THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher — J. E. DOWD, General Manager — WILLIAM M. REDDIG, Editor

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1948

Charlotte's Dream And Reality

SPLENDOR and squalor, hope and despair exist side by side throughout our civilization and their conjunction in Charlotte has been called to public attention by reports that have been presented in the news columns in recent days.

One day last week, in a matter of minutes, City Manager Yancey and other Government officials stepped from the fair scene of Twentieth Century Charlotte into a setting that properly belongs in the Dark Ages. They made that swift transition on an inspection from City Hall to the nearby slums of Brooklyn, near the heart of the downtown section.

The City officials paused long in dismay at the worst of the hovels that greeted their eyes. It was a cracker-box which rents for $1.50 a week and is occupied by an aged Negro woman, who lives philosophically in the filth and misery which is the lot of slum dwellers. In a few words, she said all that can be said for the conditions so glaringly exposed in what she calls home. "Ain't it terrible," she said, "that people have to live like this?"

A day earlier, a man with a dream had stood at a third-floor window in City Hall looking out over this same ground. He saw the slum houses and the other old buildings of this section but they dissolved into a picture of a magnificent esplanade, two blocks wide and four blocks long. It was a shining civic center of a Queen City, flanked by two wide concourses, landscaped with trees, lawns, shrubbery and flowers. A beautiful park had replaced the ramshackle structures of 1948 and it contained a convention hall, an athletic stadium, a health center, schools, and other municipal buildings. Boulevards and parking facilities, which eliminated traffic congestion in the business section, were in the picture. It all carried out the scheme required for the proper development of the area around the City Hall and Courthouse Squares.

The man with the dream is J. B. Marshall, consultant for the Planning Board, and it is incorrect to call his picture visionary, a word which carries the connotation of impractical or chimerical. He was not dreaming; he was seeing the future. The esplanade is the most practical project before Charlotte. It will enable the community to meet a half dozen or more of its most urgent needs in one program that will benefit everyone, bring pride and new faith to all. It must come, it will come if the community is to fulfill its true destiny.

We now are making a slow beginning. City officials have decided to condemn six houses in enforcement of our slum clearance ordinance. Three business organizations recently joined hands in a program to eliminate sub-standard housing, as soon as material, labor and price conditions permit. It is a good sign that private commercial interests are assuming more direct responsibility for success or failure of slum clearance and their united efforts doubtless will bring a clearer conception of the need and the opportunities in this field.

Under the daily economic drive and the pressure of inflation and shortages, men are unable to see and make the most of their potentialities but the steps being taken by City officials and business men, and J. B. Marshall's dream, are promises that the community will live up to the highest aspirations of its people.

Ike Brightens Democratic Outlook

POLITICOS will find much food for thought in a study of the Gallup Poll and Fortune Survey figures on the Presidential contenders, with General Eisenhower out of the picture. Since this form of political speculation harms no one, let's pull out the crystal ball and begin.

In both samplings, President Truman has run ahead of all aspirants except the magnetic General Ike and Senator Taft has run a dismal last, not counting the mysterious Henry Wallace.

Since it is clear to all that the GOP derailment of the Eisenhower boom was encouraged greatly by Wallace's bolt from the Democratic Party, which led Republican strategists to believe that they could win with an organization man, Henry will have to be given the credit for causing the GOP to commit political suicide if the November returns bear out the story that is told by the Gallup and Fortune studies.

One of the more significant aspects of this analysis is the size of the indicated independent vote, which is shown in the wide margin between the top and low men, Eisenhower and Taft, in relation to Truman. In the Gallup Poll trial heats, Eisenhower scored 55 per cent to 45 for Truman, Taft registered 37 to 63 for Truman; Dewey had 49 to 51 for Truman; MacArthur got 43 to 57 for Truman. In the latest Fortune Survey, released this week, Eisenhower had 48 per cent to 34 for Truman; Dewey 40 to 43 for Truman, MacArthur 38 to 42 for Truman, Stassen 36 to 40 for Truman, Warren 31 to 42 for Truman and Taft 27 to 52 for Truman.

All observers agree that the November turn-out at the polls will be enormous, which normally means that the independent vote will be the decisive factor by overwhelming or landslide proportions. If we go by the above figures, we must conclude that the Republicans have thrown away their only good chance to capture the all-important voters who are not bound by party ties.

Truman's consistent lead over all others in the field except Eisenhower seems to mark him clearly as the favorite of the independent voter among the candidates remaining in the field. Further support for that view comes in a Gallup sampling which has been made since Wallace entered the race, which indicates that the Third Party candidate takes a little from all candidates, leaving their relative positions substantially unchanged. Eisenhower scores 47 per cent against 40 for Truman and 6 for Wallace in a three-way race. Truman goes up to 46 per cent and Wallace to 7 when the third man is Dewey, who takes 41. Truman climbs to 51 and Wallace to 8 when the third man is Taft, with 31.

Republicans obviously are counting on later polls and events to change this picture. Meanwhile, they have cause for deep concern over their dependence on Wallace to cut down Truman while the GOP travels without Ike.

Beware Of Love While Courting

ANOTHER of those pieces on how to be happy though married comes to our attention. It is the work of Dr. Ernest W. Burgess, professor of sociology of the University of Chicago, who bases his finding on a sixteen-year study of the problems of marriage and reports the results in the current issue of *Collier's* magazine.

His research disclosed that marriages of companionship turn out to be happier than those of romantic love. Developing this evidence into something of a theory, he declares that "sex or physical" attraction must be relegated from first to third or fourth place in selecting a mate, after mutual understanding, common interests and temperamental compatability— if the marriage institution in America is to survive.

To help this cause along, Dr. Burgess offers a chart for a cautious six-step approach to marriage—casual dating; keeping company but with the privilege of dating others; going steady (and not with others); an informal understanding that you'll marry; a private engagement and finally a publicly announced engagement.

As we get it, the only safe rule to follow is to be sure not to get seriously interested in anyone you love. "First be friends and then be lovers," says the Doc. An infatuation or "falling in love at first sight" is a warning to duck out.

All this sounds very sensible but unfortunately it includes no prescription for the broken heart you get when you renounce the one you adore for an agreeable companion, and no advice on what to do if an irresistable charmer enters your life before you fall in love with your wife, and no assurance that life would not be a drab affair without that old romantic nonsense which man has found so pleasing for centuries.

Dr. Burgess believes that romantic unions between couples who are intellectually, temperamentally or socially unsuited for one another are a large factor in producing our record divorce rate. We offer the wholly unscientific opinion that it is not the misguiding influence of blind Eros but modern living conditions which accounts mostly for the failure of married couples to become good companions. Love will do better again when we solve the economic and social problems that press for attention today.

From The Milwaukee Journal

Tax Sleuths Worth Their Hire

THE Bureau of Internal Revenue has recently made a number of income tax studies that cover various businesses and professions. The Bureau has discovered, among other things, that some East Coast commercial fishermen have been manipulating their books and that many physicians and farmers, by keeping no books at all, have "forgotten" some of their income.

The Bureau now knows of several new schemes that are being used in the evasion of taxes. It is seeking to learn of others. The general knowledge thus developed should be of assistance in checking individual returns.

The fact is that persons whose income derives from sources other than payrolls often can, if they wish, fail to report all their income with little danger that the fraud will be discovered by a routine check. It requires a more detailed study than is routinely given to uncover such evasions.

The present campaign to learn the various patterns of such efforts is a good move. After that, results will depend on how many examiners there are to check returns. If the number is adequate, the chance that a taxpayer can cheat the Government for long will be lessened.

For that reason, the recent Congressional cut in the appropriations for the Bureau was highly doubtful economy. Since it is known that a properly trained Bureau agent will earn for the Treasury many times his annual pay, there has been no saving here. There has been a loss.

When men are being regularly caught in their efforts to evade, fewer men feel tempted. Even some of those who thought they might "get by with it" have a change of heart and ask to make amended returns. The total gain for the Treasury can run into hundreds of millions.

It'll Take More Than Sugar-Coated Pills

Long Fight In Congress

Anti-Lynch Law Issue Revives

By JAMES MARLOW
Associated Press Staff Writer

WASHINGTON

THERE'S been a lynching in this country every year since 1882. There have been 44 lynchings since 1936. There was one last year. Almost all those lynched have been Negroes. Most lynchings were in the South.

From time to time there's been talk in Congress of passing an anti-lynch law to let the Federal Government, instead of the States, punish lynching. But there a big difference between talking about such a law and passing one.

Congress now is talking of such a law. Once again it may not go beyond talking.

Since 1900 more than 200 bills have been offered in Congress to make lynching a Federal crime. Most died quietly of inattention. A few times Congressional committees have held hearings on anti-lynching bills, listening to witnesses argue for and against them.

Several times a committee has approved such a bill and sent it up to the full House or Senate for a vote. Even when the House passed it, Southern senators managed to kill it when it came before the Senate for a vote. The last time was in 1938.

• • •

RIGHT now a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee is holding hearings on three anti-lynching bills. If it approves one of them and sends it up to the full Senate, the Southerners probably will try to kill it again.

The arguments for and against an anti-lynching law center around the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, sections 1 and 5.

Section 1 says no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

(Lynching deprives a person of due process of law: Trial by jury.)

Section 5 says Congress can pass any laws necessary to be sure that section 1 works.

The main argument against an anti-lynching law is this: It would be unconstitutional by giving the Federal Government power to interfere in a State's own problems.

This argument is based on the tenth amendment to the Constitution which says that the powers not given to the United States by the Constitution belong to the States.

The three bills now being considered by the Senate subcommittee were offered by Senator Wagner of New York, a Democrat, and three Republican senators: Hawkes of New Jersey, Morse of Oregon, and Knowlton of California.

Briefly, their bills say this:

1. Anyone helping in a lynching could be fined up to $10,000 or imprisoned for twenty years.
2. Any officer who failed to protect a prisoner from a lynch mob could be fined up to $5,000 or jailed for five years.
3. The next-of-kin of a person lynched could sue the city or town where it happened for as much as $2,000.

• • •

THE President's Special Committee on Civil Rights—President Truman appointed a committee of fifteen civilians in December, 1946, and it reported in October, 1947—has a lot to say on lynchings.

Its report—called "to secure these rights"—deals with a number of civil rights violated in this country but, on lynching, it says in part:

"The communities in which lynchings occur tend to condone the crime. Punishment of lynchers is not accepted as the responsibility of state or local governments in these communities. Frequently, State officials participate in the crime, actively or passively. Federal efforts to punish the crime are resisted . . .

"The almost complete immunity from punishment enjoyed by lynchers is merely a striking form of the broad and general immunity from punishment enjoyed by whites in many communities for less extreme offenses against Negroes.

"Moreover, lynching is the ultimate threat by which his inferior status is driven home to the Negro . . .

"The threat of lynching always hangs over the head of the Southern Negro; the knowledge that a misinterpreted word or action can lead to his death is a dreadful burden."

People's Platform

Those Awful New Dealers

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

IN order not to lay undue criticism on innocent people who still believe in America and our proven form of Government, which is still the best and most cherished in all the world, I would like to make myself perfectly clear in making mention of the New Deal. The New Deal is that which has established itself in Washington with a bloodthirsty hunger for power and control over the American people and all that we have, at any cost. The New Deal promises everything to the people, gives them nothing and takes away that which they have.

Our late President set the New Deal in motion and made the remark that the Government has taken control over our economic system to such an extent were it in the hands of political puppets it would become penal and oppressive. Harry Truman pledged himself to carry on in the way of the New Deal and conditions seem to be getting more penal and oppressive by the hour. I consider a New Dealer any one who follows or supports New Deal tactics of destroying, giving away and squandering our national resources for the purpose of gaining power and control over the U. S. and at the same time, with our money and resources build another world dictator to destroy the freedom and peace of the world.

Be they Republican or Democrat, if they are New Dealers I am against them regardless of who they are or where they come from. A glittering promise and a New Deal pat on the back plays torment with a soft-shelled Republican. Regardless of party affiliation, a New Dealer is one who supports or votes to continue the New Deal racket against his better judgment and the best interest of a free America, according to the Constitution, which is still our best guide for a sound economy and a free country.

A radical New Dealer is one who take part in falsifying the facts, advance New Deal tactics, feed the world on poisonous New Deal propaganda then blame it all on Russia when at the same time the New Deal is trying to accomplish what Russia has already accomplished—complete control over the people, plus.

—P. C. BURKHOLDER.

Senator Thomas admits doing a little trading in commodities. Probably he was only obliging a constituent.—New Orleans States.

Maybe the Democrats should pick up the discarded GOP slogan "Had enough?" and clean up with it.—Baton Rouge State-Times.

Joseph Alsop

Hoover Slugs ERP

WASHINGTON

THE name of Herbert Hoover has overnight become the rallying cry of the opposition to the European Recovery Program. The Senators and Representatives now fighting ERP have never proposed defeating the bill altogether; from the reasonably moderate Senator Taft to the strikingly immoderate Senator Brooks, they have conceded that some sort of measure with the ERP label would have to pass. Former President Hoover's prescription for transforming ERP into a limited charitable commitment, restricted in several crippling ways, was therefore made to the opposition's order.

There are good reasons to suspect that the ERP opposition had some advance knowledge of Hoover's letter to Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg. Some of his proposals closely resemble those in the Herter bill, put forward as a rival to ERP by the House leadership. Representative Christian Herter has allowed himself to be drawn into the House Republican chieftains' plan to dilute ERP to the danger point. And there has long been a close relationship between Hoover and Herter.

RALLIES GUERRILLAS

The real point of Hoover's letter, however, is not its orgin. In the House, the opposition to ERP was already bold. In the Senate, the combined prestige of Senator Vandenberg and Secretary of State Marshall had caused the opponents to adopt a kind of half-hearted guerrilla tactics. To be quite blunt about it, Senator Wherry, Senator Malone and the others gathering to fight the bill did not seem quite sure they were doing the respectable thing

Now they have Hoover's prestige to weigh against Marshall's and Vandenberg's. It has thrown over them a cloak of respectability, and given them immeasurably greater boldness and confidence.

The opposition's great point of attack was the amount to be authorized for expenditure on the rebuilding of Europe. It was here that the main danger lay, and now lies.

At least a week before the Hoover letter, there was no secret about the opposition strategy for reducing the $6.8 billion authorization for the first fifteen months of ERP. They hoped to cut the authorization to a maximum of $5 billion in the Senate. They hoped to reduce this amount to somewhat around $4 billion dollars in the House. They expected the House-Senate conference to set a final, compromise authorization around $4.5 billions. And then, further cutting was to occur in the appropriations committees. Representative John Taber's House group was to allow $3.5 billions. Senator Styles Bridges' Senate committee was to provide $4.5 billions. And the Senate House conference was again to compromise on $4 billions.

HOPE DYING

It is significant that $4 billion was precisely the sum named by Hoover as adequate and safe for the ERP authorization. Yet even before the Hoover letter, the Administration's own Congressional checkers had begun to admit sadly the possibility that the opposition would drive its program through. Hoover has simply greatly increased a threat that was already quite black and ominous enough. Furthermore, he has added the threat of all kind of restrictive amendments, several of which he advocated.

Altogether, it is time to admit that the position in Congress is very bad indeed. It may be inquired, of course, why such reductions in the amount of ERP, and limitations on its planning, will be so exceedingly grave. After all, most bills sent up to Congress receive a good deal of mauling, and the resulting compromise between legislative and executive branches generally results in some sort of workable statute.

In the present case, however, these rules do not apply. In the first place, the State Department, being terrified of Congress, began by offering the lowest possible estimate of the money needed for the job of shoring up the European ruins. Any much lower amount will produce a mere unfruitful relief program.

EUROPE WATCHES

Secondly, there is another and far worse factor in the situation which the average Senator or Representative finds immensely difficult to understand or even imagine. The members of Congress are working up to the vote on ERP with their eyes on the folks back home. But as a practical matter, a vote to reduce and cripple ERP will have approximately ten times as great a political effect on Paris, France, and Rome, Italy, as in Paris, Kentucky, and Rome, New York. Here in the United States ERP is one issue among many. Abroad, ERP is the final test of the dependability of the United States, as a leader and support in the great world contest with the Soviet Union. If we seem to be a broken reed, that contest will surely be lost on the political battleground of Western Europe. And we shall seem a broken reed indeed, if ERP is mangled as planned.

Marquis Childs

A Career Man Quits

WASHINGTON

HERE is a piece of family arithmetic. It is the real case of Mr. A., who came to Washington to a fairly important Government job, with some responsibility for shaping policy, at $10,000 a year.

After taking a pretty severe kicking-around from Congress, from eager beavers in his own department and from a part of the press Mr. A got out. In the relaxed mood that followed, enjoying his first real vacation in a long time, Mr. A tried to figure out what his venture into the Government had cost him.

Roughly it came to $90,000 a year, figured out as follows. No. 1—An outright cut in salary from $60,000 to $10,000. No. 2—The cost of maintaining a home in Washington in addition to the established family residence where the children were in school—$20,000. The balance of the loss was made up by the fact that, as a Government official with no active connection with his several businesses, he could no longer deduct certain expenses, directly and indirectly related to business operation, from his income for tax purposes.

TOO MANY AXES

Now, obviously, Mr. A is a wealthy man—self made, it happens. This is not to enlist sympathy for Mr. A, nor was he seeking sympathy. In fact, he probably would have stayed on in the Government if so many axes had not been whetted for him.

But this case does illustrate, it seems to me, the penalty that a Washington job exacts.

The President has been criticized for putting military men in civilian positions. The latest case in the headlines is that of Air Forces Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, who has now been turned down a second time by a Senate Committee for the post of Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Criticism of that appointment appeared in this column.

Yet this should be seen from the President's side of the desk. Here is the history of how Kuter was nominated.

For several reasons it was decided not to reappoint Chairman James M. Landis. After this decision was reached, a list of names of possible candidates was prepared.

This list was carefully studied. Most of the names were crossed off for one or the other of two reasons. The men who would have qualified as disinterested administrators had no background in aviation. It would have taken them three to six months to learn the job at a time when action was urgent. On the other hand, those with an aviation background had connections that seemed to disqualify them.

After much combing over, several men seemed to have the proper qualifications and no serious disqualifications. Four of these qualifiers—all civilians—were sounded out. They all declined to consider the job. They gave salary as one reason. They gave abuse by Congress and the aviation industry as another reason.

When the act creating the Civil Aeronautics Board was passed in 1938, the salary of board members was fixed at $12,000. But Congress has persistently refused to make more than $10,000 a year available, thus cutting what was already a small enough salary for a man with the capacities that such a position implies. In the aviation industry he would get not less than $25,000 a year.

WHAT TO DO?

In the face of four rejections by civilians, the President felt he had no alternative but to turn to a capable soldier-flier who would accept orders. Because he felt he could not ask Kuter to sacrifice his military status, with flying pay, etc., the President asked Congress to pass a special law exempting him.

Drew Pearson's • Merry-Go-Round •

Trend In Steel Hits Little Business

WASHINGTON

SMALL manufacturers, at their wits' end for lack of steel and blaming their woes on the market, should take a look at the new board of directors of General Motors. It might help them to understand where all the steel is going.

What happened was that General Motors recently elected Richard Mellon, of the famous Mellon family, to its board of directors. There was an interesting reason for this. General Motors manufactured the staggering total of 1,925,858 passenger cars and trucks last year—nearly half of all the automobiles produced in the entire USA.

Obviously, General Motors had plenty of steel or it could not have hit this record production. But apparently it wants more. For Richard Mellon and family are the biggest stockholders in Bethlehem Steel. Also, the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co. runs the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

Thus, General Motors should have even more steel at its disposal for 1948. Thus, also, independent auto manufactures such as Kaiser-Frazer will have a tougher time. Also, there will be less steel for all sorts of other manufacturers, from filing cabinets to bicycles.

The General Motors-Mellon family move is typical of what is going on all over the country. Various big companies are either buying an interest in steel plants or maneuvering to put steel magnates on their boards of directors.

All of which is why allocation of steel becomes more and more important—if little business is not to be choked to death.

Incidentally, Richard Mellon happens to be a close friend of Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman, the man who has been tearfully pleading with the steel companies to adopt voluntary steel allocations, but so far has refrained from getting tough.

NOTE—Dick Mellon is also a director of Gulf Oil, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Union Switch & Signal, Aluminum Corporation of America, Melbank Corp., Mellon Indemnity Corp., Pullman, Inc., Union Fire Insurance, Carborundum Co., Westinghouse Air Brake, and Koppers Co.

First Atom Patent

ONLY a few people know it, but a basic patent for atomic energy was officially registered by six Italians with the U. S. Patent Office as early as Oct. 3, 1935. As a result, the Atomic Energy Commission is debating how much Uncle Sam owes in royalties to these six patent owners for use of their basic patent.

The story goes back to 1940 in Rome where G. M. Giannini (no connection with the California bankers), Enrico Fermi, Edoardo Amaldi, Bruno Pontecorvo, Franco Rasetti, and Emilio Segre were schoolmates.

Together they evolved a nuclear reaction process which they called "process for the production of radioactive substance," and for which they filed a patent in Italy on Oct. 26, 1934.

About this time they decided to leave the realm of Mussolini, and all except Amaldi succeeded in reaching the United States where they again applied for a patent on Oct. 3, 1935. It was finally granted July 2, 1940.

As early as 1937, Giannini tried to form a company to produce isotopes, but couldn't find a backer. Later, Fermi joined the U. S. Army's Manhattan Group which produced the atomic bomb, and eventually it turned out that their patent, which no one would back in 1937, formed the basis for the bomb which astounded the world at Hiroshima.

At that time the Army approached the Italians and offered to buy their patent. But before negotiations were completed, Congress passed the McMahon act, turning all authority over to the Atomic Energy Commission and expropriating all atomic patents. The Commission plans to compensate the owners for the patents seized.

Today, Giannini is at Pasadena, Calif., working on high-speed rockets and guided missiles for the Government. Rasetti is a professor at Johns Hopkins. Segre is a professor at the University of California, while Fermi is professor of physics at the University of Chicago.

Inside Story On Panama

THE inside story why Panama tore up Uncle Sam's lease on strategic bases will be told soon by Rep. Mike Mansfield in a one-man report to Congress. Just back from investigating the incident, the Montana Democrat has already reported behind closed doors to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and is now summing up his findings for the public record.

Mansfield blames the incident upon a wave of pre-election hysteria and predicts that Panama will reverse its action after the political fever cools down. The vote to evict the United States was taken at the height of a wild demonstration which actually surged into the National Assembly chamber. Few of the demonstrators understood what they were clamoring about, except that it was a question of their rights against the Yankee outsiders.

At the bottom of the plot Mansfield put his finger on three University of Panama professors who had fanned the sparks of anti-American feeling into red-hot anger among a few college students who, in turn, stirred up the demonstration. In hot-blooded Panama, such a spirit is contagious and swept through the populace like a prairie fire. The resulting public clamor easily swayed the 51 Assembly delegates, all up for re-election next May.

Panama's Communist Party, which claims a scant 1,000 members, took up the battle-cry from the students, but never played more than a secondary role in the demonstration, Mansfield reports. The original proposal to abrogate the U. S. lease was introduced by former Foreign Minister Ricardo Alfaro on the legalistic grounds that the treaty expired one year after the Japanese surrender.