

The Colonies Win A Round

TO history-minded Southerners the pointing of the finger by the Supreme Court of the United States took its stand for Dixie in the freight rate case must have sounded like the echoes of the guns at Fort Sumter. For in modern times the South has come to realize that it is not a colony in public to colonial, and that this business of the quaintly rigged and complex freight rate structure was milking it dry. It realized, too, that it was part of the regional struggle which had its roots deep in history, going far back into ante-bellum days. For many years the North and East have owned America, and some of the means by which they held control were devious indeed.

This decision, though experts will point out that it is incomplete, may be a triumph almost as far-reaching as one the region once sought in an abortive war for power. The victory means, obviously, that manufacturers of finished products in many lines may now move South and compete with manufacturers anywhere in the country. Thousands of firms now here may entertain visions of greater profits, and thus bigger payrolls, by completing operations they now carry on in partially-processes. For the South's business leaders move forward to accept these new opportunities, the dividends will flow to virtually every citizen of the region. This decision digs deeper than the alleviation of the South's economic suffering. In its decision, as quoted on the new wires, the Court dealt rather casually with law and precedent, and fixed its eye upon the causes behind the industrially laggard South and West. It was almost as if the Court were handing a cease and desist order. The Court established a momentous precedent here, in speaking out for the principle of equality of opportunity among American regions. It spoke against colonialism.

A New Army of Censors

IF it is proper for a Roman Catholic to march with his fellows in protest against the immorality of Hollywood, then certainly a Southern Baptist may follow along. If the Legion of Decency can make unlovely noises at each appearance of a hackneyed passion-throbbing screen drama, and whisper a grim warning to its members when every new Forever Amber appears, the Baptist brethren are entitled to do so and do likewise. And to go, as vigorously as we support Decency on all and occasions, we are not elated by the news that the Southern Baptist Convention plans to boycott movies which do not meet "standards." The Baptists noted that Hollywood was glamorizing loose morals by "exploiting for its own profit tendencies of human nature." They hit the nail almost directly on the head. Hollywood is guilty, not only of that sin, but of numerous others which are (arguably) speaking, at any rate) equally heinous.

Devises of leading ladies to wriggle their lovely ways through endless sticky legends of adultery and the like. But we suspect that all who tilt with the Hollywood they consider a detrimental force in American life will learn much and suffer much before they are done. Perhaps they do not understand that Hollywood does not really have to glamorize loose morals, to pander to our baser natures. Loose morals have always been glamorized, haven't they? Perhaps they haven't read no significance into the immortal fact that a book banned in Boston is doomed to become a best-seller; that the simple sign "For Men Only" or "For Adults Only" packs movie houses. Perhaps they haven't had time to realize that the moral prohibitions serve chiefly to whet the appetite of the salacious public, and that such boycotts as they plan are almost invariably terrific failures. Despite our dim view of the effectiveness of the usual technique of the prohibitionists and censors, we wish the newly-alert Baptists well, and the pioneer Legion of Decency. They carry our sympathy and understanding into the unequal battle—but not our hopes. We can tell them at the outset that it is precisely at his most ignominious moments that man—or woman—is most charming. And we're sure that the merest glint of the brightness on the marquee will forever fetch the mob, and break the sternest of boycotts, however firm its foundation.

South Carolina's Example

SOUTH CAROLINA, moving forward in good order with its mad lynching trial at Greenville, gives hopeful signs that the South has come of age. In this unprecedented attempt to uphold the sanctity of law and order, the State, officially at least, strives to put the law above the fiction of race relations which have so plagued us in the past. At Greenville, South Carolina is demonstrating courage and wisdom. It would be unfortunate if Southerners pinned their hopes upon a conviction of these alleged lynchers. At the moment there is no doubt that the South is doing its duty with a calm vigor that might be expected in Michigan, say, or in Pennsylvania. It dug through some ticklish and unpleasant police work and adamantly refused to let the lynchings go through the trial opened. It has already shown good faith, and that means accomplishment regardless of the verdict of the court. It is still rare in the South for a lynching to have any such aftermath; South Carolina has already outdone most of her sisters.

Any guessing game with the courts is a dangerous one, particularly in a distance. But just now the chances of convicting these taxi drivers charged with lynching the Negro Willie Earle (himself charged with the murder of a taxi driver) seem bright. In deed, the community has shown some sympathy for the drivers by contributing to a defense fund. Eight of the first nine men of the jury were textile workers from the town and its environs. Traditionally, the community seems more likely to reflect upon the crime of the Negro than that of the allegedly venal white men. But conviction or acquittal, in this instance, is not of paramount importance. South Carolina has already proved her good intentions, and has egregiously supported the principle of equality before the law, even in the face of an unlovely tradition. Whatever the verdict she wins, she deserves national applause.

Another Voice

Back from Oregon speaks his piece. He's seen Joe Stalin and him interviewed—As well as one with no Russian accent—And he finds that Stalin, except for his drinking. It really must given to our way of thinking. (Joe likes vodka, which to our notion is a leading first cause of stomach ailment). We haven't made sense in Stalin's opinion as to what the law should be. Of course, I pushed, the bear will bite us.

But has no desire just now to fight us. So Stalin sees peace, though perhaps not unity. If Russians and Americans grasp their opportunity. We don't know how Stalin felt about Stalin. But the thought has just occurred to us in his mind. That after a quart of vodka as solace He'd swapped him Gromyko for Henry. —O. J. Coffin, in Greensboro Daily News



People's Platform Liquor Presents A Bill

Editors, The News: DOES liquor pay? Judges, prison-keepers, sheriffs, and others have given their united testimony that from four-fifths to nine-tenths of all cases committed in the United States are caused by drunkenness. The FBI director, Edgar Hoover, stated that our annual crime bill is estimated to be over \$10,000,000. Therefore, the estimated annual cost of crimes from drunkenness is about fifteen times this amount, or \$35,000,000.00 collected in 1946 from liquor. Does liquor pay its crime debt? In 1945, it was estimated that 43,000,000 people in our country were drinkers of liquor, and possibly there were nearly 2,400,000 drunkards of which number 600,000 were chronic drunks. How many 993 these drinkers? In 1945 Federal Government reports show that Americans consumed 231,000,000 gallons of whiskey and other distilled spirits, 140,000,000 gallons of wine, and 70,000,000 barrels of beer, 4,000,000 barrels less than in 1945 due to grain shortage. The staggering cost of this liquor was \$8,700,000,000. What did these citizens have in return for their money? Their families, physicians, welfare agencies, morticians, penal institutions, and insane asylums knew the answer. More than 40,000,000 people have banded themselves together to renounce alcohol forever to be redeemed from the disease of alcoholism. But what of the rest of the 600,000,000 chronic alcoholics of 1945, probably increased in 1947. Are they doomed to diseased lives of torment for themselves and their families? Can they pay the liquor tax? And what of the liquor industry? Can they say that they are not? Can they count on permanent fabulous profits for rich living at the expense of the people? The national secretary of the National Farmers Association has predicted that national prohibition would return in 4 to 6 years. This authority in the liquor industry, a student of the liquor question, before, during, and after prohibition, told his audience of retailers, liquor dealers that he had traveled 4,000 miles in the last six months of January and that his investigation of the liquor and distillery had revealed some startling and almost unbelievable conditions. Hence his prediction of prohibition.

Thank the Lord the clouds that clutter up the air over the radio when they are not cut off by the taste by injecting a little Scotch into the soda. I believe I speak for several others when I say a new and strange war on the life would be welcomed. "Sneak Column" that about everything going on in the liquor business and the role of alcohol in the good and bad of alcohol and its hushhushbacks and old habits, had been remanded of every day. My own man in every herd that loved his rider. Every time I look into the alley and wagon yard, only makes it hard on the carriage and giraffe trade. The news doesn't ever sell so long as someone sells it. There's only fear is that the pure in hearts will go to it to develop a sweet tooth and cause a serious abortion on the market. Some have even so far as to say they prefer "wagon yard" to "government rum" as they can get a better kick. Most "government rum" requires a transformation of moonshine anyway to be able to get higher than Georgia quips on. So when the skills are racked on election day, regardless of who racks up the most skills, we will be in a state of mind to vote for the man who has a mother-in-law, with a couple truck loads of baggage to send a work-week. My editor, how about as I say, hanging a new brand of linen on the line and changing the sheets? The old is a bit snappish and is showing little tale of age. —H. D. MICHAEL. NOTE: We have not everything that turns up in the wash. But between now and June, we doubt if there's much chance of a change in the time.—Eds. The News.

School Election

Editors, The News: BY a resolution adopted at the last meeting, the Board of School Commissioners directed that an official expression of the Board's appreciation of your support and assistance in carrying the recent election be increasing tax support. You have the public a clear presentation of the needs of the schools, and then gave the school support, strong endorsement in your editorials. For the Board extends to you and your staff sincere thanks. The Board is very grateful for the splendid report of Mr. Dick Young who rendered very effective service in behalf of the schools. —R. F. HARDING, Board of School Commissioners, Charlotte, N. C.

Charlotte

THE PEOPLE'S PLATFORM is available to any reader who cares to mount it. Communications should be sent to the editor, and if possible, on only one side of the paper. Label and address will be deleted—otherwise printing charges after must be stamped although, in exceptional cases and upon request, we will withhold the writer's name.—Editors, The News.

Drew Pearson's Truman Rights Wrong to Francis Biddle

WHEN this columnist was young and new at the game it always rankled to have to admit making mistakes. With the seasoning of the years, however, he has found that it pays to admit them. After all, human beings can be wrong. Just two years ago this month I told the story of how Harry Truman had fired Francis Biddle as attorney general because of his deep-seated loyalty to Kansas City Boss Pendergast and his resentment against Biddle for having appointed several Pendergast friends. Among other things, Biddle had refused a parole to Boss Pendergast, also had insisted on the reinstatement of Maurice Milligan—the U. S. District Attorney who sent Pendergast to jail. Also Biddle had held out against appointing Fred Crawford, Truman's old sergeant in World War I, as U. S. Marshal in Kansas City. When Truman was newly become President of the United States, fired Biddle without even the courtesy of talking to him personally. The story made Truman appear to be a very vindictive man. While it is true that Truman still has a deep loyalty to his Pendergast friends and also that he fired Biddle, I am now convinced that it is not true, as previously reported, that the President nurses such deep grudges against those who opposed his old Missouri cohorts. At any rate, some inside knowledge happened recently which show that he is doing everything possible to undo any wrong he may have done to Biddle.

The Senator from Michigan has not reported Biddle's name out of the President's grants office the other day. Many Presidents of the United States, discouraged at the opposition of so powerful a Senator, especially one who had withdrawn the federal policy money, had used to do so. Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson and the Felix Frankfurter school of vigorous opposition to Biddle), has advised Biddle's withdrawal. Acheson has long wanted to appoint George Hart as attorney general, and has suggested that Biddle undertake the codifying of United Nations laws instead. Senator William E. Jenner has also intimated to Truman that he will block Biddle's appointment indefinitely. Truman, however, has not been moved. The answer of the man who once fired Biddle, presumably in a dispute regarding Pendergast, was a letter to Vandenberg stating that he had absolutely no intention of withdrawing Biddle's name. It is now reported that Truman might be willing to send Biddle as ambassador to France—provided Biddle is willing to make the switch. But if Biddle wants to continue the fight for the United Nations post, the President has made it clear he will back him to the limit. It seems only fair to report these facts about Harry Truman, which I hereby do.

WASHINGTON THE SUSPICION will not down. That the session of the United States Supreme Court will consider the problem of Palestine is merely another delaying move in the chess game of the people. Thus far there is little indication of any desire to break through the current impasse of frustration and defeat. The longer we accept that pattern, the more we are forced to the spectacle of the displaced persons. (What a polite, official term for the millions of refugees, despair). The more blunted their consciences become, the more they will continue to suffer. That is perhaps the most terrible relic in the whole tragic, wretched business. It begins with the assembly called by the diplomatic thrust and counter-thrust and continues on through what has struggled so long in the quagmire of indifference are lost sight of.

The process of a U. N. Inquiry is time-consuming. But if we were sure that a settlement would be made on the basis of an impartial inquiry, then perhaps we could wait. It has been indicated to come, however, from British sources that a U. N. report might be ignored as readily as the report of the Anglo-American Commission which spent so much time and effort on a job of recommendations. WATCHFUL WAITING As Americans, we can hardly be prone to the attitude taken by the American delegation at Lake Success. It is an attitude of watchful waiting on the whole, and the attitude so much seems to be left unaided.

The United Nations, it will be argued, is not equipped to accept a mandate over such a troubled area. This argument has a superficial validity. Organized Jewry has kind of a monopoly would make the authority of the U. N. ineffective has been painfully clear. The United Nations is an international police force has engaged in an interminable wrangle. Supporting the U. N. effort to take over the Palestine mandate. Supporting the U. N. effort to take over the Palestine mandate. Supporting the U. N. effort to take over the Palestine mandate.

WATCHFUL WAITING As Americans, we can hardly be prone to the attitude taken by the American delegation at Lake Success. It is an attitude of watchful waiting on the whole, and the attitude so much seems to be left unaided.

Samuel Grafton

Stopping Recession

NEW YORK FOR several months now, the standard luncheon club routine for the speaker of the afternoon to get up tight, to give a few minutes of his time to the members of the club, to give the members a good laugh, to give the members a good laugh, to give the members a good laugh.

THE TROUBLE with fighting a recession is that it is a long, slow, and painful process. It is a long, slow, and painful process. It is a long, slow, and painful process.

REMEMBERS WHEN Francis Biddle was old-fashioned. I can remember way back to when Congress used to be referred to fondly as the tribune of the people. "We don't have anything personal against John Coilett, Mr. President," argued Langer, "but we think someone from North Dakota should have received that appointment. It is never has had a man on the eighth circuit bench." Langer added that in the same period every other state in the eighth circuit area had one man represented on the bench. President's own has had no appointments. Langer said, Minnesota and Iowa, three each, Missouri, two each, Wisconsin, two each, and so on. He said, "Well, I'll admit you got a good case," replied Truman. "You've got it right and I know how you feel about this matter." But just as you're through with the appointment of Judge Coilett, "He's an excellent choice," don't you think? The President didn't elaborate on whether the fact that Coilett was an old Missouri sidekick and director of education in the State of Missouri was a good reason for his appointment. He stressed the "vast amount of work (legal cases) coming from Missouri" to the eighth circuit court as an added factor.

Then he added to his callers: "I told you I thought you're right and I hope, as a person, you're right. But you won't make an issue of this." When the President said a personal favor of members of Congress, even three Republicans such as Langer, Young and Robertson, he is not often turned down. So the North Dakota trip promise is not to be broken. They left the White House with an intimation that Truman would drop the Coilett appointment and that the courts would be only an intimation, not a promise. Note—Senator Truman and only Judge Coilett to occupy additional space in the Federal Building in St. Paul, Minn. Since Truman's office never got a word, he used to step in to use Coilett's. Thus they got acquainted.