THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher · J. E. DOWD, General Manager · WILLIAM M. REDDING, Editor

'Testing - $1 - $2 - $3 - $4'

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1947

Wallace's Reckless Course

HENRY A. WALLACE'S left-handed endorsement of Senator Taft for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1948 is the most alarming utterance that has yet come from that alarming zealot. It is so disturbing because it fits in perfectly with the Communist design to drive America back into isolationism and to steer us toward economic collapse through inflation, the two courses by which the Marxists hope to eliminate this country from the contest with Russia.

Sounding off again this week in Buffalo, N. Y., Wallace let it be known that if it came to a choice between President Truman and Taft, he would vote for the Ohioan. He prefers Taft not because the Republican Senator is softer than Truman toward Russia, but because the GOP leader has no heart for the Marshall Plan, opposes Universal Military Training and would do nothing to put the Government's brakes on inflation.

Democratic Party officials naturally are concerned over Wallace's repeated threat to head a Third Party movement in 1948. The former Vice-President and former Cabinet Member, who was booted out of Truman's Cabinet for attempting to obstruct the Administration's foreign policy, cannot yet be written off as a political factor. There is a chance that he could turn the election to Taft if the Ohioan were the Republican nominee.

Wallace stands to carry the American Labor Party support, which has been an important item in New York elections. He has some following in California, Washington and Michigan. A Third Party ticket headed by him might draw enough votes from the Democratic candidate to put California in the Republican column, and that big Western state is going to be a large and possibly a decisive factor in the 1948 election.

Wallace's crusading for peace makes no sense to the great body of Americans when he turns his campaign into a movement to strengthen the American right and isolationism. His attacks on the Truman Administration as a "war party" and as the tool of Wall Street and American business men in the foreign field echo Russia's Molotov in his cries against "world domination of the United States of America." The Wallace tirades carry the same tone sounded in the fulminations of that notorious America Firster, Col. McCormick of The *Chicago Tribune*.

McCormick, a conspicuous supporter of Taft for President, also rails against the Marshall Plan as a scheme for "bossing the world" and declares that "since the war, our Government has been conducting itself in Europe with all the infamy of a European conqueror."

Molotov, Wallace, Taft and McCormick attack the Truman foreign policy from different motives and the false cry of imperialism is a mask for their various personal and political objections to President Truman or his program.

Unwittingly or deliberately, Henry Wallace is letting himself become a tool of the conflicting interests which would hurry this country toward a showdown between the extreme right and left. If his Third Party movement resulted in the defeat of the Truman Administration, that would increase the chance for curtailment of spending for Euroopean recovery, diminish the chance for inflation control and raise the prospect for high tariffs, renewal of trade warfare and return of the old economic isolationism which proved so disastrous in the past. Such an outcome would not carry us nearer to peace but would immeasurably heighten the danger of economic breakdown at home, European decline, Russian aggression and world war.

Ed Pauley Wears Out Friendship

HARRY TRUMAN'S old friend, Ed Pauley, the oil man and party bigwig from California, is under fire again. The last time it was Pauley's oil and political operations that embarrassed the Administration. This time it's grain and politics.

The other time the Pauley affair produced a storm which resulted in the retirement of Harold L. Ickes as Secretary of the Interior. He didn't like the smell of Pauley oil and politics and said so. Mr. Ickes charged that Mr. Pauley used his political influence to advance his private interests and challenged his veracity. His testimony figured in the Senate refusal to confirm Pauley's nomination as Undersecretary of the Navy.

President Truman insisted on Pauley's confirmation but his friend gave such a poor account of himself that the Chief Executive finally had to withdraw his name. The President was miffed by Ickes' performance and called for his resignation.

In September of this year Pauley was appointed special assistant to Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall of North Carolina. He would like to have Royall's job and it is reported that Mr. Truman had Secretary Royall and Defense Secretary Forrestal lobbying with members of Congress for Pauley, with no luck. Senator Taft refused to support Pauley for confirmation, declaring that if he was not qualified to be Undersecretary of the Navy, "the same thing holds true for any other high Government position."

The special assistant now is the central figure in another Senatorial investigation which was started by Republicans, who are making an issue of the fact that Mr. Truman's friend has engaged extensively in grain speculations. They question the propriety of such operations by a high figure in an Administration which has publicly denounced speculation in commodities as gambling and as a factor in the price spiral.

In his defense, Pauley reports he has been unloading his grain holdings since he became an official in the Army and contends the transactions are "perfectly proper and ethical." It is true that there is nothing illegal in the operations but they are not appropriate for a man who is close to the President and an important figure in the President's party. Mr. Pauley sees nothing wrong in speculation and publicly repudiates Mr. Truman's contention that such dealings boost prices. He characterizes that as "loose talk."

Mr. Pauley doesn't share the President's views on an important point of Administration policy, and he doesn't have the same sense of ethics and loyalty as the President. Edwin W. Pauley simply has too many financial irons in the fire to devote a proper amount of attention to the business of being a public servant and a friend of the President.

One Great Step Toward Peace

IN A WEEK of confusion and gloom, one event stands out brightly as a certain step toward American security and world peace. That is the action of the United States Senate in ratifying the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. It was done with such dispatch and unanimity that the public scarcely had time to appreciate the significance of this ratification.

This country's approval of the pact was of particular importance as the remainder of the Western Hemisphere nations have been watching to see what action Washington would take. Three now have ratified and the others are expected to follow quickly.

The historic pact, negotiated at the conference of nineteen republics in Rio de Janeiro last Summer, creates a regional security system that may serve as a pattern for world collective security. Our security zone extends from pole to pole, from Hawaii to Greenland. It binds all members to joint action for defense in all measures short of military force, on the votes of a two-thirds majority. A decision requiring application of military sanctions would be binding only on those states that voted for it. The treaty provides for collective measures against both a non-American power and a state within the hemisphere that violated the peace.

Two aspects of this treaty are of vast importance in connection with the world conflict that now is revolving around the United States and Soviet Russia. One is the pact's majority rule principle which eliminates the veto power of one nation, power that Russia has abused so scandalously in the United Nations. The American republics applied the majority principle for collective action under Article 51 of the UN Charter and this same formula may be used in the United Nations to break the deadlock over the veto. There is, in fact, already a movement under way to negotiate similar collective security agreements among the member nations in UN.

The other great point is that this pact completes the American defense system, confronts Russia with the fact that the New World now is impregnable. It undoubtedly will do much to discourage the Soviet from agression in this hemisphere and it should influence Moscow toward a change in policy that will permit the re-establishment of world equilibrium.

From The Christian Science Monitor

Are All Men Equal?

A WELL-KNOWN columnist has told Jefferson and the Founding Fathers off. You remember that in their Declaration of Independence they were naive and brash enough to declare that "all men are created equal." Now comes a loud though late dissent:

Offhand, I can think of no more hypocritical fraud on the people of the United States than the self-inflicted doctrine of equality among and between mankind. Not one person in a million believes in this.

Not one in a million, it is safe to say, believes the columnist is the "equal" of Jefferson in ability and perspicacity, in scholarship and statesmanship. But millions of heirs of the Declaration of Independence certainly believe that in the eyes of their Creator both men—and all men—are equally important, that they are equally entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, equally possessed of the right to think what they please and say what they think, no matter how silly, provided it is not seditious or slanderous.

Equality is a basic spiritual fact that is constantly denied by the unequal circumstances of material life. To the materialists who join in the denial we commend Lincoln's view of the equality of all men as "a standard maxim for free society" which should be "constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even, though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated."

People's Platform

Economics For Americans

PINEHURST

Editors, THE NEWS:

A RECENT dispatch from Washington, "Officials Revise Plan to Fight Foot-and-Mouth Disease", must have caused many a cattle raiser in North and South Carolina to wonder what the Department of Agriculture would next turn out. Officials of the Department stated "that the slaughter program against foot-and-mouth disease, started nine months ago in Mexico, was too hard on the Mexican economy and would end immediately." "The Undersecretary of Agriculture, Norris E. Dodd told a press conference that the department had accepted a proposal by Mexican officials to change over to a program of vaccination, continued quarantine and slaughter of animals when the disease cropped out in a place previously uninfected. Mr. Dodd said that the United States experts in the field hoped to hold the disease south of a quarantine line."

"Mr. Dodd also reported that the United States campaign against foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico had thus far cost this Government between 30 and 35 million dollars. A large part of this has been for the animals destroyed. The United States as of Nov. 15 had paid for the 22,603,295 cattle killed, whereas the Mexican Government bore most of the costs for the 786,256 sheep, hogs and goats slaughtered." "The Mexican Government from the beginning had wanted to use vaccination to control the disease. Mr. Dodd added, but the United States had contended that only real slaughter would wipe it out."

To the above, one, B. T. Simms, chief of the Bureau of Animal Husbandry, contributed the cheerful note when asked "if his men could hold the line, replied I think so."

"And we've got to push it back or it will push us back. Foot-and-mouth disease doesn't play a tie game."

Fairly bubbling over with optimism Chief Simms added, "I hope this will not result in Mexico and the United States being resigned to live with hoof-and-mouth disease from now on. Animal disease is one of the reasons that Europe is hungry now."

All this presents an interesting picture, 30 to 35 millions of the money taken from our taxpayers and spent to try to eradicate a disease in Mexico, hundreds of miles from the Mexican-Texas border. The political consequences in Mexico apparently unfortunate for the existing regime, our Agriculture Department accepts a proposal of the Mexican Government to abandon the only known way of stamping out the disease.

The British have had a long and bitter experience in dealing with this most terrible cattle disease and they have found that there is only one way to deal with it and that is, when it appears on any farm to slaughter all cattle that could have been in any conceivable way exposed to infection.

It seems that the "Good Neighbor" policy only works outwardly North, South, West and East of our borders, and that the stupidities of our Treasury Department can be equalled by those of our Agriculture Department. Both these departments have been operating for years in an economic vacuum, i. e., in a sphere in which common sense is repelled if it even seems likely to enter. "We, the richest nation in the world," only if compared to those wallowing in the abyss of bankruptcy. Our dollar, selling in the free markets as well as in the black markets at a tremendous discount in terms of gold. When FDR cut the dollar to 59.06 he started the ball rolling. Unbridled extravagance, combined with a global war continued the debacle and the outrageous rise in prices since 1939 is leading us ever deeper into the morass.

In a time when we are nearing the selection of nominees to be voted on at the Presidential election, it seems almost too much to hope for that the members of the Congress irrespective of party, would read "Will Dollars Save the World?" by Henry Hazlitt, the most brilliant of our American economists, who never was a member of FDR's stable. I feel sure that some good might result were they so to do. In the main congressmen are largely lawyers and business men in a small way, who know little about economics. When things go wrong many of them are apt to "holler" about Wall Street, in the belief that it is popular among their constituents, most of whom don't know any more about economics than they do. In the present crisis where our economic future, for generations to come, is at stake, it is a sad condition to contemplate.

The reading matter in Mr. Hazlitt's book is contained in some 89 pages, the wording simple and the print large enough not to strain the eyes of even a tired congressman. The cost is only $1.50. To any member of the Congress, either of the House or Senate, who will buy this book (read it, and then write me on his official paper that he doesn't think it is worth the money he paid for it, I will cheerfully refund $1.50 by return mail.

If the people of our country realized what we are confronted with, millions of our citizenry, in fact an overwhelming majority of all the voters (irrespective of party) would unite to protect the value of the dollar. The over 70 million holders of Government bonds, the millions upon millions of holders and beneficiaries of insurance policies issued by American insurance companies, the hundreds of thousands of people dependent for their support on fixed incomes, who are past the age where they can be productively employed, the millions who are in receipt of pensions or annuities, and even the millions who are supposed to be benefited by "social security", on reflection cannot help seeing that a continuation of the decline of the American dollar will ultimately result in universal ruin and leave us in the position where we couldn't help our friends when we desired to do so.

—FRANZ H. KREBS.

Samuel Grafton

The New Look

NEW YORK

THERE is indeed a new look. The new look is a complacent look. Those who have it peer vaguely about and murmur: "Wasn't it terrible when we had those controls and you couldn't buy good food, because the black market had it all?" Only with butter near a dollar a pound, we are producing and eating less of it, per capita, than at any other time in the last 27 years. The new look is a dull look, a myopic look. It can see the end of its nose, but, beyond that, everything blurs.

There was something sharp, almost eagle-like, in the old look, when we actually looked to see how the people of the republic were eating. There is something grubby about rationing, no doubt, but there is something proud, too. The new look is saucier, but it isn't as proud. The new look is a look the other way.

The new look is a smug look. The old look was an interested look; it was continually registering, when it was confronted by tenant farmers who wanted to own their own land, or by city dwellers on a substandard diet, or by would-be homeowners who longed for places of their own. Maybe the old look was a little tense, but it saw a lot; it saw people.

• • •

The new look sees words and phrases, it proclaims that all these problems and a lot more, will be taken care of by natural processes. The new look is patched with blind spots. It does not notice when city health officers (as in New York) report that expectant mothers are having serious health difficulties, because they cannot afford proper food to maintain the natural processes going on within them.

The new look is a glance at the tips of one's fingernails.

The new look is a suspicious look. It continually suspects and expects disloyalty. It is clouded with doubts of those around it in a way in which the old look hardly ever was. There was a certain air about the old look, as of a man walking in daylight on a broad highway, and there is a certain air about the new look, as of one venturing through a dark alley, and keeping his fingers crossed for luck until he gets to the end of it.

• • •

The old look used to walk through a new public housing without any fear that the fiercely proud people in it were secretly disloyal to their new plumbing and their bright new kitchens; the new look hurries by the overcrowded flats and has dark thoughts about the impatient people within.

The new look is a defensive look. Its wearers say plaintively that ours is the best system, and they say it over and over. When we had the old look, we hardly ever said it, but we knew it; we knew it the way you know any piece of machinery is good, by using it. We didn't have to search our souls about where we were going, because we were so visibly on our way; you could use contour-ploughed hillsides and new waterpower dams as direction markers.

• • •

Maybe the new look would lose some of its defensiveness if we began to move again, toward adequate shelter, food, clothing for all our people. Maybe Communism, for all its aggressiveness, would cease to be the menace it now appears, if we began to go again. We'd be harder to hit if we were on the move. It's the sitting bird that's the easiest target.

Stewart Alsop

Third Party Threat

WASHINGTON

HENRY A. WALLACE has let the cat (except possibly for the tip of its tail) out of the bag. He has stated flatly this week that there will be a third party in 1948, unless the Administration unexpectedly adopts the Wallace formula for abandoning most of the world to the Comintern. He has stated further that he will support this party. He has been coy about whether he will head the ticket, but this coyness was wholly unnecessary, since he is the only possible candidate. What this amounts to, of course, is that, as a miracle, Wallace will run, as predicted in this space for more than a year. Since Senator Claude Pepper has cautiously ducked the No. 2 spot on the Wallace ticket the egregious Senator Glen Taylor is probably cast, for the role of Sancho Panza to Wallace's Don Quixote.

All this must please Mr William Z. Foster, Communist Party chief whose cohorts, as has also been documented in this space, are the real brain trusters of the third party movement. Only a few days before Wallace spoke up, Foster had used less double talk than usual in telling a convocation of the faithful in New York that a third party headed by Wallace must be their main preoccupation in the coming months.

HELP THE REPUBLICANS

As Foster and his party strategists know, the creation of their third party will have two entirely foreseeable results. It will make the nomination and election of a right-wing Republican far more probable, since it will certainly drain off moderate Republican and Democratic support. It will also cause the Communists to be isolated and enfeebled still further in their main stronghold in the labor movement, the CIO.

A vast change has already taken place almost unnoticed in the CIO, particularly since Walter Reuther's smashing victory in the automobile workers' convention. Except for those unions like the electrical workers still tightly gripped by the Communist machine, the entire CIO has now vigorously shaken the Communists loose. A series of state CIO conventions has been under way, and in state after state—in New Jersey, in Connecticut, in Rhode Island, in Alabama, in Wisconsin, in Minnesota—the CIO rank and file has risen to smite the Communists hip and thigh.

The two most significant of these outbreaks have been in Wisconsin and in Minnesota. The Communists hold in Wisconsin's CIO, which only last year was strong enough to contribute heavily to the defeat of one of labor's ablest friends, Robert LaFollette, is now completely broken. Working through the electrical workers, the Communists brought their biggest guns including Gerhart Eisler, former "Daily Worker" editor, to bear on Minnesota, in an effort to control the state CIO and a third party. At the convention, they were roundly and resoundingly trounced. As in most other state CIO conventions, the Marshall Plan was heartily indorsed and the third party mapeuverings condemned.

CIO FOR TRUMAN

It is now virtually certain that the CIO leadership will actively support the Democratic Party and President Harry Truman in 1948, unless Truman manages to put a remarkably big foot in his mouth before that time.

This in turn will mean that the United Electrical Workers, and the other smaller Communist-run CIO unions, will be forced to obey Political CIO policy. For they take their orders not from Murray but from Foster. Thus there has already been consolation at CIO headquarters that in 1948 the Communist-run unions may be faced with the unpleasant alternative of getting out of their Communist leadership or of expulsion from the CIO. In short, the third party issue may cause the Communists to lose their last toehold in the American labor movement.

Henry Wallace himself has now given the real reason why they are willing to risk this disaster. He agreed by implication that a third party would make far more likely the nomination and election of a right-wing Republican like Senator Robert A. Taft. Taft has denounced the Soviet Union far more fiercely than any responsible Administration leader. Yet Wallace stated coolly that Taft's election held out the best promise of reversing American foreign policy.

Thus the real objective of the third party backers (including William Z. Foster) is unveiled. It is the election of a right-ring isolationist Republican in 1948. It is based squarely on the assumption that the curious pinch-penny nostalgia for a simpler and less expensive past which afflicts so much right-wing thinking would reduce American foreign policy to mere sound and fury, signifying nothing.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Lt. Col. Laux Stymied In Safety Efforts

WASHINGTON

HERE is more about the 800 U. S. paratroopers shot down by our own troops over Sicily and the Army's attempt not to rectify the error, but to punish officers who wanted to correct the causes of this tragedy.

One of the men who took part in this Sicilian airborne infantry operation and was lucky enough to live through it was Lt. Col. David Laux. Afterward, he directed his energies toward making sure that future Army transports carrying paratroopers were equipped with self-sealing gasoline tanks so they could not be shot down so easily by anti-aircraft fire. A transport carrying paratroopers must necessarily fly low and slow; therefore, it is an easy target from the ground, no matter who is firing. And the planes shot down over Sicily had no self-sealing tanks, armor plate or any other protection whatsoever.

However, when Laux was opposed on better protection for these planes, he finally wrote a letter direct to Secretary of War Stimson, who turned the letter over to one of the officers opposing Laux on self-sealing tanks—Gen. Barney Giles. And Giles immediately ordered Laux to Alaska.

A day or two later, after Colonel Laux had arrived in Alaska, Giles followed him up with an amazing 600-word telegram, which, if Congress ever gets around to investigate, would be revealing evidence.

General Giles telegraphed Gen. Dale V. Gaffney at Nome, Alaska, directing him to secure from Colonel Laux all reports, papers and letters relative to self-sealing tanks and paratrooper transports. The telegram also asked that Laux authorize the Air Corps in Washington to pick up any papers in Laux' home pertaining to the protection of paratrooper planes.

Too Tough For Barney

BY this time General Gaffney smelled a rat. And being a tough Irishman with a son who was in a troop-carrier outfit, he got on the telephone and proceeded to bawl out General Giles for sending Colonel Laux to Alaska.

"When I want any officers of lieutenant colonel rank up here, I'll make them myself," he said. "You don't need to concern yourself with sending them to me."

When Giles remonstrated, Gaffney shot back:

"Don't give me any of that, Barney. What's the matter? Has Laux got something on you?"

Thus, Colonel Laux, the man who tried to prevent future mistakes in the Army, sat out the rest of the war in Nome Alaska, nearest point to Siberia.

Meanwhile, the Army had searched his files, and frankly admitted they wanted to burn all his reports, letters, etc., which demanded self-sealing tanks in troop-carrying planes. Laux managed to keep one copy of his letter to Stimson, however—the letter recently published in this column.

In this letter, Colonel Laux told the Secretary of War that there had been "criminal negligence" in regard to troop-carrying transports and that he, Laux, "was prepared to prove it."

However, no investigation was ever made. Meanwhile, Brig. Gen. "Mike" Dunn, who was reduced in rank when he protested Army failures, three times was later recommended for promotion by the Navy. He has never been promoted. Nor has the Army done anything about some of the high-ranking officers who still run the Air Corps and whose gambling with people's lives is probably worse than Gen. Bennett Meyers' gambling with other people's money.

Quite a few good young officers are now getting recognition in the Army and are doing A-1 job. But when it comes to ousting those responsible for tragic errors, the old brass hat protective association still operates.

Merry-Go-Round

WHEN Chuck Luckman held his first conference as food czar, one of his severest hecklers was Izzy Stone of PM. When Chuck Luckman bowed out as food czar, Izzy Stone was one of many who came around to congratulate him on the swell job he had done. The Luckman Food Committee served without salary and with most of them paying their own expenses. . . . A colonel went to the barber shop in the Pentagon to get a haircut. Seventeen people waited ahead of him. After a long wait he was about to get into the barber's chair when a general walked in. "You're next," said the barber. . . . Then three other generals walked in; all got their haircuts ahead of the colonel. It doesn't pay for any one less than a general to get his hair cut in the Pentagon barbershop.

History Teacher Truman

JOHN DEAN, a sixteen-year old high school student of Charleston, W. Va., who recently won an essay contest on what place organized labor holds in democracy, called at the White House recently, accompanied by Senator Harley Kilgore and Eugene Carter, president of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor.

And when the younger informed Truman that he was a student at Stonewall Jackson High School in Charleston, it caused the President to drop an interesting bit of American history.

"Coming from a school with a name like that," he said, "it's rather appropriate for you to be the winner of an essay contest on democracy. Stonewall Jackson was a great man and a great leader.

"Young man, do you realize that when Stonewall Jackson was your age, sixteen, he walked all the way from Charleston to Washington and sat on the steps of the Secretary of War until he was given an appointment to the Military Academy at West Point?"

Young Dean said this was news to him, but he planned to tell his classmates all about it.

Under The Dome

NEBRASKA Republicans are not enthusiastic about having Senator Kenneth Wherry, the "merry mortician," speak in their towns. They fear embarrassing questions might be asked about the "Wherry Plan" whereby a workforce made up of all senators in promising low prices when the OPA ended. . . . To be discouraged from speaking in his home state is heartbreaking irony to a man who simply loves to speak. . . . The all-important cement case now pending before the Supreme Court will decide for the first time in history whether the Federal Trade Commission has the right to prosecute anti-trust cases—hitherto reserved chiefly by the Justice Department. For years the Federal Trade Commission, whose members constitute the oldest-aged group in Government, have scarcely moved an anti-trust case. For instance, FTC oldsters deliberated the cement case for ten long years. A companion case on price fixing of steel was held up by the Trade Commission for 26 years. . . . In contrast, the Attorney General has wound up major anti-trust suits in two to three years—especially under trustbusting Thurman Arnold