THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

W. C. DOWD JR., Publisher — J. E. DOWD, Editor — HARRY S. ASHMORE, Associate Editor

SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1946

It's Getting Late, Sheriff

THE High Sheriff of Mecklenburg, looking ahead to a heated campaign in an attempt to hold his job, must be speculating anxiously upon the effect of the recent wave of jail breaks on his constituents. In the past couple of months six prisoners have escaped Sheriff Mack Riley's cages atop the Courthouse, and some of them have taken extended vacations. The County began to suspect that something was wrong in the Sheriff's office some time ago.

The Sheriff has given reporters the impression that this business of jail breaking is an unpleasant subject to him; he'd rather not talk about it. Just after the first escape, for instance, a reporter, trying checked the facts of the case, dropped by Sheriff Riley's office to ask if he had any statement concerning the break. And the Sheriff replied, "What jail break?" He went into explanations hurriedly when the reporter moved for the door saying, "That's all I want to know."

In a later case the Sheriff proclaimed that his jailers had been alerted, and the guard would be closer. He intimated that there would be no more escapes. But they continue, somehow. It has become clear that the posting of the guard is informal, and that jailers are not so cautious as they might be. We don't see how the Sheriff can escape responsibility for what goes on in—and out of—his jail.

In these times the duties of this functionary are sharply limited. He has become little more than a bearer of summons and a keeper of the goal. And when the traffic in and out of his cells becomes so heavy that they are more like flop houses than prison cubicles, the electorate should become curious.

We have no intention of campaigning against Sheriff Riley, nor of boosting either of his challengers. But it appears to us that, regardless of the forthcoming elections, it is an important part of the Sheriff's responsibility to see to it that his prisoners spend the prescribed time in his keeping. Otherwise, it seems, the voter must conclude that the incumbent has been neglecting his affairs.

Mrs. Clements Did It Herself

WE'D have reached the beautiful millenium if the selection of Mrs. Emma Clement as American Mother of 1946 had excited no comment at all. If there had been no voices raised in pride over this feat of a Negro woman, granddaughter of a slave, we might say racial prejudice had disappeared in this country. But, for better or worse, we haven't reached that state. And Mrs. Clement's selection does appear remarkable, and not to Southerners alone.

There are already those who are pulling this way and that, trying to decide for us whether this selection speaks well for the South and the nation at large. There are those who are trying to place the credit for this demonstration of the spirit of democracy. Some of the talk has been confusing, and we have given little heed.

Mrs. Clement lived in the South for many years—several of them spent in Charlotte. She was apparently a good citizen, and has been since. Her response to the duties of motherhood are obvious from the accomplishments of her seven children, several of whom have risen to high places—and in the South, too. But when she was chosen as Mother of The Year she was living outside the South, and she was not selected by Southerners.

The proposed debate as to the causes for this manifestation of American freedom seems beside the point to us. Especially the blundering assault of some contemporaries upon the "professional liberals" and "free-living and free-loving radicals" who are supposedly claiming credit for Mrs. Clement's honor.

For us it is enough that Mrs. Clement is and has been an outstanding mother, that she has contributed to national growth, and that she has been honored by the Golden Rule Foundation. It occurs to us that the whole of the credit for her accomplishment belongs to Mrs. Clement herself, and that it matters not a whit who steps forward to probe her claim, or uses her selection as a means of defending or excoriating the Southern mores.

The cheering thing to all those who seek improved race relations all over the country is simply that Mrs. Clement was chosen, and that her accomplishments speak clearly for themselves. We submit that she needs no chorus to aid her now.

A House Somewhat Divided

PERHAPS the membership of the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce was not wholly in favor of the letter sent out by its National Affairs Committee this week, urging passage of the Case Bill. Perhaps the message to our Congressional delegation expressed the views of the few, and not the majority. Perhaps, but it doesn't matter.

It happens that while this letter was being sent out, proclaiming the need for fair labor legislation to restore the balance, President Eric Johnston of the National Chamber of Commerce was singing a swan song. What he had to say was not quite in agreement with the letter from the Charlotte Chamber. He continued the fight to liberalize Chamber policies which he has waged during his four-year term. He took a positive approach, and said:

"We are called upon to choose between the old and the new capitalistic society. The old holds that it is a closed and perfect system of life resting on congealed and untouchable dogmas. It is loaded down with petrified prejudices—against organized labor, against government activity, against community planning."

His idea was that capitalism should be alive and resilient, able to adjust itself to new conditions, and he thought that there should be nothing sacrosanct about it. The Charlotte letter wasn't in direct contrast, but it took a different view, certainly. It spoke of the sentiment for leaving labor legislation to the states, for one thing. And it was positive in its approval of the Case Bill. It did say frankly that organized labor opposed the Case Bill, but that it did not oppose labor; it joined the growing chorus for a new Federal labor policy.

And, as there probably are local Chamber members who do not agree with that letter, there were many in Atlantic City who did not agree with Mr. Johnston. In fact, they quickly turned from his challenging speech and called for revision of the Wagner Act, the outlawing of mass picketing and violence, and sitdown and slowdown strikes. The Chamber was groping for a solution to the labor-management impasse, but took its stand on the old lines, and was hardly sympathetic with Eric Johnston's "new capitalism."

So the Charlotte Chamber and the U. S. Chamber were not really divided. They approach one of the most troublesome problems of our day from the same quarter. Perhaps it is Mr. Johnston who is out of step after all. Perhaps his leadership of the past four years, for all that it has been spectacular and courageous, has gone for naught.

Another Voice

Ralph Ingersoll On Britain

THERE seems to be some misunderstanding, created by the criticism of British military high-politics in my book *Top Secret*. The misunderstanding is on where I stand on the loan to Britain, now being debated in the Senate. People write me presuming I'm against it. Emphatically, I'm *for* it.

To be against a loan to Britain because one does not approve of the British Government's manipulation of American foreign policy is to take the position that anyone whom one does not agree with should be killed. A generous American loan to Britain seems to me very nearly a life and death matter—to the economy of a great people, as well as to the prospects of free trading the world over.

Now it is true that I do not think the Britons' efforts to rebuild the world on anti-Russian power-bloc principles are either safe or sound—but to try to kill them for their notions would be to abandon hope of a peaceful solution of the world's problems. And that's crazy—literally crazy. Many hundreds of millions of people in the world want peace. Peace, PEACE. Only a minute minority want war. To think that the will of the hundreds of millions simply cannot prevail against the will and guile of the trouble-makers, immediately after the object lessons of two world wars, is to sink so far into fantasy—in fear or evil wish-fulfillment—as to be insane.

It was necessary to kill the armed fascists when they rose against the world because, they had not been killed, they would have killed us. It is not necessary to kill Englishmen or Russians because we differ with them politically—it is neither necessary to kill them nor to try to starve them to violence by hogging the riches of the world on this continent.

Of course, the loan to Britain should be made; and a loan to Russia, too—if Russia still wants the credit to buy from us. Nor does the making of either loan imply endorsement of Britain's constitutional monarchy or Soviet Communism. Our three systems can find a way to live at peace together—just as our radical democratic government in the eighteenth century found a way to live in a world then ruled by kings and queens.

The first two steps toward finding that peaceful way seem to me free and open discussion of our differences—and tangible acts of generosity and helpfulness.—*Ralph Ingersoll, in PM.*

Let's be decent to the Russians—even while speculating in our dark, democratic way on what capitalism could make of a layout like Russia.

An Oklahoma defendant has no clear recollection of what happened after he picked up the "unloaded" gun. Everything seems to have gone blank blank.

Radio comes of age. Funniest thing on the air is Senator Claghorn, and they let him go the full 2-1-2 minutes without a middle commercial.

Our thoughts lately have been on the surf-board expert in dreamy Hawaii. In the case of a tidal wave it is assumed he rides in on the house.

The Editors

People's Platform

No. It's Not A Joke, Son

CHARLOTTE

IT HAS always been my thought that the People's Platform in The Charlotte News was for the purpose of readers expressing their opinions on timely matters sufficient in importance to interest the general public. If this opinion is correct, then, it seems to me that such a serious matter as "The Drafted Eighteen-Year Olds", which captioned a letter in the newspaper last night, written by a private in the United States Army at Maxwell Field, Ala., should not be trifled with or made the subject of a "joke" by the Editors of The News. The letter from the soldier was signed "Pvt. Jefferson Davis", and you added a note as follows:

"To insure prompt and personal attention, we are forwarding Pvt. Jefferson Davis' letter to Senator Claghorn, who knew his grandfather."

The subject of the soldier's letter was "Why should the eighteen or nineteen-year-old group now in uniform forfeit the completion of their education or possibly injure their future because the eighteen and nineteen-year-old young men not yet in any of the services will not be drafted, or be called upon to serve, if the draft law is postponed or not re-enacted." If these young men should not be drafted because the war is over, does not the same reasoning apply to that same group who are still in the service?

My son volunteered to serve his country before he was eighteen years old, and, of course, expected to be discharged, if he survived, soon after the termination of hostilities. He is at the moment serving overseas in Japan and would like very much for a replacement to be sent in order that he might return home to the United States and go to college this Fall to complete his education. Undoubtedly there are thousands of others in the same predicament.

Maybe if you had the same condition, it would appear to you to be more serious and not a joking matter. Your suggestion, in the public press, that this very important question be referred to a comedian is not conducive to fair play and certainly will not be very encouraging to the young men at Maxwell Field.

I am taking the opportunity of referring the letter that appeared in your newspaper, together with a copy of this letter to Senator Clyde Hoey and Congressman Sam Ervin with the thought that it will receive more attention than the ridiculous one contained in your note.

It would please me greatly for you to publish this letter.

—FRED R. YOUNG.

(Note: Seriously, we are sympathetic with the youngsters still in uniform who may soon watch the rising eighteen-year-olds go ahead with college and career. But we don't know how to resolve the problem of the generations passing by. Is it fair to keep on sending youngsters into service, just because some millions went before them, during the war? The boys we'll remember longest are those who aren't coming back, who no longer have careers to follow. But Jefferson Davis, by the way, once addressed himself to the problem, saying when he was asked to draft the youngsters, "I will not grind the seed corn of the Confederacy."—Eds., THE NEWS).

Slangwhangeling Sam

SOUTHERN PINES

AS a lifelong member of The Ancient and Honorable Society of Slangwhangeling Sams I cannot standily by and have you taking pot shots at a highly regarded fellow member. (Your editorial "It's a Strange Revolution, Sam" in The News April 24).

Franco's seizure of the Spanish Government is generally spoken of as a revolution. But it may as logically be called a reaction, a reversion, a return to the dictatorship of de Rivera. "What's in a name?" The seizure of power by the minions of Privilege and Vested Interests (the reactionary Southern Democrats and Old Line Republicans) is as sharp a departure from the liberal, Roosevelt Administration as Franco's rule from Republican Spain. Revolution? Reaction? What the heck! The Coalition by any name would still stink to high heaven. And if it is not broken up soon, by hook or crook, it will involve us in a national crisis worse than the Harding-Dougherty-Sinclair-Fall-Teapot-Dome debacle of the early twenties.

The mythical Man from Mars, a Patagonian, a Tibetian might be misled by Grafton's "over-simplification" in the sentence you quote. But you know what he meant and so did anybody who reads his column. Indeed his meaning was so clear that it would be a mild insult to assay an explanation.

Oversimplification? Simplicity is the soul of art; and the aim of all practical science. Compare, for example, Millet's "Angelus," with Maclise's "Death of Nelson"; the works of Henry George with those of Herbert Spencer; a modern, streamlined jet plane with the oldtime crate of World War I with its tangle of struts, braces, guy-wires, etc. Complexity is the curtain that hides the exploiter. When a government becomes so complex that its foundamentals cannot be understood by the people then, from that point on, the people of that government are "standin' in the need of prayed." As witness, the starving hordes of Europe.

And, incidentally, FDR did not "decide to adopt" liberalism. Liberalism is a thing of spontaneous conception and slow growth, with deep roots and takes a powerful lot of killing.

—S. A. REED.

(NOTE: Herewith an oversimplified distinction between revolution and reaction: A revolution has a purpose, a program, a design. Reaction is a formless protest, negative opposition aimed at destruction with no plan for replacing that it would destroy. The Spanish revolution, for instance, was designed to install Franco as a Fascist dictator, and it succeeded. Does Mr. Reed believe the dissident Democrats and stand-pat Republicans are operating under a master plan calculated to remove Harry Truman, and Harold Stassen, and install, say, John Rankin in the White House as a permanent occupant?

As we said in the questioned editorial—reaction can be worse than revolution, for it is pointless, based on an unreasoned desire to go back to standards and ideals that no longer exist. If they ever did. Some of the reactionaries in Washington are doubtless venal, but we don't believe the majority are. The coalitionists act like tired men turning back to yesterday, not hot-eyed revolutionists looking toward tomorrow.

Complexity may very well be the curtain that hides the exploiter. It also frequently hides the truth.

As to FDR's liberalism, it was Mr. Grafton who said it had been "brought to Washington from Hyde Park". It was our argument that it was as old as America, i.e., with deep roots and requiring a lot of killing.—Eds., THE NEWS).

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, although, in exceptional cases and upon request, we will withhold the writer's name.—Editors, THE NEWS.

Marquis Childs

Search For A Man

WASHINGTON

THE burden of responsibility in selecting a new Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court has weighed upon President Truman more than anything else with which he has been faced in the year he has been in office.

At the outset, the choice seemed a relatively narrow one. When the President ended his brief vacation cruise last Sunday, there were more or less inspired stories saying that the choice lay between Justice Robert H. Jackson and Justice William O. Douglas. In other words, the choice was between the two opposed wings of the court.

That, however, was before the visit to the White House of former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes. Hughes, at the President's request, visited the White House on Monday afternoon. He was asked for his advice about the appointment and he gave it.

The weight of that advice was that the Chief Justice should be selected from outside the ranks of the court. At almost the same time, similar advice came from other sources with a prestige and influence that compelled the President to take heed.

DECISION DELAYED

It had been expected that the announcement of the elevation of Jackson or Douglas would come on Tuesday or Wednesday. The appointment was delayed to give the President time to consider the new perspective. The powerful argument for selecting the Chief from outside the court went as follows.

Only in that way could the deep split within the court be healed. Selection of either Jackson or Douglas would tend to perpetuate a feud that has gone beyond the bounds of anything hitherto known in the history of the Supreme Court. While the President had some understanding of how bitter this feud has grown, he learned more about it as he studied the background of the dispute and the personalities involved in it.

The late Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone was a tolerant man who believed in the right of self-expression. As an associate justice, he had sometimes resented the discipline exercised over the court by Hughes as Chief Justice. Hughes was a schoolmaster who believed in firm discipline.

Perhaps because of Stone's humanness and his tolerance, the clashing personalities on the court tended to get out of hand under his Chief Justiceship. It is the practice on the court for the Chief to state his opinion first, and the tradition is that he do so without interruption. On several occasions Stone was heckled, as though he were a college debater, while he read his opinions.

INTEGRITY CHALLENGED

In one extraordinary instance, the Chief Justice's personal integrity was challenged. There was a painful and awkward interval in which Stone sought, successfully, to master his emotions.

The extent of the feeling on the court has hardly been a secret. It has been especially bitter between Justices Felix Frankfurter and Hugo L. Black. Jackson, siding usually with Stone and ordinarily an even-tempered man, has not concealed his feelings in some of his opinions and also in one or two public addresses.

To cure this breach or, at any rate, to restore order and dignity to the court seemed then, as the President studied the matter, to be the first consideration. The advice of the venerable Hughes weighed heavily in the scales the President was trying to balance.

There was also another related consideration. It was argued that, if any member of the present court were to be elevated, he would be a Roosevelt rather than a Truman appointee, since he would have been named to the court in the first instance by Truman's predecessor.

In the earnest discussions in the White House, the hope appeared of naming a man from outside the court who would seem to be above politics, above the conflict between liberal and conservative, right and left. Such a man, it was believed, would restore the court to something like harmony.

WHERE IS HE?

But then the question was where to find such a man. There are very few men who have been above the contemporary battle and yet who, at the same time, have the qualifications for what has been called the most important judicial office in the world.

That is why, conceivably, the President may in the end turn to the court for his choice. He may take quick action to end the speculation that has persisted since Stone died. But whatever the nature of the final choice, it has been for the President a heart-searching trial.

Bertram Benedict

Unions & The South

WASHINGTON

THE CIO and the AFL are each preparing intensive campaigns to get more members in the South. The CIO held an organization meeting for that purpose this week in Birmingham. The AFL gets going at Asheville, N. C., on May 11. The CIO announces it will spend $1,000,000 in its campaign, the AFL, that it is out to get 100,000 new members in the South.

The CIO organization campaign in the South will have political as well as economic aims, whereas the AFL will concentrate rather on the economic aim. The result may well be that the AFL will endorse certain candidates for political office which the CIO will oppose—just as the AFL got behind Truman for the Democratic Vice-Presidential nomination in 1944 when the CIO threw its support to Wallace.

The AFL supports members of Congress who have voted pro-union, without much regard to their stand on such issues as the poll-tax and the Fair Employment Practice Bill. This is true also of the Independent Railroad Brotherhoods, which met on April 25. Included among their endorsed candidates is Senator Bilbo (Dem., Democrat, of Tennessee), foe of FEPC and anti-poll tax legislation.

FIGURES UNAVAILABLE

No figures are available on trade unionism in the South, although everybody knows it is weaker there than in other parts of the country. In the larger Southern cities the AFL has considerable strength among the building trades, and the AFL organizing campaign in the South may use the AFL building trades unionists as a nucleus. The AFL is well represented also in the printing trades in the South, and in the Coal mines, now that the United Mine Workers has returned to the AFL fold.

Once the current coal strike is over, John L. Lewis is expected to take a leading part in the AFL campaign in the South. It remains to be seen whether his recognized organizing ability will overcome the handicap of his unpopularity in most sections of Southern public opinion. President Green of the AFL said on April 25 at Chicago that the AFL had a better foundation on which to build in the South inasmuch as the Southern worker has refused to respond to Communistic appeals."

CIO STRENGTH

The CIO is strong in Southern steel mills. Unionism in Southern textiles also is CIO, although probably less than one-third of the Southern textile workers are organized. The CIO had considerable strength among the shipbuilding industries in Gulf ports, but that industry is now on the wane. Such unionism as exists among the Southern rubber, oil and chemical workers also is CIO.

One problem confronting both labor bodies in their campaigns will be the color line generally drawn in the South. Many AFL unions either do not admit Negroes or else set up adjunct unions for Negro membership. The CIO prides itself on admitting Negroes on the same basis as whites, but the CIO union leaders are too astute to ignore Southern attitudes toward Negroes. Recently Van A. Bittner, the CIO organizing chief, declined the proffered aid of a New York group headed by the Negro Representative from New York City, Adam C. Powell, Democrat. For that matter Bittner rejected also assistance from the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, a Southern group working to remove disabilities suffered by Negroes. The CIO is more apt than the AFL to use some Negro organizers in the South.

POLITICAL WEAKNESS

The lack of subservience to unions among Southerners in Congress was shown when the House passed the Case Southern Representatives voted to sustain President Roosevelt's veto of the anti-strike bill; had it not been for the votes from the South, the motion to override would have lacked the necessary two-thirds majority in each House.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Lewis May Take Over Presidency Of AFL

WASHINGTON

DESPITE the fact that John L. Lewis is gradually stagnating the nation and for one month has not even deigned to give his detailed terms to the mine operators, AFL insiders concede that he can write his own ticket about taking over the presidency of the Federation.

However, the miners' boss, for once in his life, is playing the shrinking violet and wants to be urged.

He has told close friends recently that he isn't interested in the AFL presidency and has no intention of becoming a candidate at this year's convention in Chicago.

These friends add that Lewis wants to be "drafted" for the job, not this year, but in 1947.

The strategy may change before the convention, but present plans for Chicago, are to continue President Bill Green in office for one more year, with the understanding that simultaneously he will announce his retirement, effective in 1947.

Before his recent return to the AFL, Lewis' supporters had planned to railroad his replacement of Green this year. However, because this would be too obvious a slap at Green, who has been president since Dec. 9, 1924, they are now agreeable to postponing Lewis' election for another year. The fact that Lewis has public opinion so overwhelmingly against him in the coal strike may also have something to do with it.

Whip-Lashing Bilbo

ONE colleague boisterous Senator Theodore Bilbo doesn't like to tangle with is Delaware's Senator Jim Tunnell, who has a tongue like a whip-lash when angered. The Mississippi chatterbox learned this the other day while heckling Tunnell during a speech on the return of surplus lend-lease from overseas.

Bilbo interrupted at one point to inquire if Tunnell had ever heard of "Roosevelt's statement that lend-lease would be paid back to this country in the kind and class of materials and goods which we gave."

"I have never understood that the President ever thought it would be paid back dollar for dollar," replied Tunnell. "It was not a loan."

"Roosevelt did not say that," persisted Bilbo. "He said that it would be paid back in materials."

Tunnell: "I am not sure but that the saving of the blood of American boys is material of value."

Bilbo: "I do not understand the Senator's observation."

Tunnell: "The Senator may not understand it, but I think the American people will."

Congress Retreats

IT ISN'T often that the public rises up in protest so quickly and effectively as over the recent cutting of price control in the House of Representatives. However, the "save OPA" mail drive on Congress now appears to have scored a bull's eye. Senate opposition to crippling House amendments is mounting and anti-price control Senators one by one are beginning to yell "Uncle!"

Despite this, OPA Boss Paul Porter and Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles are awaiting the Senate showdown with crossed fingers. What they fear is a compromise lease-lend bill—a watered-down, but still dangerous version of the House "repeal" measure.

Porter warned of this in a recent secret conference with Bowles and other top officials when the question was raised as to whether the outspoken Bowles should continue his resonanding for air-tight OPA legislation. Bowles himself felt that it might be smart for him to pull punches temporarily.

Porter, however, vigorously advised the contrary.

"This is no time to trim our sails or for you to let down. Chester," he told Bowles. "There is too much at stake. We've won the first round, but there is still a lot of fighting before we are over the hump."

The price control chief said he was much heartened by the new "Society of the Friends of Price Control" in Congress, led by GOP Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper of Iowa, who recently back-flipped into the ranks of those favoring OPA extension.

"I guess the next step will be for the National Association of Real Estate Boards to come out for a compromise bill," Porter said. "That's what worries me. We have to keep our guards up against compromises. Either we have a price control or we don't. There's no middle ground as far as I'm concerned."

Porter recently gave a closed-door session of the Senate Banking Committee a sample from the same book. When several Senators protested that the OPA should be more "flexible and reasonable" in restricting price increases, he replied:

"The trouble with many people is that they consider the words flexible and reasonable synonymous with no control at all."

Capital Chaff

JOHN L. LEWIS has appropriated Bernard Baruch's park-bench "office" in Lafayette Square across from the White House. . . . Dean Acheson, the able Acting Secretary of State, showed up for work the other day wearing striped pants, a black morning coat, black tie, neatly starched collar, and a large hole in the sole of his left shoe. . . . The City's organizational drive in the South is known by the code name: "Operation Dixie".