THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher — J. E. DOWD, General Manager — HARRY S. ASHMORE, Editor

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1947

The Doctrine Makes Strange Bedfellows

THE Senate's confirmation of the Truman Doctrine in Greece and Turkey by a non-partisan vote of 67 to 23 is being hailed as definite proof of American unity. Certainly the majority is an impressive one under the circumstances. Absolute unity is impossible in a nation in which speech is free and opinions and interests diverse, and there have been few occasions, in peacetime at least, when the Senate has shown less division on major matters of foreign policy. Lend-Lease, for instance, carried by a vote of 60 to 31; the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements by 42 to 37; repeal of the arms embargo by 60 to 33.

Nevertheless the 23 dissenting votes cannot be easily dismissed. They were cast by a mixed bag of sixteen Republicans and seven Democrats, and among them were acknowledged leaders of both Parties. If the straw polls mean anything, the dissenters were standing against the tide of popular opinion. That, right or wrong, is an act of courage no politician undertakes lightly.

Four of the seven opposing Democrats were Southerners, although in this case there is no reason to attach particular partisan significance to their stand. They were Senators Byrd of Virginia, McKellar of Tennessee, Pepper of Florida, and O'Daniel of Texas. The votes of solons so completely irresponsible as Messrs. McKellar and O'Daniel cannot be assayed by logical standards. But surely there is significance in the fact that Senator Byrd, the most conservative of all the Southerners, and Senator Pepper, the most liberal, wound up in bed together on a major policy issue for the first time in history.

Certainly these two gentlemen arrived at their common decision to oppose the Truman Doctrine by entirely different routes. Senator Byrd's motive stems largely from his deep concern over the fiscal policies of the United States; he doesn't believe we can afford to lend financial aid and support to any foreign nation under any circumstances. Senator Pepper, on the other hand, is a New Dealer who has never displayed the slightest fear of deficits; he opposes the Truman Doctrine because he does not accept the theory that communism and capitalism are unalterably opposed and therefore sees no reason why current differences can't be resolved through the United Nations.

These are, perhaps, extreme opinions of the right and left. And yet who can say that there is not merit in each of them? Did the United States Government really exhaust all possibilities of co-operative action through UN before it decided to embark upon a course of unilateral action designed to contain Soviet Russia? Did the gentlemen who cast their votes for the Truman Doctrine in the Senate fully and soberly consider the potential cost of maintaining it, and the possible effect on the American economy?

There was little sign of solemn deliberation on these major points in the Senatorial debate. The impression we got was that the leaders of both Parties had satisfied themselves that co-operation with Russia is impossible and that rank-and-file Democrats and Republicans accepted that verdict without question. There was even a feeling that any Senator who dared speak out in opposition was guilty of something close to treason. All of which, we suppose, is the natural fruit of a bi-partisan foreign policy.

It is desirable, perhaps even essential, for the United States to present a united front to the world in a time of international crisis. But true unity must be forged in the fires of public opinion, and the Truman Doctrine has not yet been submitted to that test. It is the product rather of agreement among partisans who have not felt it necessary to discuss publicly the details of their accord.

Inclined as we are to accept the Doctrine as an unpleasant necessity, we nevertheless find in the Senate's voting record a disturbing reminder that there are a good many things we don't know about it. The dissenters represented no minority united firmly in support of some such ideology as isolationism; they were instead a group of politicians and/or statesmen who looked upon the Truman Doctrine from independent and even conflicting viewpoints and found that they could not support it. This, it seems to us, at least raises a question as to whether the appearance of national unity is not in fact an illusion.

The Senate vote alone cannot make the Doctrine an effective instrument of international policy. That cannot come until a sizeable majority of the American people understand it, accept it, and express their willingness to sacrifice to maintain it. So far as we can see that fundamental condition still has not been met.

The Liberals And Political Action

THE liberal, trying hard to maintain an open mind, always runs into grave difficulties when he attempts to translate his humanitarian creed into political action. This takes him into an area where the closed mind usually pays off, and sooner or later he finds himself in the doubtful company of those who are determined to carry a point at any cost, which is, of course, an illiberal attitude.

This, we think, explains the present ineffectiveness of the liberal political movement in the United States. The Communists, of course, provided the rock upon which it foundered. In the nature of things the open-minded liberal accepted support on a specific issue from any source, recognizing as he did the right of all men to disagree with him without being read out of the human race. This, however, left him vulnerable to exploitation by the Communists, and to attack from those on the far right who found the association a convenient means of discrediting any and all opposition.

It is not surprising, therefore, that 87 of the country's leading liberals — including Frank Graham and Howard Odum of the University of North Carolina—have found it necessary to issue a manifesto declaring their opposition to Communism and all its works. The failure to distinguish between pro-Communism and "a desire for friendly relations between America and Russia", they insist, "occasions the grave present-day plight of the liberal-progressive cause."

This serves to further emphasize the cleavage in liberal ranks first made evident by the simultaneous formation of the Progressive Citizens of America and the Americans for Democratic Action. PCA, for which Henry Wallace is a leading spokesman, does not reject Communist support, while ADA does.

But it also serves to emphasize the true nature of the liberals' problem. It is not the liberals who have failed to make a proper distinction between those who are pro-Communist and those who are only trying, within the limits of traditional American methods, to improve relations between Russia and the United States. That failure must be charged to the general public. The prevailing attitude of the American people, it seems to us, leaves no room for fine distinctions of any sort. As a matter of fact it hardly leaves room for honest disagreement on any matter involving not only Communist Russia, but labor unions and civil liberties. Simply disavowing connection with or sympathy for Communist activity will not restore the liberal's effectiveness, for he will be damned if he only stands up for the right of Communists to be heard.

This attitude, we hope, is a natural product of the tense time in which we live. If that is so it will pass, as it has before. But until it does the liberal may as well resign himself to political impotence. This just isn't his inning.

It Happens In The Best Of Brackets

AN income tax overpayment of $52,989 would be newsworthy in any event. When such payment is made by a man who was a ranking authority on tax matters in private life, and Undersecretary of the Treasury in public life, it certainly belongs in the man-bites-dog class.

The payee was the late Max Gardner, and the year of the payment was 1946. The Treasury Department announced yesterday that refund in that staggering amount would be made to the Gardner estate, or credited against other taxes.

It is probable that Max Gardner, being the sort of man he was and being somewhat on the spot because of his official position, gave the Government full benefit of every doubt. Even so it is difficult to see how he could have leaned over backward to the tune of $52,989.

The answer must be that Max Gardner, like all the rest of us, got lost somewhere between subparagraph 6b and line 217 (a). Even with his vast legal experience—and his Washington law firm had handled some of the trickiest corporate tax deals in history—he simply couldn't make his income tax computations come out even.

It is a fine posthumous compliment to Max Gardner that he erred on the side of the Government. But it was, nevertheless, an error, and under the circumstances it should bring cheer to every citizen who has spent the Ides of March gnawing on a frayed pencil-end.

And maybe—just maybe—it will remind the Treasury Department that there ought to be a simpler way of extracting income taxes from the long-suffering public.

A Moscow newspaper deplores the melancholy of Russian music, and a thought is to turn Tschaikowski's "Pathetique" over to some Woody Hermanski for the hotcha treatment.

"Farmers," says a page 1 item in a produce trade journal, "raised too much spinach last year." Come, come, boys—no editorial prejudices in the news columns.

"Naturally," said the boss Russian in the fairy story, "I will give you all that stuff conceded us in the Yalta agreement, if it was not approved by two-thirds of the U. S. Senate."

It says here that Herman Talmadge and Gerald L. K. Smith see eye to eye—another of the rare occasions when all hands seem evenly insulted.

'Don't Bother Me With Details, M'Boy — Just Keep Flying'

People's Platform

Another Gerrymander?

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

OAKVIEW is a suburban section immediately outside the city limits of the city as now constituted, and situated on the northerly side of the Mt. Holly highway, the Chadwick Hoskins Mills being directly on the opposite side of the highway looking south.

The proponents of this plan of extension as they have made surveys for the purposes advertised, obviously intend to exclude the Chadwick-Hoskins properties, but the owners of property on lateral lines are at a loss to understand why their properties are at least partially included, and the property of Chadwick-Hoskins excluded, because if the owners of porperty in the Oakview development would secure benefits to compensate them for additional taxes, and perhaps other property burdens of annexation, why would not the Hoskins properties have the same benefits inure to it. Certainly it has to a great measure the same class of properties which exist in the Oakview development for it is located on the same lateral lines as it relates to extension limits.

The citizens and property owners in Oakview feel sure that if any interested person will take the trouble to check the outer lines of the extension under question will come to the inescapable belief that the "Gerrymandering" obviously employed by proponents out "GERRYMANDERED" the gentlemen from whom this obnoxious term obtained its name. Gerrymandering in any activity is unnatural, unfair, and generally results in impositions on the people it affects. Not only are the methods employed in locating the extension lines in this section wrong, but at a point near the Hoskins Drug store, running west to east, about one-half of Oakview will be within the limits, the other half out, at another point running south to north at least one-half of the development will be inside the limits and the other out, the splitting up a settlement in this fashion cannot fail to be injurious to the property owners and ought not to be attempted.

The property owners of this development are not opposed to constructive development of the city when done in what would be a fair and open-handed way with the end in view of affecting all interested parties alike, but this Gerrymandering method which always benefits some and punishes others has the unalterable opposition of the property owners who constitute the most substantial residents living in this development. They feel in this day and time when things are "topsy-turvy" at best, they should not be compelled to fight something which can at best only result not only in inequities, but positive burdens. If it be that Charlotte at any hazard must annex the outlying hamlets, and the taxes and other burdens are imperative, then by all means cut out the Gerrymandering of outside limit lines so the burdens will fall equally on the strong as well as the weak.

—T. L. DARBY.

Raw?

ROCK HILL, S. C.

Editors, THE NEWS:

YOUR very fine editorial, berating your hard working Hornet team has jarred the sensibilities of this Rock Hill "Chief" fan. To call our team raw because they outplayed the Hornets is both unjust and certainly a poor adjective to describe that group of sterling and hustling ball players assembled under the tutelage of Carnevale.

Webster says "raw" means uncooked, without a covering of skin; as a raw spot on the hand; crude; unpolished; green, and etc. Seems like the two lickings the Chief's administered to the Hornets must have left a raw spot on your two typewriter fingers. Don't never call those fine boys raw again. Heck, hoping we lose many more thrilling and victorious games with the Hornets on the low end. Yell for success from Washington but our "raw team" will do it again.

—BOB SURITZ.

(NOTE—Webster also defines raw as "in the natural state or approximately so—unseasoned, unpracticed." Manager Carnevale of the raw Chiefs had never seen four of his boys before they reported for the opening game. Manager Abbott of the well-roasted Hornets wishes he had never seen them at all.—Eds., THE NEWS).

Wet?

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I NOTICE an article in The News of April 21st contributed by Mr. H. B. Hiatt Jr. wherein he urges those in favor of ABC stores to vote "wet" on June 7th. Better watch your step Mr. Hiatt. I recall very clearly reading an article not so long ago from Raleigh stating that the sponsors of this bill were hot under the collar at some days for calling them "wets" or referring to this as a "wet" bill. Instead they insisted that it was intended to curb the sales of liquor. How about getting your crowd together on this point?

—S. R. HUTTO.

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I'D like very much to say I read H. B. Hiatt Jr.'s letter in Mondays afternoon paper and I must say I bitterly disagree with him on the ABC stores.

God's people don't take a drink to enjoy themselves. They go to church and try to carry on God's work while the devil tries to tear it down. I just thank God for the Baptist ministers of Charlotte. Liquor has broken up many a home. I have seen children hungry and cold just because the mother and father of that home drink. The orphan homes are run over because of broken homes. Whisky came between the parents and their children.

And I'll say to you if you vote in these ABC stores and your boys and girls grow up and go to these hellish dives and make drunkards out of them, then blame yourselves with it. The thing to do is pray that God won't let that come to Mecklenburg County. We pay enough taxes without that. The so-called church member that will vote for liquor is no better than the man that is deep in the gutter, he just pays to keep his name on the church book.

So Mr. Hiatt, you vote for the rotten stuff to win our young boys and girls of today. Take your drink and enjoy it. I'll vote against you and enjoy it.

—MRS. STELLA STOWE.

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.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Too Many Wall Streeters Around Truman?

WASHINGTON

A SIGNIFICANT tug-of-war is going on backstage among the Trumanites over bringing another Wall Street banker into the official family.

Center of the controversy is bald, delightful Bob Lovett, ex-Assistant Secretary of War for Air, whom General Marshall wants to make Undersecretary of State. But there is one drawback: Lovett is a partner in the Brown Brothers Harriman banking firm.

And Averell Harriman, whose father helped found this firm, and who is now Secretary of Commerce, isn't happy about having another Harriman official high-up in the Administration. He hasn't anything against Lovett—quite the contrary. But already there is criticism over the number of Wall Streeters around Truman.

Whereas Roosevelt based one of his famous speeches on "driving the money changers out of the temple," Truman to some extent has reversed this. Here is the roll call of bankers high-up in his party councils:

Secretary of the Navy Forrestal—Former head of Dillon, Read, which floated some of the sour loans to South America and Germany.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy John Nicholas Brown—President of the Counting House Corp.

Undersecretary of State for Economics Will Clayton—Former head of Anderson & Clayton, world's largest cotton brokers.

Assistant Secretary of War Howard Petersen—Wall Street attorney for various banking groups.

In addition there is Secretary of Commerce Harriman, Lewis Douglas, Ambassador to Great Britain; his brother-in-law, John J. McCloy, now head of the World Bank, and Archibald L. M. Wiggins, Undersecretary of the Treasury who, though a small-town banker, was president of the American Bankers Association.

Many of the above are able men. So was Lovett as Assistant Secretary of War. However, another Wall Streeter, some Trumanites feel, would be one too many.

Note—Dean Acheson is anxious to retire as Undersecretary of State as soon as General Marshall can replace him.

Mysterious Mr. Maragon

PAINSTAKING Secretary of War Patterson has written a letter to Congressman Jack Anderson of California, which again points to the amazing power wielded by Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, backslapping, poker-playing military aide to the President. It looks as if Vaughan has been able to reach into the War Department, mesmerize conscientious Secretary Patterson, and bamboozle him into writing the kind of letter Vaughan dictated written.

The letter states that the demotion of Col. William L. Lee from the rank of brigadier general "has no connection" with the fact that Lee slapped the fabulous John Maragon, bosom pal of General Vaughan, in Italy last year. Maragon is the Greek who once shined Truman's shoes in Kansas City, and who now occupies a ritzy suite in the Carlton Hotel here, accompanied the President to the Army-Navy game, the Navy Day review in New York, and is frequently seen riding in a White House limousine.

Just how Maragon gets his influence remains a mystery. However, here are the facts on what he was able to do through General Vaughan in the War Department.

Despite Secretary Patterson's denial that the Maragon incident influenced Colonel Lee's demotion, the official text of Lee's reprimand reads:

"It has been ascertained that you have conducted yourself in such a manner as to bring discredit upon the military service in that on the evening 15 February 1946, in front of the Hassler Hotel, Rome, Italy, you committed an assault upon an American civilian, Mr. John Maragon, by striking the latter with your hand. Although there appear to have been extenuating circumstances in connection with the incident referred to, those circumstances did not justify your improper conduct. Such conduct would not be excused in a junior officer, and it cannot be condoned in a general officer.

"You are hereby reprimanded as disciplinary punishment under article of war 104 for the misconduct described above."

Holding Up Promotion

HOWEVER, that wasn't all. The above reprimand was issued April 12, 1946. On May 2, Lee came up for promotion to the rank of major in the Regular Army, his peacetime rank having been reduced to captain. At that time, General Vaughan, the man who mysteriously pulls strings in so many Government departments, took the trouble to telephone all the way to Paris to inquire about Lee from Maj. Gen. Arthur Wilson.

Vaughan told General Wilson that Lee's name was on the list for promotion in the Regular Army, but that he, Vaughan, proposed to hold it up.

Wilson, however, strongly advised against this. He said it would hold up the promotion of all names below Lee's and cause a "stink." Later, Wilson wrote a letter to Vaughan explaining that Lee was well and intimated that he should forget his thirst for revenge.

However, the influence of General Vaughan and the mysterious ex-bootblack from Kansas City was such that Lee was yanked back from Italy by air priority, no longer a temporary brigadier general, and stationed as a temporary colonel at the Smoky Hill Army Air Field in Kansas.

Note—After being slapped down in Rome, Maragon flew on to Greece by way of Cairo. There, in the lobby of Shepheards Hotel he bought some postcards which carried Arabic, English and Hebrew titles. Loudly he asked if the printing was Hebrew. Upon being told that it was, he threw the cards on the floor, stamped on them and said; "We got plenty of Kike stuff in the States already."

Around The Iron Curtain

A SECRET U. S. agreement with Iran will give that key country $50,000,000 of U. S. military supplies. It's part of the ring around Russia. . . . General Schwarzkopf, former head of the New Jersey police who won fame in the Lindbergh kidnapping, has been training the Iranian Army. . . . The United States is now studying the defense of India. British, Indian and American experts have been conferring secretly in New Delhi on plans to protect India's northern borders from a possible Russian Drive in World War III.

Marquis Childs

Drive On Inflation

WASHINGTON

THERE is little evidence to show that President Truman's continuing campaign to talk prices down to a lower level is having an appreciable effect. In fact, when the newest statistics are released at the end of the month, they are likely to show that the general trend is still upward.

Here and there individual manufacturers have marked down their price tags. But this is the exception rather than the rule.

The President's repeated appeals to business men to be good boys and bring down prices are wearing a little thin. It is like any other formula based on "moral suasion," as the President put it, rather than on the underlying realities of our economic life. We have not forgotten Herbert Hoover's "Prosperity is just around the corner."

Mr. Truman is saying the reverse: unless prices are lowered immediately, a recession or worse is around that corner.

'MORAL SUASION'

Whether it can be done by "moral suasion" is a big question. Former OPA Administrator Chester Bowles, in an article in the New York Times, says no. No individual business man, Bowles points out, is wholly the master of his own decisions as far as prices are concerned. Morever, human nature being what it is, the temptation to get all that a sellers' market will bear, so long as that market lasts, is almost irresistible.

The President, in his Associated Press speech, said that not all industries had shared equally in the huge profits of the past twelve months, and he added that he did not have to name those in which profits were highest. It would have been useful if he had named them.

A break-down prepared by the National City Bank on the net incomes for leading corporations in 1945 and '46 shows that the fattest profits were in just those industries in which consumer demand has been greatest and most immediate. Thus, distilling corporations in 1946 made 41 per cent profit on their net worth. Corporations making hosiery and knitted goods were next with 28 per cent, and cotton goods, silk and rayon and woolens were not far behind.

The baking industry in 1946 made 21.8 per cent profit on the net worth of the leading corporations. Interestingly enough, the price of bread was recently raised throughout the country. The dairy-product industry made a return on net worth of 18.9 per cent while the percentage for drugs was 23.6.

This compares with the iron and steel industry in which the percentage was only 7.5. Although there is still a world-wide shortage of steel, a long-established marketing system tends to reduce the impact of demand.

HOUSE DIVIDED

Even at this late date, there are definite steps which the Government might take to damp down the fires of inflation. That is to say, these steps might be taken if our Government today was not a house divided against itself in this pre-election year.

A Government that could act with any unity of purpose would, for example, certainly put debt reduction ahead of tax reduction so long as the danger of boom-to-bust was just around the corner. Instead, we have a running controversy between the Republicans in Congress and the Democrat in the White House over fiscal policy.

With a debt of $250,000,000,000, we can no longer afford to let the boom-to-bust cycle run its course. That is what one of the wisest men in the Senate, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney of Wyoming, is saying over and over again.

The machinery provided for in the Employment Act of last year could mean the beginning of reasonable guidance from Government. This was the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee of Senate and House.

The President complied with the law by submitting an over-all economic program. The joint House-Senate committee was to have presented its own "findings and recommendations" by Feb. 1. So far, the joint committee has produced nothing.

PREPARING REPORT

A report on prices by the Congressional committee is in the works. This is likely to be a narrowly factual document. At any rate, it will not be the broad-gauge analysis that is specified in the Employment Act. Chairman Robert A. Taft and Vice-Chairman Jesse P. Wolcott find it hard to agree on certain phases of policy, conspicuously on housing.

Consumer common sense may check the price rise. That seems at the moment to be our chief hope.

Samuel Grafton

Limits On Freedom

NEW YORK

THE Christian Science Monitor carries an astute article, making the point that the Western powers would be much more eager to get rid of Franco in Spain if only this could be sure Spain would not go left. There is something pitiful in the desire for this kind of guarantee. It is a funny love affair we are carrying on with freedom, accompanied as it is by so much distrust of the lady, doubt of her virtue, and concern about whether she is quite right in the head.

Refine it as you like, put whatever gloss or construction upon it you care to, and this feeling still remains the sickness of our time, for it is, in essence, a doubt about ourselves, our system, our way of life. We love our way of life and we want to spread it, but we don't trust it, and political man could not be in any worse moral trouble than this. For finally, we find ourselves reduced to letting a system we hate, fascism, linger a little longer, in order to protect a system we love, but do not quite care to introduce.

WHAT WE WANT

Yet what right have we to ask for guarantees as to what democracy will do? The essence of it is, and the glory, that we don't know what it will do, but that we are willing to ride with it, nevertheless, simply because we prefer this kind of non-knowing to the repulsive certainties dealt out by all alternate ways of life. What we seem to be tumbling for, obviously, in the case of Spain, is not freedom, but its image, its simulacrum, a hen in eagle feathers, sitting for a portrait of the king of birds.

It is an essential condition of the democratic life that it can give no such assurances of systematic good behavior. We ourselves fought a civil war, a foreknowledge of which would have been quite enough excuse, by today's standards, for great foreign powers to have stepped in to control us a bit, and save us from our tragedy; and yet that would have been the greater tragedy. It is true that freedom sometimes has to pick its way to the future over bones and battlefields, but the point is that for unfree freedom there is no future.

ALL OR NONE

Without the freedom to go right, to go left, to go crazy, there is no freedom at all, for it is only in the grinning presence of these alternatives that men develop that considerable right in the head, that forbearance which in the end are our only real security. That is why there is something sick, at bottom, in our conception of the kind of unfree freedom we would like to give to Spain, with each man and party tethered by a silken line, hardly visible, but indisputably there.

The trouble is that after twenty years of this kind of control (as after twenty more years of Franco), Spain would still be a hotbed of unrest, whereas after twenty years of freedom she might be a stable country, rid at last of the pitiful insecurities of repression.

CRISIS OF FAITH

Clearly, we are in a crisis of faith about ourselves and our way of life. Spain is not the only sign of it. For our doubts have begun to turn inward too, as we find ourselves thinking now in terms of loyalty tests and of blocking our political alternatives by force of law, forgetting that it is only by standing freely in their grotesque and dismal presence that we have in the past developed our democratic ethics. But the tied arm withers, the fixed compass shows no direction, and it is hard to see how men can be made free unless they remain free to choose freedom. If we want something to be afraid of in this tangled day, let us be afraid of this drift toward a nervous pseudo-safety, which would substitute feeble acts of Congress for what should be the strong free choices of thinking men.