

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

And Evening Chronicle

Published Every Afternoon Except Sunday By
The News Publishing Company, Inc.

W. G. Dowd Jr., President
and General Manager
J. E. Dowd, Vice-President
and Editor

The daily edition of The Charlotte News was established in 1888. The Evening Chronicle was established in 1903 and was purchased by and consolidated with The Charlotte News May 8, 1914.

The News desires to be notified promptly of errors in any of its reports that proper correction may be made at once.

MEMBER ASSOCIATED PRESS AND AP FEATURES

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited to this paper, and also the local news published herein.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Charlotte, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

By carrier: 20 cents a week; one month, 67 cents. By mail: One month 67 cents; three months, \$2.00; six months, \$3.20; one year, \$10.40.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1942

Peace Plan

The Vice-President Has All the Answers but the Big One

Vice President Henry Agard Wallace, accused of idealism, took the stand last night to bring the Atlantic Charter up to date, to clarify the peace aims of the United Nations, and to explain away the fable of the world's quart of milk. He spoke for the Administration, if not for all our Allies, and he spoke well, up to a point.

Peace, he said, must not find us unprepared. The victorious nations must be ready with a council to administer the affairs of the world. First, we must disarm the Axis powers, assume sufficient control over them to make certain of their psychological disarmament for the future. We should clear German, Italian and Japanese schools of Government control, and thus kill Nazism, Fascism and Japism.

The Vice President thought himself something more than an idle dreamer: "Is it Utopian to foresee that South America, Asia and Africa will experience a development of industry, a saggy sentimentality to hold out hope to these millions in Europe and Asia fighting for freedom, our freedom?" He called up the ghosts of the first World War, branded the mistakes. To there, we were with him.

This time, after disarmament, the world must have "the maximum" of home rule and "the minimum" of centralized force to hold the structure together. There, Henry Wallace became vague, confessed he didn't know the real answer to the problems of tomorrow: "The United Nations are groping for a formula which will give the greatest possible liberty without producing anarchy."

The United Nations? The world has groped for that self-same formula for ages, but never found it, and likely never will. It will be satisfied with the Wallace plan for peace, even though it be a new high in realistic approaches. It carries the search for a solution only to the point of a question. If we leave it there, we're ruined again.

The only solution which has never been attempted is a world order with great concentrated power to enforce peace, to police the globe for generations if necessary, and smother the little flames of war. If we shy off from such control now, we will have relinquished our own obligation for the second time, and prepared the way for the third great war.

Dr. Little

His Work for the Community A Monument to His Memory

Dr. Luther Little's announcement of his coming retirement as pastor of the First Baptist Church brings realization to the community that the active life of one of its outstanding leaders is coming to an end. His 25 years of service as pastor have seen monuments built to Dr. Little in his church, his congregation, and the esteem in which he is held in North Carolina and the South.

The years of his pastorate, beginning in 1917, might be said to represent an era of progress for Charlotte. To that era, the pastor of the First Church has contributed considerably. As a leader in social and religious affairs, he made his influence felt throughout the city. Under him, his church grew to a new prominence.

As one of those men without whom no Christian community could be built and developed, he is deserving of Charlotte's appreciation and praise. When his time of retirement comes in the summer his work will stand behind him, sufficient reminder of the man who passed this way.

Yankee Trick

Japs Meet P-38 Over Bunk; Find Criticism Academic

The little Jap pilots, those who returned, must have jabbered hysterical, unbelievable stories when they reached home. In the bright New Guinea skies they had seen, for some minutes, almost half of their fellows were missing they would never return. It was those damned Yankees again. New tricks; two planes flew where one flew before. Double planes, the sky was full of them.

This Lockheed's Lightning, the P-38,

Bunk. It dropped in quickly, uninvited, and made its first little tea party a whooping success. A dozen of the twin-fuselage interceptors, under double billing as the fastest warplanes in the air and the biggest bust of America's air program, flashed down out of the sun to mix it with a flight of 40 Jap planes. They did well.

Thirteen enemy fighters (a little over-anxious) and two bombers went down before the terrific hail of fire. The flying American artillery, throwing 75 mm. cannon shells and spraying 30 caliber machine bullets, completely wrecked a superior force. The visitors gave precious little protection to their desperate soldiers on the beaches below.

In one more theater of war a new U. S. weapon made itself felt, and its weight from the first was considerable. The criticism which has been heaped upon the Lightning at home and abroad in no way shortened the range of its guns, or lightened its firepower. Against such armament, the light Jap ships were almost helpless. One P-38 was slightly damaged, but that was all.

Dwindling criticism of our weapons in the first year of war are dying down; they will be heard more infrequently as planes, tanks, guns and men prove themselves in battle. The fifteen Japs who went down over Bunk, at any rate, can take no consolation from the fact that the Lightning is not maneuverable in combat. They know better, and learned the hard way.

Food Rush

Delayed Rationing Plan Puts People to the Test

At first glance the new rationing program for food in the United States would seem to be the most colossal blunder in a long series of Washington experiments in restriction by bureaucracy. Because the point system of rationing some 200 items of food was announced five weeks in advance, there is a golden opportunity for the hoarders to indulge in selfishness at the expense of the public, and lay in their stocks.

This is not the first time such an opportunity has been given. We followed the same haphazard program with coffee and gasoline. Gilt time; the American people can make a good thing of hoarding. We are of the opinion that, despite the difficulties of the course, food rationing should have been announced as it went into effect. But because that was impractical if not impossible, the people have been saddled with a burden of responsibility.

Between now and February the American public has its greatest chance to demonstrate that it knows what our war is all about, that it can accept the rationing of food as part of the war, and leave hoarding alone. A proper spirit exhibited by the public in these five weeks could make the hoarder unpopular and afraid. It could make the rationing program a success.

We fear, however, that thousands of Americans cannot be constrained from invading every grocery store in sight, buying to the limit of their resources. The five-week pause gives another great advantage to the rich who are able to lay in their stocks—but it is our hope that retail grocers will see to it that a rationing program of their own will halt any immediate buying rush and prevent a food shortage before February.

We are not convinced that Americans will accept the challenge from Washington and calmly await the start of rationing. But we are certain that this is a rare opportunity for those of us at home to prove ourselves. To fail is to betray, in a sense, the boys overseas.

General Eisenhower fooled the Nazis by buying long underwear in London stores. They, of course, assumed he was returning home to a living-room temperature in the low 60's.

Through the Fuehrer's kindness, a few Italians are admitted to Southern France. To date, however, the Duce hasn't shown up at Monte Carlo claiming to be big Casino.

To the unnamed Russian who, in the maelstrom of battle, counts 2,823 captured tanks, a DSC—for distinguished

The Tree Of Liberty Only Grows When Watered By The Blood Of Tyrants. BERTRAND RUSSELL

Platform Ormonos

Both Ends Of A Candle

By Samuel Grafton

IN A MACABRE kind of way, I derive considerable enjoyment from listening to those Congressmen who say that no political issue should be made of the war, but that gasoline rationing is the most disgraceful non-issue ever imposed on a free people. Sometimes they say that no political issue should be made of the war, but that it was some business that they have their backs to the wall.

In the delightful dialectics of confusion, it also stated that no political issue should be made of the war, but what's this business of telling a man he can't travel when he wants to, where he wants to?

The higher flights of this kind of rhetoric, which means the dumber speeches, often inform us that no political issue should be made of the war, but that these new trends to dictatorship simply must be stopped.

I feel obliged to call attention to this fine line so often drawn between the war itself, and its necessary and inevitable consequences. The game is to support the first and denounce the second, a quite irresponsible game. The plain truth is that anyone who opposes the natural and unavoidable consequences of the war, opposes the war, and his agreement to support the war in principle becomes a refusal to do so in fact.

I have written at some length about the "obscurantists," those weedy fellows who are baiting the vote-getters to catch every group of citizens simultaneously, even if incoherently, when they declare firmly that they are against all this regimentation nonsense, and also that it is high time labor worked wherever it was. Neither argument, by itself, is so bad as the cynical and murky combination of the two.

But the chief weapon in the armory of the ob-

scurantists is precisely the one I have outlined above, which is to draw a distinction between the war, which they support, and all its local and special phenomena, which they oppose.

"This makes a wonderful, obscure holiday for your obscurantist politician, for he can demand on Tuesday that we fight to the finish, and denounce on Thursday the hiring of any additional Federal workers needed to prosecute that fight."

He is in the war, and out of it, as he chooses and as it suits his purpose. If a victory has been won, he is in the war, and he boasts about it. If automobile tires must be collected, however, he instantly steps out of the war, and stands aside, and says, hey, what's all this?

When North Africa is successfully invaded, he is proud that we did it, and did it so well, but when the boys on Guadalcanal turn out to lack some kinds of munitions, it is no longer "we" it becomes "they"; "they" are bungling, he says, standing on the sidelines, now, and shaking his head.

He wants you to know now that he is for the war, and he wants you to remember afterward that he was against it. He wants you to recall that he was with you in everything you did, and also that he was against everything it cost.

His political program is based on the theory that you will be so sore about your butter, you won't care what happens to your victory, and his dearest hope for the world is that it will bend down and tie its shoe while the future passes by. He is in it again, out again, and we must sharpen our perspective to this kind of stuff, or else obscurity is going to take over the country.

We have got to come to know this man, in both parties, as familiarly as we once knew the prohibitionist and the free silverite. He is the issue, and not the issues he raises.

Back To An Old American Idea

—By Herblock



Place An Order Now

It's Peace Or Chaos

By Dorothy Thompson

WASHINGTON MR. FRANK ALTSCHUL, in an exceptionally well argued letter to the New York Times last Sunday, recalling the tragic revision of sentiment following the last war, warned against putting our hopes too high for the period following this one, lest again, out of disillusionment, we throw away the opportunities offered by our victory.

Mr. Altschul does not depreciate American idealism. What he fears is that the hope for too much and getting relatively little, the odd disgust with what Americans are now to consider the irreducible aims of other nations, will again, as after Wilson, put our idealism into reverse and swing us back to isolationism. If it does, we shall again start the cycle over a new war.

His warning comes at a moment when many, notably Mr. Willkie, are pressing for a clearer exposition of peace aims. Mr. Willkie wants to see a strong co-operative peace structure created, and he wants to see the end of imperialism. Mr. Altschul fears that perhaps all the nations participating in the war on our side are not in agreement, especially about the latter, and the attitude appears to be growing. Either we get what we want, namely the fulfillment of our ideals, or we will wash our hands of the whole business.

After the last war, this actually happened. It was not only the political opponents of President Wilson who turned against him. Actually some of the strongest supporters of the League of Nations were turned against him. They had seen that Wilson had not had all the stubborn faults of his stubborn virtues, he might have carried the country with him in his aims. He also knew that the Treaty and the League were faulty.

But he was deserted by his most idealistic followers. They were, in fact, sick with revulsion than the isolationists. They wanted their own world or no world order and they got the latter.

The trouble with most liberals is that they are unwilling to admit that Peace demands a new power structure. The achievement of an exact justice with which all nations and all people will be eternally satisfied, is obviously unattainable. So is the immediate creation of a world in which every human being will be free from want and fear. We can reasonably hope to begin to create a world climate in which the worst social and international injustices are alleviated. But even that will be impossible unless we can chain the dogs of war, and this requires peace.

The liberal mind is hesitant to face this fact.

active power, power has been associated with opposition in the liberal mind, ever since. It hopes to "remove the causes of war," which it interprets to be imperialism, unemployment, strictures on national rights, and many other things.

But it is obvious, that if we wait to stop war until we have removed all its possible causes, we will wait until the end of time. It would be as logical to argue that we should have no police system in any state until all the laws of the state were absolutely just, and all possible causes of social conflict eliminated. If we did we should have universal anarchy.

Actually, an immediate cause of this war lies in the achievement of one of the more idealistic aims of the last one: The rights of small nations to self-determination, and independence. No one can say that this ideal was not realized. Poles, Czechs, Jugoslavs, and others, were liberated. Plebiscites were held, under impartial control, to permit boundaries to be formed on the principle of self-determination.

But these independencies were part of an adequate power structure; each depended for its defense upon a League of Nations without force, from which any state might secede, and eventually upon treaties with one or another of the Great Powers. Their weakness constituted a temptation to aggression, and Nazi Germany was able to tempt them.

Now, if considering the demands for independence resulting from the unravelling of the colonial question, it is to be held that this is a unifying force in what framework? Do those who denounce imperialism define what they mean by it? Do they wish to Balkanize the entire Pacific area into many complete independencies, granting to every island in the sea the right to do as it pleases regardless of the world power structure for peace liberals mean this, but unless they are clearer in their exposition, this is what may follow. If empire are to be dissolved, what is to take their place as a unifying force? The idealists who ever fought on this continent was fought against the principle of self-determination when that principle was invoked by the South.

Lincoln, the idol of liberals, opposed it with the principle of union, believing that there would be a more freedom from want and fear for the American "Common Man." If this country remained one empire, with equality between the states, then if ever broken up into many independencies, And who, today, North or South, doubts that they were

Side Glances



"Take care of yourself, Sally—I'll be worrying about you in that war plant while I'm in a nice safe tank!"

Still Cooking

The Old Feuds

By Raymond Clapper

WASHINGTON THIS old town has seen more feuds than the West Virginia hills but seldom one any more bitter than that between Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and head of the RFC, on one side and on the other, Vice-President Wallace and Milo Perkins of the Board of Economic Warfare.

The bill to grant the RFC a needed additional five million dollars to finance war activities was lost in the last session of Congress because it became entangled in this feud. RFC is over-committed now and this money is one of the first urgent bills waiting for attention by the new Congress.

In view of all that has happened, probably the best solution would be to set up separate funds for the Board of Economic Warfare instead of requiring it to finance its operations in critical materials through the RFC. The two agencies simply can't work together. It is useless to try to force them to do so. Secretary Jones and Milo Perkins are unable temperamentally to work together. They bristle at the sight of each other. Vice-President Wallace, chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, is firmly behind Perkins, his executive director.

A difference of outlook was appreciated when BEW felt that Jesse Jones allied in building up pre-Pearl Harbor stocks, especially of rubber. BEW moved in more aggressively to obtain critical materials abroad and to keep them from being bought by the Axis, often paying far above the normal price.

Secretary Jones was inclined to be cautious and put out money only on a sound business basis. The Board of Economic Warfare had the duties, not necessarily of making sound business deals, but of obtaining critical materials that war production required regardless of price. It must also prevent the enemy, regardless of cost, from obtaining critical materials that he needs to carry on the war. He considered that military considerations, the shortening of the war and saving of lives placed the BEW transactions in critical materials above the normal commercial limits.

Yet in RFC there was haggling over putting out the money that BEW required. Finally last April President Roosevelt gave BEW power to issue directives requiring RFC to close and finance as he worked out by BEW. The secretary of the RFC, Milo Perkins. Some of his friends in Congress tried in the last session to wipe out that power of BEW over him. It almost went through and would have gone through had not a Senate committee and said that in his judgment the war effort would be imperiled by restoring control over BEW to the RFC.

Mr. Wallace told the senators that instead of BEW being too hard-bitten in its dealings with other agencies, making the RFC and the State Department, it had not if anything, hit hard enough. He said Milo Perkins had to spend too much of his time being tactful with other officials and trying to reach unanimous decisions.

Nothing can eradicate the feud that has grown out of that difference of outlook. The two agencies ought to be completely apart. For until they are, the friction between them will slow down the activities of both agencies. Both are essential now as we go into the year of our heaviest production.

College Revolution

War Scholarships

Christian Science Monitor

IT IS recalled that when a traveler brought the first lens to England, the monks destroyed the bit of glass, holding it devilish even to want to peer into the microscope. The Puritans who helped throw off the yoke of the Dark Ages had a like superstition. They held that knowledge is inextricably a part of that free atmosphere in which reflection attains to individual conscience, and government by consent of the governed flourish.

They brought this viewpoint to the New World, where their schools rose in the clearings almost as swiftly as their churches. And they kept this heritance to America. Now the Dark Ages are being reborn in the "Dark Bowl" when the dust and the poverty was densest and although store windows were boarded up, you found a bright brick schoolhouse in the middle of the field, in the bad lands and in the desert no less than along the arched valleys and coastal shelves, you find colleges forwarding that liberality of thought in which, as a by-product, arts and invention flourish.

And how important this has been! It is sometimes asserted—and it is partially true—that Nazi Germany illustrates what can be done in a single generation by the technical training of the schools and by crushing them upon reactionary purposes.

Now, what have we said? We have said that liberal education is essential to democratic progress. And why do we need it? It is because America, which has always cherished the principle of democracy, is now being damaged by a larger number of them without adequately realizing it.

The raw material of the colleges, the youth, is also the raw material of the fighting forces of the technicians of the colleges is the implement, largely of today's type of warfare.

Those 200 or 300 colleges that are to be selected under the plan just announced in Washington for the year 1943-44, are to be selected on the basis of Army and Navy will be called upon, in the main, for technological teaching. This will occupy their facilities and doubtless permit them to carry on, even maintaining part of their classical and liberal arts work. But those schools having few women students, if any, and who have rightly seen their orbit as the nurturing of the great liberal tradition, seem to be on a bit of a lull.

This problem is big and not easy of answer. Some schools have large endowments and can afford to devote their plant and energies to the few under 16, the undrafted and others remaining to them. Others may be so situated that they can only give back to the enriching, liberal atmosphere of academic halls.

The present situation has such profound potentialities, it deserves

For the others, we offer a proposal for discussion. It would appear there is an obvious link between the present plight of the colleges and the situation that will confront young men demobilized. The good of the country demands that these young men shall eventually obtain the education now denied to them.