'Something Seems To Be Stunting His Growth'

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1947

UMT Is Part Of A Pattern

THE President's special commission on Universal Military Training prefaced its report with this statement: "Universal Military Training has no proper place in American life except to the extent that national security and our world obligations demand it." There is further evidence that the commission looked upon UMT with some reluctance in the fact that it rejected the War and Navy Department's blueprint and brought forward a plan of its own calling for a higher degree of civilian control. But the commission did find, after reviewing all the evidence at its disposal, that "national security and our world obligations" now demand a clean break with American tradition.

The members of the commission are not militarists, nor are they citizens who might be panicked easily by an ideological bugaboo. They do not believe—as the American Legion appears to—that a brief tour of military service would be a fine and healthy thing for a growing boy. They have soberly weighed the current American position in the world, and the threat posed by Soviet Russia, and concluded that full military preparedness (of which UMT is an essential part) is in order.

If the commission's (and the Administration's) analysis of the current international situation is correct, there is no valid argument against UMT. To object to its adoption would be like objecting to an expansion of the fire department when the roof is already smoking. But it seems to us that UMT cannot be offered to the people in the somewhat casual manner Mr. Truman has employed thus far with any reasonable expectation of acceptance.

It is time—past time — for a full and frank discussion of the Truman Doctrine and all those changes in American policy necessary to implement it. Speeches like Senator Vandenburg's on the Communist seizure of Hungary are excellent expressions of moral outrage, but they leave unanswered a good many pertinent questions. Do we intend to rest with a speech of condemnation? Do we really believe that reviewing Communist seizure of power before the United Nations will change anything? Or do we intend to say to Russia that we will not tolerate her interference with the internal affairs of Hungary, and back up that statement with the military force UMT is supposed to make possible?

UMT, aid to Greece and Turkey, arming the nations of the Western Hemisphere, foreign relief, Senator Vandenburg's speech on Hungary—all these things are part of a pattern. No one of them makes sense without all the rest, and taken together they do not make sense unless the Administration and the Congress are convinced that ideological conflict between Russia and the West is inevitable, and armed conflict probable.

We cannot consider this pattern solely in terms of its desirability, or even its necessity. There is, always, the question of cost—both initial outlay and maintenance of a foreign policy that depends upon virtually a war-time military establishment and a broad program of economic aid to friendly foreign nations. An economy-minded House of Representatives is already balking at the comparatively minor initial appropriation for Greece and Turkey—endorsing the objective of the program but displaying extreme reluctance to finance it. And there is no sign of the people arising in wrath to demand that the Congress match its words with deeds.

The people of the United States, we believe, will overwhelmingly support any aggressive policy directed against Soviet Russia. But the people also overwhelmingly desire a major reduction in Federal taxes. Can they have both? The Administration has indicated, timidly, that they cannot, but it has never laid that issue on the line. Neither has the Republican leadership, which is now in the impossible position of supporting both a greater effort against Russia and a vast reduction in Federal expenditures.

Until the people are told how real a threat of war with Russia now exists, exactly what military establishment and foreign aid program that threat justifies, and exactly how much such a program will cost, there can be no true national unity. A people who want to get tough with Russia and pay less taxes at one and the same time are a people divided in the most dangerous way—in their own minds.

Our Annual Parade Of Drunks

THE police have a variety of rough-and-ready classifications for their alcoholic customers: fighting drunk, shouting drunk, falling-down drunk, and passed out. A fighting or shouting drunk will normally be charged with assault and battery or disturbing the peace — drunkeness, if it is mentioned at all, being incidental to the more serious count. Only those in the last two categories are charged with simple drunkenness.

The police are naturally reluctant to arrest a falling-down drunk or a passed-out drunk if he is doing no particular damage. If he is at home or among friends he will not be disturbed unless a formal complaint is lodged against him, and this is rare. Those who are listed on police blotters as plain drunk are, nine times out of ten, citizens who have fallen asleep in a public place or who have been sighted by a patrolman weaving out of control, along a public thoroughfare. Even in these cases, an offer on the part of a sober bystander to take the afflicted one home will usually avert a trip to the station.

So the plain drunk who finds his way to jail is an extreme case — friendless and completely soused. Yet an average of about one out of twelve of Charlotte's citizens finds himself in this category once each year. This is an average, of course, and makes no allowance for the repeaters, who are numerous. It is, nevertheless, an appalling statistic.

The 10,000-a-year drunkenness rate recorded by the local courts (one of the highest in the nation, incidentally) is unhappily not a post-war phenomenon. No trace of a downward curve is perceptible in the month-by-month figures since V-J day. In the first five months of this year 4,138 persons stood trial or forfeited bond on charges of simple drunkenness in City and County Recorder's Courts. This does not include any of those charged with more serious misdemeanors growing out of the use of liquor.

Yet in the face of these familiar and dismal figures the prohibitionists are insisting that the voters of Mecklenburg will decide on June 14 whether liquor is to be sold in this county. Plainly liquor is already being sold in this county — vast quantities of it. The 4,138 drunks who stumbled up to the judge in the first five months of this year didn't get that way drinking Grade-A milk.

Would we improve our drunkenness record by voting in ABC stores? Certainly there wouldn't be any miraculous, overnight improvement, and perhaps there wouldn't be any improvement at all. But it is hard to see how strictly-regulated State stores could result in any increase in a drunkenness rate that is already higher than that of any ABC county, and also higher than that of most cities where open bars flourish behind neon signs. To argue that an increase would follow legalization of our enormous illicit liquor traffic is to argue that Mecklenburg produces a special breed of citizen far more susceptible to strong drink than the average American.

These figures make it clear that prohibition has been an abject failure in Charlotte; if it has prevented any citizen (including those minors who would be barred from ABC stores) from obtaining a drink when and where he wanted it the court records show no evidence of it. It would be a wonderful thing if the voters could go to the polls a week from Saturday and decide whether Mecklenburg is to have liquor or not. Unhappily their only choice is, as it always has been, between illegal liquor and legal liquor, between an uncontrolled bootleg trade and a system of open sales by a responsible public agency.

Another Voice

Our Communist Veterans

DURING the war, risk of life made no distinction as to political belief. All Americans in combat, whether they were Republicans, Communists, Democrats or anarchists, were subjected to the same perils. By the same token, honorable service in the armed forces was honorable service regardless of the political affiliation of the men who performed it. Yet Representative William J. Crow now would discriminate as to the quality of that service. He has introduced a bill to deny veterans' benefits, including the GI Bill of Rights, to all members of the Communist Party or to veterans "in sympathy with the general aims of the Communist Party."

This, in our opinion, is a vicious move. Aside from the question of legality or the even more dubious question of enforcement, it does violence to the principle of freedom of thought. The bill is one that casts dishonor on all military service, and as such it should be resented by all veterans' organizations, whatever their creed. Communists were accepted on the same terms as others when we needed men. Nor is it illegal to be a Communist. Abhorrent as are the Communist philosophy and tactics, we have not succumbed to the pressure to proscribe the Communist Party, nor should we. That would be the surest way to promote martyrdom and thus actually further the Communist ends. The same may be said of the Crow bill. It is an example of the way in which our extremists ignore principle in attempting to stampede Americans into losing their balance. In truth, the most frightening thing about the Communists is not so much what they can do to us, but what we can do to ourselves if we listen to the counsels of the witch-hunters.—*Washington Post.*

We'll probably settle for less, but meanwhile the ideal candidate for '48 would be fearless, wise, dynamic, silver-tongued and as photogenic in Kodachrome as a Palomino horse.

Gangsters, laying aside the sweater and the cap, become the fashion plates of Paris. For the girl friend in the Apache dance number, a Worth gown is indicated, with sliding pads.

People's Platform

Brand The Outcast

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I SEE from a statement in THE NEWS that Mr. Thad Adams, the local attorney, has decided to go over to the camp of the ABC store advocates, because he has become disgusted with present conditions.

One reason for these conditions is that a stupid Legislature enacted a liquor law for the benefit of the distillers and bootleggers. I refer to the gallon provision of the law which makes enforcement impossible. Now that same Legislature recently enacted the Sims-Morris bill, which provides for another liquor election, not to control liquor because it cannot be controlled, but to sell more liquor, both "legal" and bootleg.

There is another reason for the present liquor situation in Charlotte and elsewhere, and that is the "style-setters" in Hollywood since 1933 have done a good job for the distillers in advertising the "glamour" of cocktail parties and the like, educating the young people in the art of liquor drinking, and some oldsters too for that matter, until now one rarely sees a movie without witnessing a liquor scene. The large deceptive advertisements in magazines encourage young people to drink liquor.

Liquor was once an outlaw—an outcast and shunned by decent people, but during the past few years the liquor crowd succeeded in a large measure in "clothing" this outcast in a cloak of so-called respectability while the opponents of liquor were asleep at the switch, but there are forces at work now that have broken this hold on society and liquor will soon be the outcast that it once was.

Mr. Adams also states that the liquor business should be openly regulated and conducted under law, by reputable and reliable citizens. To me there is little difference between the reputation of bootleggers and a man who is willing to sell the stuff from a so-called legal store to his fellow-beings, knowing full well what the results will be. There may be a few reputable men in the liquor business but I doubt it. Liquor and reliability do not go hand in hand. There is one thing we are sure of and that is one cannot depend on any promise made by the liquor crowd. That crowd has broken every promise it ever made to the public. The liquor interests will sell to any person, at any time and at any place where customers may be found.

I do not intend to vote for the ABC stores or any other kind of liquor store. After the liquor crowd has been beaten in the forthcoming election, the dry forces will continue their fight until every liquor store in North Carolina has been closed, and until liquor has been branded by public opinion the outcast that it is.

— J. T. FOLEY.

Call To Arms

IN our county (Mecklenburg) we will soon have the opportunity to vote either for or against the ABC stores. Many are praying that the sleeping, lazy or indifferent Christian will awaken to his duty on that day. We must defeat the devil! Let us not be ignorant of the fact that the great danger our negligence will bring. The devil is "always on his toes" when an issue of this kind comes up. But what about the Christian? Will he be on "his toes" that day? Is he "on his toes" today. Doing all he can to let others know how he stands? Doing all he can to defeat the Devil?

We are hearing on all sides the advantages of the ABC stores. (as if there could be an advantage). I would like to ask a question of those who hold this view, who would place an ABC store on the streets of our cities, would legalize liquor, to put the bootlegger out of business and all the other arguments you use with which we are so familiar: tell me, one good thing liquor has ever done for mankind. Has it built homes, hospitals, or schools? Oh, yes, many palatial homes have been built, over the ruins of homes broken—liquor the cause! Hospitals? Oh yes— to make room for broken bodies and broken health. Liquor the cause! Schools? Oh, yes—for the mentally deficient. Liquor the cause! And we cannot leave out the cemetery where many an untimely grave has been dug. Liquor the cause.

More revenue? Seems to me—"Robbing Peter to pay Paul."

Then the argument about the bootlegger going out of business. He will always be with us. Always has. Those who would slip up the back stairs will continue. ABC stores will never correct this evil. They will only be "dressed up pretty" to entice those who otherwise would give drinking no thought.

We are the guardians of our youth. Why place temptation in their way?

What we need today is not legalized liquor to stop drinking (how inconsistent) but for God-fearing men and women to raise up and demand the enforcement of the present liquor laws. Why are they not enforced? Answer that one yourself. Other laws are. This one can be too! Christian get busy!

—J. D. PREVATT,
Former Pastor,
Gospel Baptist Church.

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.

Senator Soaper Says:

GRIMMER even than the kiddies' late afternoon programs is this thing of letting bushed Europe hang from the cliff until the Big Four meets again.

Told that strike hotheads in the West had had to think up ways to jam a phone system, a local parent of five girls just laughed and laughed.

Joseph & Stewart Alsop

Army-Navy Merger

WASHINGTON

IN the morass of current trivialities, great issues and great problems have a tendency to get lost. One such is the unification of the armed services. After months of hearings, chiefly remarkable for the pettifogging tactics of such opponents of unification as Senator E. V. Robertson of Wyoming, a bill is at last being reported to the Senate. Senate approval seems to be pretty well assured. If all goes well, the unification bill will then be jammed through the House, after curtailed hearings, at the close of the session. And Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal will probably be named to head the new combined defense establishment.

All this will be very fine — if it occurs. Despite obvious defects, the Senate bill is a genuine triumph for Major General Lauris Norstad and Admiral Forrest Sherman, the two brilliant officers who are its real authors. As for the prospect of Forrestal's promotion, the President could find no better man for the immense task of inaugurating the new defense system. But since the bill has an excellent chance of getting lost in the general political shuffle, it is still highly relevant to point out some of the reasons why service unification remains one of the fundamental national problems.

STARTLING FACT

The present disunity of the services is responsible, for example, for the startling but undeniable fact that the United States is the only major power in the world without an agreed national strategy. In August, 1945, President Truman requested the assembled Joint Chiefs of Staff to re-assess the strategic situation of this country, and to present recommendations for action, based upon this re-assessment. But the corporate interests of the services would have been deeply affected by these recommendations, which would perforce have involved the roles and missions of the Army, Navy and Air Forces. And so the Joint Chiefs have never, to this day, succeeded in answering President Truman's letter, despite at least one stern reminder from the White House.

This basic division is in turn responsible, directly or indirectly, for all kinds of other omissions which would seem perfectly incredible if they were not accepted as quite a matter of course. One such is the failure to do anything truly decisive about the so-called Arctic frontier. The concept of the air staff, generally approved by the War Department General Staff, is that the main defense-line of the United States has now become a great arc across the Northern periphery of this hemisphere.

LIP-SERVICE

Putting this concept into practice will demand the construction of costly bases, warning systems, and other installations. A sort of lip-service is being paid to the concept, in the form of a half-hearted program for testing the existing, and generally obsolescent military equipment in Alaska and at the Canadian-American base at Churchill on Hudson's Bay. But the decision, whether of not to make the essential investment for true defense of the Arctic frontier, has simply not been made.

A slightly different omission, on an even larger scale, is the failure to adopt an Asiatic strategy. Here there are two alternatives. We can content ourselves with the simple defense of the Pacific, holding such island outposts as Okinawa, and allowing the whole continent of Asia ultimately to come under Soviet domination. Or we can make the necessary investment to halt the Russian infiltration of Asia (already well-advanced in Burma, Indo-China and Indonesia, as well as in China proper) by restoring stability to China.

The investment demanded by the second alternative will be very great, indeed, since the situation in China has been permitted to deteriorate in an appalling manner. But the price of the first alternative will be acceptance of the inclusion in the Soviet sphere of a billion and a half additional human beings, more or less, plus all of Asia's incalculable resources.

NO CLEAR CHOICE

Until the present, no clear choice has been made, either by the joint chiefs of staff or on a higher level, between these two alternatives. Now, when the situation in China is already desperate, it seems likely that the decision will be made to restore stability to China at all costs. Under the circumstances, it might have been better to face the facts of the national interest in Asia a year or two earlier.

Samuel Grafton

Uncomfortable World

NEW YORK.

I HAVE been trying to figure out the postwar world, because, like everybody else, I would like to nest down in it, and kind of rub my shoulders against it, and get comfy. Why not? Except that you hardly get the pillows placed right before you become uncomfortably aware that there are rocks in them.

For example, you are allowed to enjoy the thought of a tax cut for about three days; the Republicans want to clip about three billions off income taxes and spread the money around, and while there are good public reasons why this should not be done, there are good private reasons for enjoying the idea.

But within 72 hours of the vote on the proposal, it turns out that we are going, unexpectedly, to need $1,750,000,000 a year for compulsory military training, which, along with an unexpected $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey, wipes out about two-thirds of the saving, and makes the tax cut look something like a kited check. That's the postwar world for you; you reach for its boons and it bites your fingers off.

SELLING THE ROOF

Of course the Republicans may tilt the table slightly, and by affixing not to note the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, keep their "budget savings" intact and their tax cut whole.

But it could give some Americans an uncomfortable feeling to know that their tax cuts may be coming out of national defense, which is a little bit like selling your roof to put flowers in your garden.

Then there is housing, an issue which does as much as most to make the postwar world look about as attractive as the inside of an aging lion's mouth. With bad teeth. We were promised originally that almost a million houses a year would be built by private industry, with strict controls, and that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill would provide 500,000 additional homes in four years, under Federal subsidy. But the controls have been thrown away, the houses aren't being built, and the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is so far back on the Senate schedule that that body will have to take up vivisection, reckless bicycle riding, and a few other such issues before it ever reaches it.

ONE CONTRIBUTION

The only positive contribution the Senators have made to the housing problem so far is to pass a spurious rent control bill which makes easily possible a 15 per cent increase in rents on the fleabags so many of the veterans at present occupy. They have increased the price of the housing that was originally conceded to be not good enough.

It is this sort of thing which makes it so hard to get cozy in the postwar world; something like trying to take a nap on an escalator.

This is supposed (officially) too be a period of declining prices; but the potential of 15 per cent wallop on rents can pull the cost of living index straight up again, and every dollar extorted from the citizens in this way reduces by one dollar less for them to spend on goods and services in a critical, recession-flattened time.

UNHAPPY FEELING

You know, sometimes, trying to bed yourself down on all this wallowing incoherence, you get the feeling that maybe some of these boys don't really know how to run a postwar world. Else why should it roll around so unsteadily, and give so potential 15 per cent wallop on rents can pull the cost of living index straight up again, and every dollar extorted from the citizens in this way reduces by one dollar less for them to spend on goods and services in a critical, recession-flattened time.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

: Truman Shows Concern Over U. S. Housing

WASHINGTON

WHITE HOUSE friends say that President Truman is getting more and more concerned over the housing shortage and the failure of either private industry or the Government to do much about it.

Whether Truman now realizes his mistake in letting his own Administration officials cut the ground out from under ex-housing czar Wilson Wyatt remains to be seen. However, it is a fact that not only Congress, but also Truman's own housing expediters have bogged down on housing.

Here is an example of how they have bogged right in Truman's home baliwick—Kansas City.

The other day Dutch Miller, promoter of the midget-car races at Olympic Stadium, Kansas City, wanted to enlarge the seating space for his spectators. In hot weather, he said, they had to sit too close together. So he proposed $8,500 worth of new construction.

However, the Kansas City Citizens Committee, appointed to protect the veterans' housing program, said no. They ruled first that midget-car races weren't necessary to the life of Kansas City, and second, that it wouldn't hurt the spectators to sit a little closer together, anyway.

When Dutch Miller went over the heads of the Kansas City Veterans' Housing Committee and took his case direct to the Office of Housing Expediter in Washington. And, much to the surprise of the local people, he won. William E. O'Brien, the housing expediter, wired his official permission to build bigger and better seating arrangements for those who wanted to view the midget-car races in Kansas City.

Theaters Vs. Veterans

Questioned by this column as to why he overruled the Kansas City committee, deputy housing expediter O'Brien explained that only a small amount of building was involved. However, what he forgot was the sock-on-the-jaw he gave to the morale of the folks in Kansas City. The starch was taken right out of them regarding veterans' housing.

However, when Harry Truman appointed O'Brien and Frank Creedon to run the Office of Housing Expediter, he should have known what he was doing. For Creedon's previous record in yielding to private interests as against veterans' interests was readily available to the White House. Time after time, as a member of the Civilian Production Administration, Creedon had overruled Wilson Wyatt when it came to veterans' housing.

Here are some of the cases where Creedon ruled in favor of reconditioning or remodeling amusement places and against veterans' housing:

Knickerbocker Burlesque Theater, Columbus, Ohio; Griffith Theaters, Carlsbad, N. Mex.; A. Afalu and Sons Theater, Leland, Miss.; Paul Neale Outdoor Theater, Lexington, Ky.; Constantine Paegla Theater, Nogales, Ariz.; Edward S. Nolan Theater, Eclectic, Ala.; N. H. Sparks Theater, Tompkinsville, Ky., bar and liquor store, San Diego, Calif.; Frank Nunzi and Tony Mangier night club, Galesburg, Ill.; Princeton, Ind., Theater.

Many of these involved only small amounts of money. But taken in the aggregate they have a definite impact on veterans' housing. Most important impact, however, is on the morale of local citizens committees, such as in Kansas City, when they are overruled by the Office of Housing Expediter in Washington.

Narrow Escape In Jap Camp

THE Navy has received a new and revealing affidavit regarding Lt. Comdr. Edward N. Little, who now faces secret court-martial for his treatment of American prisoners at Camp 17, Puktoka, Japan. The affidavit indicates that another American might have been tortured or killed by the Japs had the war lasted one more day.

On the day the war ended, Paul J. Shaughnessy, former coast artillery private, of Brighton, Mass., was caught stealing a pair of pants at Camp 17. And, according to Shaughnessy's affidavit, Little was about to turn him over to the Japs when the American commander of the camp intervened, ordering Little to think over this severe punishment for at least twelve hours, before turning Shaughnessy over to the Japs. (Two other Americans turned over to the Japs by Little had been tortured and starved to death.)

A few hours later—and while Little was still thinking it over—the war ended. Here is Private Shaughnassy's story of what happened:

"I was a prisoner of war three and one-half years. I was under the command of Lieutenant Little, Camp 17 in Japan. As a mess officer he had caught me for stealing a pair of pants. He had threatened me in front of at least 40 or 50 direct witnesses and he said 'Shaughnessy!!! I'm going to turn you over to the Japanese and they are going to shoot you.' I gave him an answer back which was very unsuitable and he struck me and I fell to the ground. He came over and raised me from the ground and said, 'We are going to the Japanese.'

"On the way to the Japanese we ran into our then camp commander who asked Mr. Little where he was going and they were arguing. I am bringing Shaughnessy to the guard house.'

"Our camp commander commanded Mr. Little to weigh the evidence at least twelve hours before making any hasty decision lest that what he turned me over to the Japanese. I would be shot as I was already a three time loser.

"Mr. Little reluctantly gave in after a direct order. He told me that I could go to work on the noon shift but my chances of coming out of the camp alive were nothing. I returned to my barracks, wrote two notes back to my folks at home. I also gave the notes and a picture that I had saved from the start of the war to a very close friend, Thomas is his name, from Pennsylvania.

The War Ended

I WENT to work and that was August 15, 1945. I worked two hours and all my comrades came back to camp. Not knowing what had happened, we were in a more or less stagnated state for three or four days not knowing whether the war was over.

"When a Red Cross car came into camp the fifth day and told our camp commander that the war was over, an MP section was set up out of our own men with Mr. Little in charge. The first act that he did was to have myself and four other men thrown into the guard house. The American planes came over while we were in the guard house and dropped food to be distributed among prisoners. Mr. Little, through his own orders, had the men in the guard house cut off from the extra food dropped by the planes. He was supposedly going to save us for the Americans to be brought to trial.

"I escaped from the guard house on August 29 at 9:30 P. M., went out through a hole in the fence, and on the 12th of September I ran into Americans down in Kenyon in the southernmost part of Kyushu. I was also a witness to the Pavlockus and Knight incidents in which Mr. Little was responsible for their deaths. The Pavlockus and Knight deaths were due to food incidents, but mine was due to clothing. If Mr. Little was in the defense that he was protecting the rest of the camp's food supply, how is he going to explain my incident as it had nothing to do with food?"