THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

and Evening Chronicle

Published Every Afternoon Including Sunday By The News Publishing Company, Inc.
W. Jos. Ross (Pvt. Prisoner) Burke Davis, Editor
Thos. J. Ross, Editor, Vice-President and Editor, on leave for the duration
W. G. Dowd, Jr., Managing Editor 1896-1937.

The daily edition of The Charlotte News was established 1892. The Evening Chronicle established 1903; the two combined in 1927. The Sunday edition was established May 2, 1926.

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: 35 cents a week; one month, 87 cents. By mail: One month, $1.50; three months, $4.00; six month, $6.50; one year, $12.00.

A Start

With Reservations, The Senate Likes Big Four

There is reason for encouragement in the reported agreement between the Senate's liaison committee and the State Department on the "broad principles" of an international order powered by the Big Four of the United Nations. But the optimism aroused here should be cautious and restrained. It is significant, to be sure, that a responsible body of Senators agrees that the United States should enter into such an international organization, even though the agreement is limited to generalities. But it is also significant that this group of men insisted upon an "escape clause" providing that no nation could be held in the combination of powers against its will.

That may be accepted just as it stands, as a guarantee against oppression of, or discrimination against, any nation. But it may also be an intellectually dishonest reservation on the part of the Senate, with an eye for an exit to be used by the United States. It may be only an escape hatch to isolation, a means by which the Senate minority might seek to retreat, after victory.

That possibility, of course, does not alter the fact that a considerable start has been made toward lining up Senate sentiment in behalf of a satisfactory peace settlement and a plan for world order. It does mean that this is only a preliminary, and there is no way of guaranteeing that the Senate's two-thirds will be willing to enter a binding agreement with Russia, Britain, China and other nations who see fit to follow their example. If this new league of nations is to have no power to bind its members together, then it may eventually become no more effective than its forerunner, and the enemies of international order in the Senate may win, after all. There is much more to be accomplished here.

Long Peace

Almost Any Peace Plan Works If Enforced

Dorothy Thompson, discussing today the realities of the coming settlement with Germany, makes a point to be read and remembered. It was not the Versailles Treaty, she insists, which brought on this war. That treaty was neither too hard nor too soft. It could have been enforced, but was not — because the victors chose not to enforce it. That is the danger of any new peace, and an answer to those who are chirping one little tune or another on behalf of Germany.

Through President Roosevelt, the United States has already announced that it will take no part in a blood bath in Germany, believing that the slaughter of many thousands would work no lasting good. But this is an entirely different matter from the cautions of observers that we must deal tenderly with Germany, from her leaders down—so that we will not sow the seeds of another war. In that category comes the suggestion of H. G. Wells that Hitler should not be executed for fear he will become a martyr, and send Germany into underground sulking which will culminate in another effort to conquer the world.

This reasoning, taken far enough, will not only preserve the memory of Hitler, Hirohito and Mussolini in the Axis nations, but will convince the peoples of those nations that they risk nothing when making wars of aggression. Miss Thompson, for one, speaks for the making of a real peace—whether it is hard or soft does not concern her. The vital matter, as others have suggested before her, is that we set a definite pattern, and follow it to the letter, year after year.

Germany has already withstood tremendous suffering, but because that was administered in the course of war it has not become a part of the price she must pay after defeat. She must pay a greater price than that, and it must be realized that she may be prevented from making war again only if we preserve the terms of peace through several generations.

Round Two

Avery Must Find A New Line For His War Plant

The Government's seizure of Hummer Manufacturing Co., a Montgomery Ward subsidiary, is going to place a new burden upon Sewell Avery. This time, he obviously cannot protest that his company is engaged in nonwar work, and so stir public sentiment in his behalf. Though he had argued, when he needed priorities, that his Chicago plant was essentially a war plant, he took the opposite view when the Government took over. Hummer, however, is engaged in the manufacture of plane parts, among other items.

This time, it will be interesting to see what Mr. Avery will advance in his own defense. Anything he says must be expected to be superficial, and designed to muddle the situation. For the issue at stake is the same as in the instance of the Chicago seizure. Mr. Avery has here again defied the authority of the War Labor Board, has refused to accept maintenance of union membership as a device to maintain peace with his employees, and has refused again to submit to arbitration.

Here, another union, the more conservative AFL Machinists, faces him, and takes the same course the Chicago CIO union took in the first skirmish. Mr. Avery is stubborn enough, and convinced that the Government is violating his rights. But his resistance here is at least proof that his protest that Montgomery Ward was engaged in non-war industry in Chicago was not honestly made. He's obviously refusing to co-operate for other reasons. At least part of the time in Chicago, he was just talking.

Rebirth

Communist Party Back With A New Platform

The Communist Party in the United States, pronounced dead by a coroner's jury in Moscow, is revived. It came back to life in singular fashion, mumbling of its resurrection in a disjointed manner the public will not readily understand. Its new name is The Communist Political Association; it professes to be non-partisan, but avows its intention of taking sides in politics at every opportunity. This time it will back President Roosevelt with its claimed enrollment of 80,000 members.

Its ideals will seem strangely mixed to most Americans. On the one hand it upholds the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. And on the other hand it "adheres to the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism and the heritage of the best thought of humanity and of 100 years experience of the labor movement."

This is to be looked upon as a compromise, in line with the death order of the Comintern. Perhaps Earl Browder's preamble, leaning to socialism and Marxism, only supplements and improves upon the Constitution of the United States, and translates its promised freedoms into modern terms. But in this country, in the face of generations of conditioning, it cannot be accepted as such by the public.

There is the promise of the new CPA that any member found guilty of attempting to subvert, undermine, weaken or overthrow any institutions of American democracy" will be expelled. The Communist movement, in its new phase, has either found a genuine respect for the American way, or else finds it expedient to pay homage at this moment.

"Though he never bathes, the Arab is kept scrupulously clean by the action of the desert wind." Nevertheless the fastidious traveler will stay well to windward.

The Merry-Go-Round

By Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON

CIVILIANS may not understand it but, inside the Army and Navy, the top-heavy awarding of medals to Army heroes is causing unfortunate bitterness and rancor.

You don't hear so much about it on the home front but, in the officers' clubs in Hawaii or Australia, you will see a Naval airman come up to a bemedalled Army airman and say, "Hi, hero." Sometimes this is almost a fighting salutation. Sometimes it results in a long and heated argument about how little the Army has done compared with the Navy to deserve decorations.

Sometimes brawls have resulted—all from the fact that the Army has given more than 100,000 air medals since the war started as against only about 700 for the Navy. While the Navy is smaller—about one-fifth—the ratio of medals is about 7 to 1,000.

There is no disposition here to detract from the valor of Army heroes. They deserve every ribbon they get and then some. But somehow or other, Navy awards should be standardized with the Army's, so that a Navy man who has shot down just as many enemy planes doesn't come home only to find that his neighbor in the Army is a hero while he, in the Navy, hasn't one single decoration ribbon on his tunic.

Contrast In Awards

What particularly riled Navy men was the Army's award of the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star and the Purple Heart to a dog. Meanwhile, some Naval airmen who had been flying for two years hadn't been decorated.

For instance, when Naval fliers operated from Guadalcanal for four months, scarcely able to hold Henderson Field and living only on Jap food, they got no reward. But when the Army came into Guadalcanal, the men of a ground crew who remained there only one week got the Legion of Merit. The Navy fliers who had fought on Guadalcanal for four months were almost ignored.

Again, while Brig. Gen. Olivee R. Germann received seven citations in one day for participation in 17 missions over Europe, Marine Corps Major Gregory Boyington had to shoot down 26 Jap planes before being awarded a medal. Not until last month (three months after he had been reported missing in action) was he finally given the Medal of Honor. General Germann certainly deserved his awards and then some, but the Marine Corps and Navy can't help feeling that their men with equal or greater records also deserve recognition.

Again, Corporal Henry J. Bonura was awarded the Legion of Merit by General Eisenhower for establishing twenty baseball fields in North Africa. Without detracting from his credit, nevertheless Naval officers are irked when Marine Corps officers like Capt. Roger Haberman, Lt. Jack Pittman, Capt. Ernest Powell, Capt. William Snyder, Capt. Stanley Sylar and Major Arthur Warner shoot down five Jap planes each—and in some cases more—without receiving citations.

Morale Affected

Naval men can't very well explain to their friends that the Annapolis ring officers trained on battleships, who really run the Navy, don't give much recognition to the Navy air arm, and are much stingier than the Army, anyway, when it comes to medals.

Meanwhile, the situation is getting serious for morale. It is not merely a question of personal vanity. Editorials on the subject have appeared in the service journals. And the situation has reached a point where it has sometimes actually interfered with efficiency in combat.

For instance, returning fliers tell of one case in the South Pacific where Jap zeros were about to clash with Army 38s. Some Navy 4-Vs sighted the approaching combat, but signalled to each other: "To hell with the 38s. Let them get home if they're good enough. If we save 'em, they'll get DFC's (Distinguished Flying Cross) and we'll get another mission."

"This isn't work, Eddie, it's just exercise, building muscles so I can wrestle Japs! Give me a bite of that cone and I'll let you try it a while!"

Reporter's Notebook

(Continued From Page Four)

[illegible]

You don't hear much complaint about scarcity of food in this country. Every evening we get dinner at the Savoy-Plaza where we have been big enough to get a table near the door. It's a good place for watching people.

The Savoy-Plaza's menu always has been big enough to satisfy anyone. It's still big. But it isn't as big as it was a year ago. Nor is it as good as it was then. It is now a semi-dungeon. No wind rattling beaver board panels over windows in the little Grill where I dine with Don Whitehead of the Associated Press and Lt. Tom Siler, former Chicago sports writer, and the old English waiter who cleans our plates complained mildly:

"What a nuisance. And all because of that beast of a man, Hitler."

The blackout, incidentally isn't what it used to be. Walking along at night you see cracks of light. The wardens still are alert for any major violations, but there is a noticeable tendency to relax.

MORE TENSION

Americans who have been stationed here for several years say they detect a tension in the British people after years of war—a tightening skin of their traditional politeness.

To a newcomer, however, people here give less appearance of strain than civilians in bomb-free America. There are few of the nervous incivilities in shopping and busriding that send many Americans home frothing mad.

This is because the average Englishman is considerably less mouthy about his opinions.

An example in point is the coming invasion of Europe. Here, as at home, the papers are full of it. In Manhattan before I left, bars and living rooms were full of conjecture on the time. It was a sure-fire conversational topic and a lot of money was being bet.

Here the invasion is something to read about, but never to discuss. These people have been taught the hard way to be security-minded. During a week in England I have heard no one use the word "invasion."

Everybody thinks about it; nobody talks about it. So far it's timing is the best held secret of the war.

Surprise! Surprise!

—By Dorman Smith

Three Times Is Out

By Marquis Childs

WASHINGTON

HERE'S another straw, a small one, blowing in the stiff political wind. They had an election up in Alaska not long ago and the New Deal candidates won a clean sweep. You don't think of Alaska as voting, but they elect members of a territorial legislature and a delegate to Congress.

The big contest was over the delegate's job. After a dozen years in Washington, Anthony J. Dimond is retiring from the House of Representatives to be federal judge for the first Alaskan judicial division. The race to succeed him was concentrated in the Democratic primary since, curiously enough, in the Far North as in the Deep South, Democratic nomination is today equivalent to victory. That has been true in Alaska since the Democratic triumph of 1932.

Three candidates sought the Delegate's post. A H. Ziegler of Ketchikan hammered away at isolationism by which he meant the New Deal. Henry Roden, veteran territorial attorney general, took a more or less neutral course with respect to the administration in Washington. The Roosevelt candidate was 40 year old Edward L. "Bob" Bartlett who had the active backing of Ernest Gruening, liberal, New Deal Governor of Alaska. In the sharp campaign, Gruening's support of Bartlett was made an issue. His pro-New Deal record was paraded.

Betting on the outcome was uncertain. At one time or another all three candidates occupied the position of favorite. Yet Bartlett won by a landslide, carrying all four of Alaska's election districts. In the second district, which includes Fairbanks, he had a majority over the field and he even carried Juneau, the capital, where Roden had been rated the favorite. One of the issues was statehood for Alaska. Bartlett was strong for it while his opposition soft-pedaled this question. Most of the big industries in the territory—chiefly salmon fishing and gold mining — are against statehood if only because it would increase taxes.

Incidentally, if you still think of Alaska as a far off place, you'll have to move into the air age. The slow army transport it's only 15 or 16 hours from Chicago to Fairbanks. By fast plane, after the war, the time will be cut to eight or nine hours.

If Alaska were a state, it would take far less time to reach Washington by plane than it took the Virginia delegation to come across muddy roads to those early sessions of Congress. After the war, a week's fishing or hunting trip in Alaska will be perfectly feasible. As I say, this is a very small straw. Nevertheless it seems to me to be one more proof of the old axiom that you can't beat something with nothing.

Ernest Gruening has been a good governor. Attacked as an outsider and a New Dealer, he has worked quietly for the territory. Gruening was largely instrumental in organizing Alaska's native population for defense when the Japanese were attacking in the Aleutians. He's made friends with Indians, Eskimoes, trappers, salmon fishermen. In short, he has had a program. He stands for something.

Willkie Is Holding Out

By Samuel Grafton

NEW YORK

I believe in the simple, direct approach to events, and so when Mr. Dewey says he is an internationalist, I believe that he is an internationalist. The New York Herald Tribune, a newspaper I deeply respect, underwrites Mr. Dewey's internationalism, and that goes far toward reassuring doubt. A number of other Eastern newspapers are now saying that there is no reason, in fact, why Mr. Willkie should not endorse Mr. Dewey, for the foreign policies of the two men are so close that you could not get a razor between them.

Well, that settles that. But then I pick up Col. McCormick's Chicago Tribune, and I find it to be in a state of absolute terror lest Mr. Willkie endorse Mr. Dewey. The Chicago Tribune says that the Governor's friends might "be moving heaven and earth" to discourage Mr. Willkie from endorsing Mr. Dewey. It says that Mr. Willkie's "foreign policy has been rejected" by the people of at least four states, and if Mr. Willkie endorses Mr. Dewey, Mr. Dewey's strength may disappear overnight.

But if the foreign policies of Mr. Willkie and Mr. Dewey are pretty much the same, how can this be? We have reached a stage in which Eastern Republicanism pictures the Willkie and Dewey foreign policies as essentially the same, while a leading organ of Midwestern Republicanism pictures them, simultaneously, and with equal vehemence, as totally different.

Now, it could be that the Chicago Tribune, smarting over the fact that every leading candidate has made an internationalist declaration, may merely have picked one man, almost at random, as its own, and it may now be busy, leering and winking, and passing out hints that Mr. Dewey is really a kind of isolationist, all to save its own face.

Or it could be that it is Eastern Republicanism which is seeing what it wants to see; that, terrible anxious to defeat Mr. Roosevelt, it passes lightly over Mr. Dewey's close bonds with Mr. Hoover and Mr. Landon, and ignores that pointed manner in which Mr. Dewey invariably proposes an initial alliance with Great Britain, and then, pause, long pause, ahem, also with Russia if she wants to come in. That pause is probably noted in the Kremlin. It is certainly noted by the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. Richard H. Rovere has, in his current Harper's Magazine article on Mr. Dewey, noted that the Governor is, first and last, a strategically-minded man. The fantastic situation outlined above would seem to bear Mr. Rovere out. To have steered close enough to call internationalism to catch the New York Herald Tribune steering so close to it as to lose the Chicago Tribune is an operation of such skill and delicacy as to make most surgery seem brutal and clumsy by comparison.

I do not offer this material by way of framing an accusation against Mr. Dewey; it is a simple, descriptive picture of what is actually going on.

It will now be seen what a hard choice Mr. Willkie faces, and why he holds back. He can hardly support Mr. Dewey until Mr. Dewey breaks with Col. McCormick. Otherwise Mr. Willkie will actually find himself hitched alongside Col. McCormick, both of them pulling the same wagon, and each of them wondering how in the heck the other one got there.

Mr. Willkie would be denouncing Col. McCormick, and Col. McCormick would be denouncing Mr. Willkie, and both of them would be electing Mr. Dewey.

Everyday Counselor

By Rev. Herbert Spaugh

TOO busy to play! Too busy for pastime! Too busy for church! Too busy for a hobby! Too busy to spend time with the family! How many men have gone to premature graves at the height of their mental powers, because they were too busy!

H. E. C. Bryant writing in Beasley's Farm and Home Weekly, takes a page out of his long newspaper experience, and says, "Of the five or six newspaper men who were my chiefs at various times, four died early because they had no pastime, did not know how to rest or play. They were slaves to their tasks, and at middle age when they should have been at their best, passed from the scene of their activity."

The times are exacting. Many are having to do double duty, work long hours. Yet it is a well-established fact that no man can continue at one job under pressure, without release of tension, and not suffer dire consequences. Then when he folds up and goes to the hospital or the cemetery, someone else has to pick up and carry on; usually does.

Bryant then quotes his favorite author, Henry Van Dyke: "There is such a thing as taking ourselves and the world too seriously, or at any rate too anxiously. Half of the secular unrest and dismal, profane sadness of modern society comes from the vain idea that every man is to be a critic of life, and to let no day pass without finding some fault with the general order of things, or projecting some plan for its improvement. And the other half comes from the greedy notion that a man's life does consist, after all, in the abundance of the things he possesses, that it is somehow or other more respectable and pious to be always at work making a larger living, than it is to lie on your back in the green pastures beside the still waters, and thank God that you are alive."

Two of the busiest men in the world today are supposed to be President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. Yet both take time out for relaxation, rest, and even the occasional cultivation of their hobbies.

The high pressure of modern living is exacting a terrific toll from the middle-aged. Many seek release through narcotics, and drugs such as alcohol and nicotine. I am continually coming in contact with those who seem to have lost control of their drinking and smoking habits.

One of the best insurance policies I know against nervous tension is a pair of hands which are worked occasionally at a constructive hobby, and a pair of knees which are used frequently in prayer and worship of Almighty God.

French Actress Robbed By Thugs

LONDON (AP)—Danielle Darrieux, French film actress, was robbed by masked bandits recently while dining with her husband in their villa in Haute Savoie Province, the German news agency DNB said today in a broadcast recorded by the Associated Press.

The actress was married to Porfirio Rubirosa, Dominican chargé d'affaires in Vichy, Sept. 18, 1942.

MacArthur And Halsey Confer

SOMEWHERE IN AUSTRALIA —(AP)—Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Adm. William F. Halsey conferred here officially last week concerning future operations against the Japanese.

While here Admiral Halsey was a guest of Vice-Adm. Thomas Kinkaid, commander of the 7th U. S. Fleet in the Southwest Pacific, the fleet which supported MacArthur's Hollandia-Aitape landings.

A True Peace

By Dorothy Thompson

WASHINGTON

THE creation in America of a "Council for a Democratic Germany," the attack that has been made on it by Rex Stout's Society for Prevention of World War III, and the acrimonious debate that arose in the ILO Conference in Philadelphia have brought about a confused discussion.

The problem of the German future is most difficult and cannot, in any case, be solved on the basis of an abstract blueprint. But the principle questions can be asked, with various alternative answers. The wrong questions are being asked, and meaningless definitions are being made.

For instance, there is the question: Do we want a "soft" peace or a "hard" peace for Germany? The mere raising of this question gives rein to emotion rather than thought. It is not a constructive question. The question is: How can we get a stable and tolerable peace?

It would seem obvious that no real peace can be maintained without the active support of some Germans, who can get into power and gather behind them a stable proportion of the German people. The only possible alternative is to make Germany a colony administered by foreign Governors.

But what Foreign Governors? A joint Government of Americans, Britons and Russians? Or shall Germany be divided for administration? Do we want to have three non-German Governments check by jowl, under conditions where various German groups will be trying to sell the three administrations? Can we treat an occupied province, economic, cultural and communications system as one, while that area can be cut with no bleeding? What chance would peace, between the three victors have to survive in such a chaos?

That question—not Germany—is the crux of enduring peace. Peace and collaboration between Britain, America and Russia. Had that condition existed we could have prevented this war even with German militarists in power. We could have crushed Hitler before he was dangerous. The Treaty of Versailles did not fail because it was too soft. It could have been softer, and still been adequate, had it been enforced, but some former victors were not interested.

Any peace to be enduring must give people life and hope. Imprisonment for life is not a form of education. Many European countries have been conquered, disarmed and put under military occupation by Hitler. But all his horses and all his men have been unable to administer them in peace because Hitler's rule was a death sentence. Some of these countries are nations revived for only a quarter of a century. But with their Armies defeated and disarmed, guerrillas still fight in mountains, and saboteurs in factories. Since everyone agrees that the Germans are as obstinate as Yugoslavs and Poles, one must expect that given similar circumstances the Germans would behave the same way.

Mr. Rex Stout's organisation—advised, incidentally by a number of Germans—takes the line that Germans are an incorrigible people. Yet this organization asserts that it does not want their extermination. If they be right, the only conclusion is: Make Germany a permanent colony—over which there will certainly be a struggle between the victors—and it will be a colony that will make more trouble than India, and all previous colonies rolled into one. What Hitler could not do to his fellow-Europeans, with the philosophy, temperament, and plan to do it, Britain and America certainly cannot do.

If I have argued logically, then: What consummation is devoutly to be wished?

To be wished is a Germany, governed by law, restored to parliamentary procedures, drastically and ruthlessly purged of the reckless adventurers who have brought her and the world into this tragedy, deprived of instruments for aggression, compelled to restore, insofar as it is possible, the dreadful destruction she has wrought; with a social stabilization achieved for her working people; with her frontiers, whatever they may be, protected by a system of collective security; and with Russia, the Western Powers, and Germany herself tied tightly into whatever European and world system is created.

This is to be desired, not for the sake of Germany, but for our own sakes—which is, after all, what matters.

Now, if there are ten Germans of clean record, who will go with us on such a program—then let us take the ten Germans. To assume that there are no Germans who could ever be trusted is to admit total political defeat.

If the counsellors of the incorrigibility theory are right, we must harden our minds and hearts to measures and results that so few American have even begun to envision.

"They put money in slot machines—they listen to tips on horses—they go to bargain sales! Why do they doubt campaign promises?"