THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

And Evening Chronicle

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

W. C. Dowd Jr., President and General Manager — Burke Davis, Editor — Mrs. Dowd Jones, Secretary.

Lieut. J. E. Dowd, USNR, Vice-President and Editor, on leave for the duration

● W. C. Dowd, 1865-1927 ●

The daily edition of The Charlotte News was established 1888. The Evening Chronicle (established 1903) 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 in 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, 87 cents. By mail: One month $70; three months, $2.60; six months, $5.20; one year, $10.40.

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1943

Army Day

Its Observance Should Carry A Meaning For Every Day

Tomorrow is a day of remembrance for the Army, for all the days under all the skies of battle in all the lands where men of the Army of The United States have fought in all the wars. It is a day for Trenton and New Orleans and Chapultepec and Gettysburg and San Juan and the Marne, back into the long years. It is also, this Army Day, for Bataan and Guadalcanal, for Maknassy and Fondouk, and the skies over Tunisia by day and night, and the late afternoon skies over France and Germany.

This Army Day finds Americans gripped by a new awareness of the true significance of its fighting men. In peace time, the Army has ever been allowed to waste and dwindle. Its soldiers are too often looked upon as a special low class, contributing nothing. It is only when war comes, and the soldier's duty of dying for his country comes nigh that he grows in stature before his fellow men. Families who have contributed sons to the growing forces begin to opine that the Army can't be so bad, after all, with Johnny in uniform. Thus the Army's importance grows in the public mind.

That kind of public emotion—for it is not thinking—is not to be tolerated in the future. After all the dreamers and quick-building planners have had their say about peace, the one way to guarantee its coming will be to maintain big fighting forces to make short work of aggressors as they emerge. This Army Day is most important for that reason. It is time for the people at home to stop and think, not about the poor boys in the Tunisian dust, or the brave youngsters in the skies all over the world. It is time to think that this sort of sacrifice will never be necessary again if Army Day, every year, finds America with powerful fighting forces, a nucleus of professional warriors able to keep abreast of military progress in peace, and to make it in war.

This is Army Day in all the posts and swarming training camps all over the nation, where millions are being prepared for the coming of combat. To those men and boys, Army Day will mean only a short celebration, and brief public notice. What it should mean to them and their families at home is that the time for paying tribute to the Army is not one day in every war year —but every day, in every year.

It is supposed the 750,000 pairs of dice purchased for our soldiery have had to meet the specifications of the QMC as to weight, balance, markings, etc., in which case the old sarge will continue to roll his own.

Play Time

Senate, Thank Goodness, Sees Foolish Post-War Plans

It is both amusing and encouraging to note the steady stream of daffy suggestions for the post-war world pouring into the U. S. Senate. It proves, for one thing, that the people are thinking of the days after peace this time, even if they are short on practical working plans for peace.

There have been suggestions that all men be given 25 pounds of tobacco per year, that all gold be dumped into the ocean, and aluminum coins substituted, that England be given a new climate, that Denver be made the capital of an international congress. Some citizens jested with their Senators; others were in dead earnest.

Many proposals offered in more serious vein have nothing more to recommend them than the dreams of the screwball kibitzers. In Congress, for example, the little knot of die-hard lovers of isolation still scream for seizure of England's bases in our hemisphere; for control over Russia's advances before we really enter this war in a winning way. And those who demand that Germany be plowed up and sown with salt, who ask millions of retaliation killings, or perhaps a return to the easy times of peace without Army, or Navy, are making senseless talk.

The peace to come must be made realistically, and without benefit of assistance from the mush-mouthed politicians who like to generalize problems out of existence. Commentators look back and see the failure of the last war in President Wilson's failure to take Senators with him to Paris. This time, there should be perfect understanding long in advance, so that the American part of the peace may be as wisely written as it should have been a generation ago. Toward that aim, it is good that the people send their queer ideas to Washington; they are not alone.

Rumanians and Hungarians, at war on the Axis side, are wondering what they are fighting for. Not that the boys are any the less valiant, but strangers have begun to ask.

The Chisels

Baby Food For Adults Is New Wrinkle In Beating Rationing

A great many grocers have reported to OPA agents that many adults are apparently eating canned baby foods themselves, in order to save their ration points on these low point-value items. OPA was quick to brand such practices as low, chiseling attacks against the rationing program as a whole and against the public good. It seems to us the OPA is exactly right.

Purchases of this kind are new proof that Americans will, unless compelled to do so, give little heed to fellow men; greed still moves the millions. Adults who eat baby food at one point per can are obviously buying food they do not need, and their actions are indefensible. Few people appear to be indulging themselves in such practices, but there should be a way to stop those who persist, regardless of the ensuing implication that Americans are not what they should be.

Not all of us accepted as we should the rationing of gasoline and sugar, and after those first restrictions, each new program brought forth more violations, more expressions of greed. By and large, the country accepted its part in the war program, but too many have expressed themselves in a kind of rebellion. As in the case of the disappearing baby food, action should be taken in each instance.

To conserve power, a southern town turns off street lights on nights "inclement enough to keep good citizens indoors." The others, it is to be assumed, will be illuminated anyway.

The Revolt

Farm Bloc Battles Nation For Benefits By Bankhead

There can be little doubt that the Senate Farm Bloc, battling to override the President's veto of the inflationary Bankhead Bill, is leading a fight against the national good. Mr. Roosevelt has the backing of economists, Labor, business and the people at large. Only the hand of the Farm Senator is set against the proposal—but it is likely now that the little band will have its way.

When Leader Alben Barkley predicted it would be very difficult to muster the necessary one-third vote in the Senate to support the veto, he virtually conceded defeat: In the House, the business man's end of Congress, the outlook is brighter. It may be readily seen from the content of the Bankhead Bill that this is just another round of the old Farm fight, led by Farm spokesmen who do not truly represent the hard-pressed farmers of the nation.

Senator Bankhead proposes that Government benefit payments to farmers not be deducted in the calculating of parity prices—not only setting up a high level of prices, and not content with the inclusion of Farm labor costs. The bill is inflationary because it provides for the farmer both the Government payments and higher prices than he has ever known for virtually all farm commodities. The Farm spokesmen, of course, ask a great deal more for their group than any other group in the country enjoys.

It is of interest to note that, as the Farm Bloc fought most Labor gains, now Labor is standing firmly against the passage of this Farm measure. This time, Labor's dead right.

How they determine that Hitler is crazy we wouldn't know. Maybe he thinks he's Hitler.

On Ruml Plan

Taxer Paul Protests

Editors, THE NEWS:

THE column "Wrong Number" from the March 10, 1943, issue of The Charlotte News has been brought to my attention. The column deals with the present Federal tax program and my part in it. I take no exception, of course, to that part of the article which is devoted to an expression of opinion, some of it favorable to me and some unfavorable. However, I should like to call your attention to some statements which are contrary to fact.

You state: "If, however, the 20 per cent withholding levy goes into effect in July, Paul will have met defeat again." Quite the contrary is true. I have been urging the adoption of just such a withholding levy ever since December, 1941, when I joined the Treasury staff. Throughout the course of the Revenue Bill of 1942, the Treasury Department recommended that part of the income tax be withheld at source. In fact, the action of the Congress in limiting the withholding feature to the Victory tax in the 1942 Revenue Act might well have been included as one of the "defeats" to which you refer. The strong endorsement of collection-at-source of the income tax was repeated in my opening statement before the House Ways and Means Committee of February 2nd of this year, and I am very much pleased that the Committee bill incorporates the 20 per cent collection-at-source measure.

Your statement that I "failed to get Congress to base the excess profits tax on invested capital" again has no foundation in fact. At the time of the controversy over the base of the excess profits tax, I was not handling tax legislation for the Treasury Department.

Apart from the misstatements of fact, I find a curious inconsistency in the article. At one point it states: "His hand is still set against the average man who craves relief from his unbearable tax burdens." In the next paragraph: "He directs the attack on the little man's dollar." Yet the following paragraph says: "He . . . wants to make all men equal through heavy, sharply-graduated taxes." In any event, a desire to make all men equal through taxes is entirely inconsistent with an "attack on the little man's dollar." A desire to make all men equal through taxation has never been a part of my tax principles, while the protection of the little man through exemption from taxation of a minimum of subsistence is a principle I have repeatedly endorsed.

Much more serious than any errors in your remarks about my policies is your misapprehension that the Ruml plan is "the salvation of the taxpayer." From the text of your column, I gather that you base this mistaken belief on the assumption that forgiveness of a year's tax would benefit the "average" taxpayer with a small income. Actually, it is precisely this "average" taxpayer whom the Ruml plan would treat most harshly. It would forgive more tax to 1,500 taxpayers with the largest incomes than it would to 10 million income taxpayers with the smallest incomes. The forgiveness for a married person (no dependents) with a $100,000 income would be 178.2 per cent of his income after tax while it would be only 12.1 per cent of income after tax for the person with a $3,000 income.

Even more important and somewhat less obvious is the fact that when large amounts of additional revenue are raised to meet the goal of $16 billion of additional revenue requested by the President, the necessary tax rate increases will fall primarily on the people with small and middle-sized incomes. The higher taxes needed to meet war costs would almost immediately offset or more than offset any tax forgiveness which the lower income groups may receive under the Ruml plan.

Enclosed are copies of my statement of February 2, 1943, before the Ways and Means Committee and two speeches in which I discuss pay-as-you-go taxation. They take up in more detail the reasons why the Treasury feels that the Ruml plan would be unfair to the great majority of the taxpayers of America.

Sincerely yours,
RANDOLPH E. PAUL,
General Counsel,
U. S. Treasury.

Washington, D. C.

(Note: Despite our admiration for the busy, brilliant Mr. Paul who finds time from his labors to fire a ready answer at The News, we'll stick with our argument all down the line. Many a proposal Mr. Paul has brought to Capitol Hill (either on his own hook or at the behest of Secretary Morgenthau) has been turned down by Congress as smacking of social legislation by taxation.

(Mr. Paul's enthusiasm for the withholding tax was expressed about the time of the first flurry for the Ruml Plan, but in his explanations to Congressional committees he was not able to state, in terms satisfactory to those who listened, his objection to the one-year "forgiveness" clause of Beardsley Ruml's scheme. He based his opposition upon "loss of certain assets" which he did not explain; his stand at that time was, so far as we know, the first statement that Ruml's plan would prove a windfall to the wealthy. Since then a great many papers and speakers have taken up that tack. Reporters whose words we read from the sessions could not make a clear case for Mr. Paul then, nor can we now.—Editors, The News).

But It Got Away

—By Dorman Smith

What's Ahead?

Do We Lose The Lead?

By Samuel Grafton

NEW YORK

AMERICA is losing its primacy in world affairs. We are no longer the king-pin. We must understand this. If we do not, it shall go badly for us. We have discovered that the Russians have a grade-A industrial plant. We did not know this on June 22, 1941. (Neither did Hitler.) We know it now. (So does he.) But it is more than just an industrial plant. It is an industrial plant administered with style. It innovates (oversize tanks, tank rifles, its own plane models, motorized snow-sleds), as well as imitates.

It moves across the mountains when threatened, and it continues to work. It has a durable and pugnacious will to live.

The British have a new industrial plant, too. We do not yet realize how the war has modernized it. British factories no longer make quaint Victorian cast-iron whatnots in the guise of machinery; they carve the living steel as well as we. Their planes are inferior to none. This is war, few figures are available; but it is a safe guess that British production of heavy goods is double what it was. Yet the foreign policy of some of us is based on legends and memories of pre-war Britain and Russia, not on British and Russian realities of today.

There is still a Lady Bountifulishness about our thinking in this field. Shall we, out of the goodness of our hearts, our infinite pity, and our exquisite moral sense, join Britain and Russia in making the world that is to be? Will we, won't we, will we, won't we, will join the dance? There is an overwhelming coyness about our deliberations. We stand, with finger in our mouth, wondering if these be partners good enough for us.

But the Russia that is repelling the invader, cannot be reduced to tears merely by our staying out. The China that stood up against Japan, even when we were supplying Japan with metal and oil, will not collapse in a heap because we choose to keep ourselves out of a world organization. These three countries will go on, with us or without us. The world will not turn up its toes and die this time, because we vote no.

This is a new kind of world, and it will go on, and the question is reduced simply to whether we shall be a part of it or out of it.

Our indecisive plucking of petals from the enigmatic daisy no longer impresses or depresses the rest of the world. They would like us in. But neither Britain nor Russia intends to write a short note to its best friend and blow its brains out if we decide in the negative. That is what the new level of British-Russian relationship, so much more highly developed than the American-Russian relationship, says to us. These two powers will go it alone, if we would have it so. They will struggle along with a combined industrial plant at least equal to ours, and a combined population twice as large, and a potential command of territory five times as great.

The question no longer is whether we shall condescend to accept these two as peace-time friends. The question is whether we shall claim our right to share in their adventure. The question is whether we can hope to make a living if we stay out of that adventure. Never has isolation been so clear a candidate for the dusty back of the shelf. The Senate of the United States can no longer ruin the hopes of the world. All it can do is vote an American exit from the world.

The world do move, the world will live. It is too late for attitudes winsome or reluctant. We have lost the power to blast the hopes of the world. Our lightning has been used once; it is second-hand. We

Side Glances

"Hello, Judge! I notice you riding that horse to court nearly every day now—doesn't the bench get a little hard along toward evening?"

Danger, Danger!

Press Muzzled

By Raymond Clapper

WASHINGTON

THIS Government is playing with the dangerous idea of carrying the technique of a controlled press far beyond anything we have experienced before in this country. A United Nations food conference is being arranged to take place within a few weeks. The President has desired to hold it at an isolated location some distance from Washington where the meeting could be easily protected from the public view.

Newspapers have been requested not to attempt to send reporters to cover this conference or to try to talk to the delegates representing the United Nations. Such arrangements go far beyond the sphere of military censorship. They reach very frankly into political censorship.

Obviously the reasons that prompt the White House to feel that a United Nations conference should be thus isolated from the normal operations of newspaper correspondents will be the same reasons that will be found persuasive by Administration officials when subsequent United Nations conferences are held. Newspaper editors have been requested to accept this policy. What else will they be asked to accept if this precedent is established?

There could have been no objection if the Government had called in the press, explained some of the considerations, and emphasized that international relations might be done serious injury by irresponsible handling of news or comment. But the press is being given no opportunity to be either responsible or irresponsible. It is proposed to shut it out flatly.

Anyone will recognize that the United Nations are still in the formative period, that their first meetings may thrive or wither depending upon how they are carried off. An irresponsible press can do fateful damage to the international relations, particularly in a time like this. But a free press is not necessarily an irresponsible press.

For evidence in behalf of a free press as against the type of control now proposed for the United Nations conference, I go directly to our own Government propaganda service itself. The Office of War Information is an enormous organization. It employs dozens of excellent newspapermen and magazine writers, men who have made their reputations in competitive private life.

Yet, the skillful propaganda prepared by these expert craftsmen falls short. It doesn't ring true enough. So OWI sends out, for the information of the people in foreign countries, the actual daily columns and editorials of well-known American writers and newspapers. The Government prefers to send abroad the regular work of these writers, and to give newspapers abroad the opportunity to print current columns of many of the American columnists, because this is the genuine propaganda of truth, the genuine discussion that goes on in America.

Abroad they don't want special propaganda written particularly for them. They don't have confidence in it. But when they read what Americans themselves are reading in American newspapers, when they are, so to speak, listening in on discussions taking place in the free press here in America, then they believe it.

such a non-military affair as an international food conference is that the same reasons will be used to impose a similar blockade on the press after the war. If we are afraid a free press will damage the United Nations now, won't we still be afraid of it after the war?

Morganton Echoes

National Evil

State Hospital Digest
Everett, Mass.

IN a startling expose of the notorious State Hospital at Morganton, N. C., a former patient, after telling about conditions that would shock the American people if generally known, hundreds of roaches occupying beds of patients, no seats on any of the toilets (three for each 40 patients) and constantly overflowing, keeping floors soaking wet, where sheets are seldom changed, where many patients never set foot on the good old earth, as they are kept "locked in" all the time, where ill patients are compelled to work like galley slaves, where filthy patients carry food trays and where syphilitic patients are to be found throughout the hospital, waiting on tables, eating, sleeping and bathing with other patients.

"Out of the Night at Morganton" is the title of this startling expose and the articles originally appeared in the Charlotte (N. C.) News and prove a terrible indictment of the manner in which one state cares for its mentally ill citizens. Some of the revelations are too revolting to reprint here. But such conditions are merely typical of conditions in certain other State Hospitals, especially in the South and Middle West, where "hospitals" are not as good as average county jails and where inmates would rather be if they had any choice in the matter.

It is clear from a study of the American state hospital picture that a great deal remains to be done; there has got to be a lot of "mopping up" before much of the prevailing prejudice against such places is lessened. Incompetent physicians, grafting attendants, unfit "nurses" still hamper recoveries in certain notorious hospitals. In one State Hospital below the Mason and Dixon line several of the "nurses" cannot even read or write. During the present acute shortage of ward help one state hospital recruited "attendants" from the nearby prison farm. In another state hospital patients come and go without ever having been spoken to by the doctors.

But one need not journey to the South to find injustices—even here in Massachusetts, "it pays to stand in with the attendants." Many a harmless man or woman who has incurred the ill will of some dumb cluck paid by the State is relegated to a back ward merely because he or she was unable to get along with an attendant. But this State, thank the Lord, has a higher type of ward help, and while incompetent help succeed in getting on the pay roll they don't last long once found out.

Asked what he considered a serious defect in the Massachusetts mental institution system, an intelligent former patient, a former jurist, said that to his mind an unnecessary evil is the censorship of letters. This prevails almost universally and hospital authorities would no more think of letting an unread letter leave the hospital than they would recommend a public denudation point on the hospital grounds.

For some reason best known to themselves, hospital heads take the view that some patient is likely to speak ill of something or other, and, of course, this would never do. Only the good things must be mentioned. One can find fault with the transportation system in a large city, one can even criticise the conduct of the police in a case, but for a mental patient to say anything against the hospital is unthinkable. Most hospital authorities