

A Zoning Law At Long Last

IT WAS a narrow squeak, but finally, after all these years, Charlotte has a zoning ordinance. Moreover, despite a few compromises here and there, it is a good ordinance, one satisfactory to the Zoning Commission which fought every foot of the way for its passage.

Enactment of this law means a great deal to property-owners. For the first time, a man may put up a house in a residential area with a reasonable expectation of living in it all his days without finding a poolhall or a glue factory springing up next door. If a few builders and promoters lose a few dollars through plans, the rank and file of property-owners stand to gain thousands of dollars in the future, as their holdings are protected against sudden depreciation.

It is amazing, in retrospect, that it took so long to get the measure through. The Association of Commerce, interestedly for more than 16 years. The ordinance isn't radical in any sense of the word, and was supported by some of the most conservative citizens among us. But Charlotte has been hamstrung by its own conservatism. It was the last city of her size in the nation to accept the principle of zoning, without

which orderly growth is impossible.

The only major amendment to the ordinance as originally proposed by the Zoning Commission is the elimination of the set-back provision. This change, we think, was reasonable enough. An arbitrary set-back line in the downtown area would have meant little unless existing structures are removed, and that, obviously, would have been an enormously expensive procedure. Still, a downtown street-widening project is going to be necessary, and some provision should be made now to make it easier. This can be done through adoption of an overall traffic plan, under which certain streets would be designed for future widening and protected by a set-back provision applicable now. But this can be done by a separate ordinance, and it is perhaps better left out of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Zoning Commission and the Council are due a hearty vote of thanks for pushing through the most progressive ordinance enacted here since passage of the anti-liquor law. The town's future is much rosier as a result of it. As we think even zoning's most embittered foes will realize in the years to come.)

'Sordid Little Political Trick' . . .

ONE of the longest editorials we have lately inflicted upon our readers dealt with the announcement, made in Washington on December 22, that the Commissioners of Agriculture of the 13 Southern States had petitioned the State Department to abandon its program of reciprocal trade agreements and "protect Southern agriculture with tariffs." We regarded this as one of the most alarming strains in the rising winds of isolationism; it stood, we felt, as evidence that the internationalist tradition of the South had crumbled at last before the assault of men who can't see beyond their next dollar.

We were greatly relieved, therefore, by the discovery that the petition was a phony — "a sordid little political trick," as *The Atlanta Journal* aptly labels it. It has now been repudiated by seven of the Southern Commissioners, who say that it does not reflect their views and was sent without their permission or knowledge by C. C. Hanson, secretary of the Southern Association of Commissioners of Agriculture. W. Kerr Scott of North Carolina is one of those who reaffirmed his faith in the traditions of free trade; the others are L. M. Walker Jr. of Virginia, St. Clorcy of Mississippi, C. E. Russell of Georgia, Joe C. Scott of Oklahoma, J. Roy

Jones of South Carolina, and Joe N. Poole of Alabama.

Clarence Poe of Raleigh, editor of *The Progressive Farmer*, is the man who exposed the fraud. Shocked, as were most Southern editors, by the implications of the petition, he immediately polled the Commissioners, receiving such replies as this from Mr. Poole: "I am unalterably opposed to repudiation or cancellation of reciprocal trade treaties, and have so wired President Truman."

However, there are still six Southern Commissioners who did not avail themselves of the opportunity to repudiate the sordid petition. Among them are the two prime movers of the Association — Commissioners Linder of Georgia and McDonald of Texas, a couple of experts who, incidentally, were urging farmers to hold their cotton for 90 cents a few months back. Despite the consistent prodding of *The Atlanta Journal*, Commissioner Linder has had nothing to say on the subject of the ambitious secretary.

Already this flagrant misuse of a majority of the Commissioners' names in so dubious a cause destroys whatever usefulness the Southern Association of Commissioners of Agriculture may have had. We recommend Commissioner Linder that he demand a thorough accounting of the trick, and if he fails to get it at once, that he resign.

The Byrnes Team Is Breaking Up

WASHINGTON commentators of such divergent views as those held by Marquis Childs and Frank Kent agree that the State Department is in bad need of reorganization to meet the tremendous tasks of a new era in American foreign relations. The problem is, by and large, one of personnel, stemming from the fact that the State Department has no diplomatic posts for men of wealth, thereby denying incentive to career men dependent upon their salaries. (For instance, Josephus Daniels reveals in *The Wilson Era* that the State Department was able to attract Cleveland Dodge, privately supplied a great North Carolinian, Walter Hines Page, with \$25,000 a year to enable him to accept appointment as Ambassador to Great Britain.)

Jimmy Byrnes indicated his awareness of the problem when he took over as Secretary of State. Unfortunately, Mr. Byrnes had little time to deal personally with departmental affairs during his 16 months in office. He therefore brought in a fellow Spartanburg, his old law partner, Donald Russell, made him Assistant Secretary of State, and gave him the task of reorganizing the State Department.

Now Mr. Russell has resigned, stepping out of his office along with his boss. This probably does not mean that the effort to reorganize the Department is to be abandoned. It may be that the State Department team is breaking up, and largely out of personal friendship for Mr. Byrnes. But it does mean that the State Department team, which worked so suc-

cessfully with Mr. Byrnes is beginning to disintegrate.

There are reports that Undersecretary Acheson also has submitted his resignation and has been persuaded by the President to stay only temporarily. Ben Cohen, Mr. Byrnes' right-hand man at the conference tables, is also reportedly on the way out. There is nothing in this to indicate an organized protest against the appointment of General Marshall. Apparently the exodus is caused by a variety of personal reasons, the most urgent being the need for Byrnes, however, furnished a great provides even to its top employees. But certainly the departure of these men will work a great hardship on the incoming Secretary of State.

The handicap will reduce the General's ability to reorganize the Department in his own right, a task for which he is perhaps even better fitted than Mr. Byrnes. With a brand new set of top assistants as new to the diplomatic business as he is himself, and with enormous demands on his time in the course of the coming series of crucial international conferences, it is all but certain that General Marshall will have to rely on the single-headed staff for help in reorganizing the Department.

The General has worked a good many administrative miracles in the past. But we may be expecting too much when we ask him to take on the task of reorganizing a State Department roughly on a par with the peacetime army he managed to convert into history's greatest military machine.

Another Voice

The Mecklenburg Declaration

WE HAVE nothing but respect for the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. There is plenty of evidence that there was such a document and we don't have to go all the way back to the findings of the committee named by the Legislature in 1820-21 to believe in its authenticity. But David L. Ryce, a legislator, who in Gaston, will find us on his side, rooting for him all the way, every time he wants to make a speech praising the patriots and virtuous men of old.

Nevertheless, we think the bill he has just introduced in the State Legislature which would prohibit school teachers of the State from teaching that the Mecklenburg Declaration is anything but the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, is open to question.

It is open to question because neither a Legislature, nor any other Governmental unit, ought to tell a teacher what truth is. In fact the teacher ought to be very careful himself or herself, as the case may be,

to put exact labels on truth while he or she is teaching.

The teacher ought to present the evidence, all that is pertinent, without fear of where the chips may fall. Those who are asking him to take on the task of reorganizing the Department in his own conclusions. That is the variety of education which really counts for something.

Truth rarely needs a defense. It carries no stigma, no statute passed to certify it. If truth were in need of a crucifix, it wouldn't be truth in the first place.

The Mecklenburg Declaration has nothing to gain from being trussed up on a legislative altar with a great deal to lose. — Shelby Dill Sr.

Ann Arbor co-eds are asked to refrain from knitting in class, which is termed discourteous to instructors. To say nothing of the possibility of dropping a stitch during a moment's inattention.

I Don't Feel Anyting Yet



WASHINGTON

WE AMERICANS tend to believe that all evils can be cured by law or order that does not exist. We make some terrible mistakes.

One of the worst was Prohibition. That was whopper. It dealt the whole movement for temperance and moderation a blow from which it has never recovered. From the tragic Prohibition era we inherited a lawless generation that is still a curse.

We may be about to make another mistake like Prohibition. We may try to cure our "labor trouble" by law. And the more we try to be just as diabolical, just as disastrous, as Prohibition.

The Congress will pass a revised Case Bill within a few weeks. It can probably be passed over the President's veto. Mr. Truman decide to send it back to Capitol Hill, & bill banning the closed shop has been introduced, and another outlawing nationwide collective bargaining.

REFORMS OVERVIEW

Many features in the revised Case Bill are long overdue. It repeals the jurisdictional strike, which makes anything else has set the general public against organized labor. It outlaws secondary boycotts. It penalizes those who call wildcat strikes and strikes of sympathy, accounting by unions to the Secretary of Labor and to the union membership.

The heart of the measure, however, is the five-member Federal Mediation Board which would be superimposed on the present U. S. Conciliation Service. When the board intervened in a dispute, both employer and employee would have to keep under the terms of the work for a maximum of 60 days. The board would have to make every effort to settle the dispute during the 60 days. But in that period there could be neither a strike or a lockout.

In the long hearings on the Case Bill last year, union leaders argued that in effect the law would be a compulsory arbitration, no - strike or lockout. The purpose of the law would be to get to the heart of the matter, the rank and file of a union, and force them to walk out of their jobs. Such a picket of feeling does not exist.

You can argue that the 60-day cooling off period is therefore all right, since the law would be destructive in their effect. But within organized labor there is an

Peace Begins At Home

CHESTER, S. C.

think he had the best manners of any I've known. I have not seen him since he graduated from college, but I am sure the ill-mannered crowd of the 1920s is still in the world. If "manners maketh man," as old William of Wykeham advised—manners then including manners—Tom Robinson is an asset for any community, North or South.

I hope he will forgive an old friend for thus embarrassing him with praise.

—EUGENE R. SHIPPEN.

People's Platform

MANAGEMENT and labor should co-operate to solve the problems of the nation. The two sides of the coin are the same. The two sides of the coin are the same. The two sides of the coin are the same.

Muddy Waters?

JUST what is all this fanfare about teachers' salaries, anyway? Everybody knows we must give them a decent raise if we're going to save what's left of education in North Carolina. But

Samuel Grafton

AMERICAN conservatives, like a unit, are protesting the conservative party's nomination of a single party family, any more than the left does. It is perhaps the most curious of the things in the new Senate session, clearly a quarrel among the conservatives.

Old Friend

BEFORE the curtain of anonymity is drawn, concealing from the reading public the personality of your new publisher, Mr. Thomas Robinson, permit me to add a word to his biographical sketch in your issue of January 9.

Mr. Robinson is not only a kinsman of Harvard's great president, Charles W. Eliot, as was said, but also can claim as his grandfather, on the distaff side, the distinguished New York Congressman, the Rev. Dr. Henry W. Bellows, minister of All Souls' Church (Unitarian), eloquent preacher, able administrator, and notable, one of the founders of the American Red Cross.

Frederick Soaper Says:

FRESHMEN in Congress are advised to "make a noise." The other play is a mysterious silence, leading the glibbie to conclude that one may be up to something intelligent.

A whiskey made of aviation gas by Jap bootleggers is rumored a failure. It is better so. A jet-propelled drunk would be more on the highway traffic could be.

First proposals call for a UN flag with a globe, six stars and a rainbow. Later, perhaps, it will break out into lights and ring bells.

"Two-pants suits are legal." And, as long as we were dealing with the dreamy abstract, so are new laws.

An ingenious and determined people—Americans. Imagine spending 12 billion dollars in a year when much of the sales resistance was on the other side of the counter.

Drew Pearson's: Byrnes Used Unusual Tactics On Soviets

WASHINGTON

WHEN the history of post-war peace is finally written, the most important chapters will deal with the sudden improvement of American-Russian relations in the late Fall of 1946.

It was with the resignation of the one man who sat all through those negotiations, it is now possible to reveal some of the gripping, day-to-day drama which was the work of the single-headed staff.

All during the sessions of the Paris Peace Conference, Molotov was nasty. He was deliberately, coarsely, and unmercifully nasty. He was, however, cunning. He was, however, cunning. He was, however, cunning.

Yugoslavs Outbluffed

THOUGH more agreeable, the Russians yielded on nothing as quick trip back to Moscow, where it was reported he got fresh instructions from the Politburo. What these instructions were nobody definitely knows, but it was believed that they were not very different from those received by Byrnes during their dinner in Paris which may have been relayed back to Moscow and sunk home.

Yugoslavs Outbluffed

THOUGH more agreeable, the Russians yielded on nothing as quick trip back to Moscow, where it was reported he got fresh instructions from the Politburo. What these instructions were nobody definitely knows, but it was believed that they were not very different from those received by Byrnes during their dinner in Paris which may have been relayed back to Moscow and sunk home.

Prohibition's Lesson



WASHINGTON

WE AMERICANS tend to believe that all evils can be cured by law or order that does not exist. We make some terrible mistakes.

One of the worst was Prohibition. That was whopper. It dealt the whole movement for temperance and moderation a blow from which it has never recovered. From the tragic Prohibition era we inherited a lawless generation that is still a curse.

We may be about to make another mistake like Prohibition. We may try to cure our "labor trouble" by law. And the more we try to be just as diabolical, just as disastrous, as Prohibition.

The Congress will pass a revised Case Bill within a few weeks. It can probably be passed over the President's veto. Mr. Truman decide to send it back to Capitol Hill, & bill banning the closed shop has been introduced, and another outlawing nationwide collective bargaining.

REFORMS OVERVIEW

Many features in the revised Case Bill are long overdue. It repeals the jurisdictional strike, which makes anything else has set the general public against organized labor. It outlaws secondary boycotts. It penalizes those who call wildcat strikes and strikes of sympathy, accounting by unions to the Secretary of Labor and to the union membership.

The heart of the measure, however, is the five-member Federal Mediation Board which would be superimposed on the present U. S. Conciliation Service. When the board intervened in a dispute, both employer and employee would have to keep under the terms of the work for a maximum of 60 days. The board would have to make every effort to settle the dispute during the 60 days. But in that period there could be neither a strike or a lockout.

In the long hearings on the Case Bill last year, union leaders argued that in effect the law would be a compulsory arbitration, no - strike or lockout. The purpose of the law would be to get to the heart of the matter, the rank and file of a union, and force them to walk out of their jobs. Such a picket of feeling does not exist.

You can argue that the 60-day cooling off period is therefore all right, since the law would be destructive in their effect. But within organized labor there is an

entrenched belief that to surrender the right to strike is to surrender a weapon that will leave the union dead or the post office a mere memory with management.

There is another consideration that could not be ignored. The alone but all of it. It gets down to this: Is such a 60-day cooling off period enforceable? Would it be workable on any practical basis? Or would it breed defiance and a new kind of law?

QUESTION FOR THOUGHT

In the extended labor hearings which began last week in Washington, after passage of the Case Bill, this question of workability should be seriously considered. A law that is unenforceable is worse than no law at all. A law that requires a vast enforcement bureaucracy may produce more evils than those it was meant to cure, as we could have learned from Prohibition.

In the countries that have been most successful in organizing collective bargaining, there has been no effort to compel arbitration. Sweden, for example, has a system of arbitration courts to pass on disputes occurring after a contract expires. In the United States, the major restraints in the mediation process, the right to strike is unimpaired. In the United States, the same is true in Great Britain.

One thing is certain: It is that for fourteen years, organized labor has leaned on the crutch of the National Labor Relations Board for every kind of excess—excess which unions are only now slow and reluctantly learning to correct.

Depending on Government-enforced close-shop agreements, the unions have too often failed to do their job. Government-enforced close-shop agreements may produce more evils than those it was meant to cure, as we could have learned from Prohibition.

RISKY EXPERIMENT

But to abruptly to rush the balance of power is a very risky experiment. It is a very risky experiment. It is a very risky experiment.

The Divided Right

NEW YORK

AMERICAN conservatives, like a unit, are protesting the conservative party's nomination of a single party family, any more than the left does. It is perhaps the most curious of the things in the new Senate session, clearly a quarrel among the conservatives.

The Divided Right

NEW YORK

AMERICAN conservatives, like a unit, are protesting the conservative party's nomination of a single party family, any more than the left does. It is perhaps the most curious of the things in the new Senate session, clearly a quarrel among the conservatives.