychiatric techniques.

There are those among the older doctors who have, through instinct or intuition, always made use of psychology in their practice. But not until the beginning of this decade did the great body of American doctors understand the principles of psychosomatic medicine.

In Charlotte last week, opening the local series of Heineman lectures, Dr. Kenneth E. Appel, associate professor of psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania, made clear the necessity for the increased application of psychiatric techniques by general practitioners.

Pointing out that there are 200,000 physicians and only 5,000 psychiatrists in the United States, Dr. Appel urged doctors in this area to expand their knowledge of psychiatry.

He cited two cases in his experience in which persons were treated for physical ailments over a long period of time before psychiatrists discovered that their symptoms were induced by emotional disturbances.

More and more the medical world is realizing that man is not a two-part being, carefully separated into mind and body; man is the combination of mind and body, and mind and body are inseparable.

Such men as Dr. Appel — and there are many of them — are helping to teach doctors this important lesson, and in so doing are bringing closer that day when a fusion of medicine and psychiatry will make man master of his mind and body.

When two or more people want to park at the same spot at the same time and the other so-and-so gets there before you do, you have a parking problem.—*Plainview (Tex.) Herald.*

We've never cared too much for football or a political argument except when the other side was so darn weak we didn't have a chance to lose. — *Pelham (Ga.) Journal.*

A hen in Cleveland, Ohio, lays flat eggs. It could be that the square milk bottles may have something to do with this trend. — *Columbus (Miss.) Commercial Dispatch.*

Efforts to keep liquor from going into the dry states may be well advised. It is sort of like trying to pour more into a full bucket. — *Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial-Appeal.*

Experience has taught us a lot, but it has made us so cautious that we aren't good for much—*Starkville (Miss.) News.*

'Maybe We Could Sort-Of Tame Him Gradually'

People's Platform

Ah, For The Good Old Days

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

IT IS QUITE likely that the few women who read your back-page columnist, Erich Brandeis, must be flattered and appeased from time to time; but there are times when he throws all reason to the wind, and lays it on a bit too thick. His latest (Oct. 31) is just a bit too much to swallow. His statement that things would be wonderful if we had a woman president, is not a dangerous statement, but it is certainly devoid of any common sense.

The three greatest tragedies of the 20th century are (a) the two World Wars which took 75 million lives, (b) the incidence of Spanish Influenza, which took thirty million lives and (c) the desertion by half the women of the world of the kitchen, the nursery, the sewing room, and the place where now reposes our generations' most horrible invention — "the baby sitter."

Man reached the highest pinnacle of his intellectual and cultural powers during the long period when the women of the world stuck to the roles of housewife, mother, cook, seamstress and companion. During these long centuries of charming women, content with being seen and not heard, the world produced Socrates, Plato, Shakespeare, Milton, Beethoven, Cavour—the list is endless.

The list is endless to the point of woman's "emancipation", when it stopped cold, and dead in its tracks. It came to an abrupt and tragic halt when women stopped cooking, sewing, singing lullabies, and being sweet, and instead, began organizing clubs, associations, conventions, conferences, political rallies, vigilantes groups, pressure groups, and even entered business, trade, and political office. Outside of the few women in history who are remembered only because of the great sons they gave to the world, there is not the name of a single female which ever has, or ever will outlive the few months or years of her own contemporaneous activities—activities full "of sound and fury—signifying nothing."

It is no co-incidence that when women finally acquired the vote after years of horrible badgering and terrible nuisance, we saw ushered into our national life the era of the greatest corruption and moral and political stupidity in our national history, and not the least of which were Harding and Prohibition.

Let us hope and pray that women will regain their charm, something which they'll never recapture by listening to Erich Brandeis, but which they have in their power to restore to mankind by slowly and even enthusiastically returning to their normal and God-given activities as mothers, companions, wives, cooks, rockers of the cradle, and seamstresses.

—P. L. LINDSEY.

More On Americanism

CHAPEL HILL

Editors, THE NEWS:

I HAD prepared a rather lengthy reply to Mr. Golden's article in which he asked me the question: "What is an American?" But after giving the epistle "prayerful" consideration I've decided to withhold it and instead, will have only a few brief comments to make.

Let me say that I'm profoundly amazed at Mr. Golden's question. I presume that he's been living with us quite a few years now; yet, he still doesn't know what an American is. I'd be very much interested in knowing what he calls himself!!

As I understand it, what he really wants to know is how to distinguish an American from a European. Inasmuch as the time or the space is not available to enlighten him, let me call to his attention several sources which may help him solve that "gargantuan problem."

First, try Charlotte's Public Library where tens of thousands of words can be found on the subject. There he will no doubt find "The American" by the subtle American novelist Henry James. James' penetrating insight is quite illuminating.

Secondly, the sociology books and the detailed American Histories are all full of good meat on the subject also. Finally, and this is the most important source of all, seek out the "blessed trinity" of reason, observation, and experience. Where all other sources may fail, this one will surely make him conscious of the great contradistinctions between the typical or standard American and the European.'

Tch Tch—and to think that Mr. Golden is an editor too—and Uncle Walt says that editors are supposed to know all about everything!

—J. R. CHERRY JR.

Aid For Our Spastics

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

THOUSANDS of hearts thrilled on reading your valuable paper this afternoon (Nov. 3). The announcement of Grand Monarch Jones of the National organization of the Azusa Grotto, that the Spastics Center of Charlotte is to receive such generous aid stirs every heart that beats with sympathy for the long neglected spastic children.

The appreciation of the members and countless friends of the Carolina Spastics Association Inc. is immeasurably more than can be expressed.

—CHAS. M. BOYD, President
Carolina Spastics Association, Inc.

Note Of Appreciation

DAVIDSON

Editors, THE NEWS:

I WISH to thank you for the very excellent co-operation of THE NEWS in our recent Homecoming. You gave us the finest coverage. It means a great deal to us. I thank you sincerely.

—J. R. CUNNINGHAM,
President, Davidson College.

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.—Editors, The News.

Joseph And Stewart Alsop

Way The Wind Blows

WASHINGTON

ANYONE WHO wants to know where the Truman Administration is headed should pay very particular attention to the name of the man President Truman appoints to succeed Dr. Edwin Nourse as chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. For his name will suggest the probable answer to a whole series of deeply important unanswered questions.

Some of these questions are: Will the Administration really slice defense expenditures sharply in the year of the Beria bomb? Will the Administration, as a recent public statement by the President seemed to suggest, really plug for higher taxes? And finally, how hard will Truman really fight for his Fair Deal program?

If the name of Nourse's successor is Leon Keyserling, present vice-chairman of the Council, the probable answer to the first two questions is "no." And the probable answer to the third question is "very hard indeed." For Keyserling is the candidate of the labor-liberal element in the Administration. And he is also one of the leading figures in a continuing and deeply significant contest within the Administration, which President Truman has never resolved.

This struggle revolves around two conflicting economic and fiscal theories. On the one hand are the economizers, who are deeply disturbed by the spectacle of mounting deficits in boom years, and whose dream is therefore a balanced budget. The recently deposed Dr. Nourse was one of the most important leaders of this group. Among his allies have been Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder, Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, Presidential aide John Steelman, Budget Director Frank Pace on some issues, and now apparently Defense Secretary Louis Johnson.

The economizers concentrate on two obvious methods of balancing the budget — cutting expenditures and raising taxes. The trouble is that hardly anyone believes that now is the time to raise taxes, or that new taxes would really make up the prospective $5,500,000,000 deficit. As for cutting expenses, the largest and most immediately painless area for slicing costs is defense and foreign spending.

President Truman clearly has been listening to the economizers. This is suggested by his rather equivocal statement on higher taxes, which actually probably meant very little. It is also suggested by something that means a great deal — the fantastic contradiction between Truman's announcement that the Soviets had perfected an atomic bomb, and his virtually simultaneous decision to cut defense expenditures drastically.

Yet, as is so often the case, Truman has also been listening to the second group, which includes such men as Keyserling's colleague, Economic Councilor John Clark; Agriculture Secretary Charles Brannan and the Agriculture Dept. Economist Dr. Louis Bean; and, on most issues, Presidential Counsel Clark Clifford.

These men fix their eyes on a higher level of national income, rather than on expenditures, taxes, and the current deficit. They argue that only a constantly increasing national income will permit a balanced budget, or indeed make it possible for the United States to carry its tremendous burden of economic responsibilities.

This group argues that the only way out of deficit spending is to get the level of production, business activity and employment the country had in 1948, and then increase this level yearly. If this can be done, they assert, even at the present level of taxes and expenditures, the budget would be about balanced in 1951, and there would be a surplus in 1952.

The alternative, according to this theory, is growing unemployment, and greater and greater deficits as the government gives relief to the unemployed. If this is to be avoided, national income must increase at a constant rate of about 3 per cent a year. Only this rate of increase can balance off constantly growing productivity of labor.

The trouble is that no one seems to have a very clear idea of how this dream of an endlessly increasing national income is to be achieved. Equally the economizers have no very clear idea of how their dream of a balanced budget is to be realized without cutting the liver and lights out of the defense program.

Robert C. Ruark

Open Road Again

NEW YORK

THE annual October itch having done its avid work, despite a month-long battle with his better self, little Buster here is off on another one of those things. Ordinarily I know where I'm going, having thought up a beautiful and noble itinerary to impress my masters, but this is open rebellion and I will tell them nothing at all. They can take that old expense account and they can . . . oops. What am I saying?

Usually the business of travel is simple. You mince into the master's platinum-floored office wearing a look of sly self-sacrifice. You toss in a few waste pitches about the weather and what a fine editorial that was the other day, make a couple of innocuous confessions of unimportant sins he knows about anyhow and then mutter that New York is wearing a little thin and maybe . . .

Then comes the real technique. If it's Winter, you never choose a trip that will be warm. You say that Montreal needs looking at and the man agrees that maybe it does. If it's Summer, you say maybe we better check St. Louis or something classy in Kansas and the man says fine. As long as it isn't too much fun you can do it.

From there on it's a cinch. Once you're out of town it is practically no distance at all to New Orleans or San Francisco or Havana or Acapulco or Denver or some other pleasant place. As long as you don't answer the phones or read letters the office can't get at you and you can generally bum eating money from the editors as you go along, editors being pretty easy to flimflam if it ain't their dough.

When you come back a couple months later the office is reasonably testy, especially when the expense account is rendered unto Caesar. But if, you keep out of sight for a few days, some new crisis usually bobs up and takes the heat off you. This has been the technique for some time, and always workable until now.

When I hinted shyly at my three keepers, the other day, that travel was broadening, they all three stood up on their hind legs and yowled.

"Not New Orleans!" they screamed, as one wounded horse, "Not Havana!"

This seemed highly unreasonable, since I had been to neither place this week, but you cannot win by battling the bosses except subtly, and I could think of nothing very subtle at the time.

"And another thing," said the leader of my keepers, in what I presume he meant to be a sarcastic tone. "Try to imagine that you are three normal people, instead of you; and attempt to spend only what three normal people would spend if they were off on a spree. By that I mean, why take a whole floor of a hotel when the bridal suite is plenty big enough? Take taxis, don't buy automobiles. If you must tip, five bucks is plenty to give the bellboy for bringing you a jug of ice water."

"And no Tangier" the No. 2 keeper shouted. "No Casablanca! We hired a columnist, not a member of the Arab League."

"No Rome!" the No. 3 boy marked. "No Capri!"

This went along until I finally figured that the only places I am free to go are Walla Walla and Weehawken, and I was never able to force much copy out of either town.

So I just say nothing at all and look pathetic and finally the No. 1 keeper says, "Well, he hasn't been to Denver lately or to San Francisco" and I blush and toe the rug and so that seems to be the plan.

I intend to start with Denver, just to fulfill the contract, but from there in it's an open agme. May go to San Francisco—may not. May go to Hollywood. May go to Honolulu. May go to Fiji or Australia. May just stay in Denver. Can't tell yet. I'm the boy with the flexible mind, and I may not come home at all.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Airplane Navy Vs. Battleship Navy

(ED. NOTE—This is the third in Drew Pearson's series on Army-Navy unification.)

WASHINGTON

IT'S easy to understand why the air admirals are boiling mad at unification. To some extent you have to sympathize with them.

What they can't forget is that for years the Navy's airmen had to fight the battleship admirals and now, just as the airplane carrier has come into its own, they find themselves stymied by unification.

The admirals who put up this long running-fight with the old-fashioned battleship admirals include such brilliant officers as Gerald Bogan, Arthur Radford, L. T. Sprague and Jack Towers, now retired. Thirty years ago, just out of Annapolis, they went into the relatively new naval aviation as fliers and worked up to the top. They were convinced that the future of the Navy lay in the air. They had the courage to believe this even at a time when most of the admirals swore that nothing could ever sink a battleship.

During the recent campaign in the Pacific, Admiral Sprague had the experience of commanding Carrier Squadron 22 with several other higher ranking admirals taking orders from him. Because operating carriers in battle formation, with their network of protecting airplanes and destroyers, is such a skilled job, Sprague, a junior, was in command. When the squadron put into Pearl Harbor or any other base, the senior admirals, untrained in carrier battle formation, then took over.

With the war over and the battleship being laid up in mothballs, naval aviation at long last appeared about to achieve full recognition. Whereupon Congress passed the unification act, and with it, the chief air responsibility went to the Air Force. No wonder the air admirals are indignant!

Naval Carriers' Heroism

THE full story of the Navy's airplane carriers was one of the most heroic of the war, and the heroism was even greater because of a serious defect discovered in the carriers after the Navy had built most of them.

This defect—like most of the Navy's trouble—was due to faulty engineering and bad planning. Airplane-carrier designers had failed to take into consideration the possibility that decks were vulnerable and that once the deck of a carrier was torn up, no plane could take off.

The Japs, however, soon discovered this. The result was that suicide Jap fighter planes dived for the deck of carrier after carrier with deadly casualties. Entirely aside from the tragic loss of life, so many carriers were put out of commission that they had to be sent all the way through the Panama Canal to the Atlantic coast for repairs. The West Coast yards were too full.

Okinawa Losses

AT ONE time during the battle of Okinawa, virtually all of the Navy's carriers were either en route back to the U. S. for repairs or en route to battle after being repaired. The shipyards at Pearl Harbor were full. The West Coast yards were at capacity, and the East Coast yards had to handle the overflow—despite the extra time necessary to carry the limping vessels through the Panama Canal.

Thus one Jap suicide plane could put a carrier out of commission for four to six months.

The British, foreseeing this, equipped their carriers with armored decks. Toward the end of the war new American carriers were also built with armored decks. But it took a long time for the Navy to wake up to its mistake.

Experience in the Pacific proved that carriers were at their peak effectiveness in making surprise raids on the enemy. If carriers had to stay in one place, as at Okinawa, they suffered unmercifully. But if they could sneak up on the Japanese mainland under cover of night, make their attack at dawn, and then retreat, their losses were much less.

Battle Of Leyte Blunder

IT WAS the battle of Leyte, where carriers also played an important part, which convinced many Navy men that unification was necessary.

The command in the battle of Leyte was divided as follows. General MacArthur commanded not only the Army but the western fleet under Adm. Tom Kincaid. It was Kincaid's job to protect the landing of MacArthur's troops. The rest of the fleet was under Admiral Nimitz who had delegated the immediate command to Admiral Halsey.

Halsey was supposed to keep Kincaid advised at all times of his movements, but not take orders from him. During the course of the battle, Halsey advised Admiral Kincaid that a squadron of Jap vessels were coming toward the Philippines from the north, and at X-time he would break away from the major battle and give chase.

When the appropriate time arrived, Admiral Halsey picked up his fleet telephone and told his commanders that X-time had arrived and to carry out their orders, previously received. His part of the fleet thereupon sailed off to the North. The battleships went with him.

However, Halsey's fleet telephone did not have the range to reach a part of his fleet. This part, consisting of smaller vessels, remained along the Philippine coast virtually unprotected.

It was suspected a few days later that the Japanese attack from the North was actually a feint in order to draw Halsey away from the major part of the battle of Leyte; and afterward, information captured from Japanese admirals substantiated this suspicion.

Surprise Jap Attack

FURTHERMORE the feint almost succeeded in seriously impeding the course of the war. For, the next night, a Japanese squadron, steaming at top speed, caught the southern part of Halsey's fleet and riddled the smaller ships. The range was so close that shells went through both sides of the vessels.

What the Jap commander did not know was that the heavier American ships had exhausted their ammunition the night before and were powerless to fire back. Had he known this, and stayed to mop up on the practically defenseless fleet, the capture of the Philippines and perhaps the end of the war might have been delayed.

But, not knowing this, the Jap admiral turned and fled.

Had all parts of the American Navy been operating under one command at the battle of Leyte, Halsey would not have gone steaming off after a Japanese feinting force.

Undoubtedly it was this incident that caused Halsey to tell the Richardson board in the late Summer of 1948 that he favored Army-Navy unification.