THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

60th Anniversary Year

THOMAS L. ROBINSON ..... Publisher
J. R. DOWD ..... General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH ..... Executive Editor

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1949

A MATTER OF PRINCIPLE

Flinch not, neither give up nor despair, if the achievement of every act in accordance with right principle is not always continuous with thee.

—Marcus Aurelius.

• • •

THE threatened loss of a $7,000,000 Veterans Administration hospital is a bitter pill for Charlotte. Our hopes had been built high. The potential addition to the community's total wealth—goods and services—was incalculable. Charlotte's claim, based on its accessibility to servicemen and their dependents, its fine corps of medical specialists and technicians, and its traditionally slender diet of Federal handouts, was good, perhaps better than that of some communities where VA hospitals have already been started.

The disappointment of local leaders who labored so diligently to sell Charlotte as a logical site, and of North Carolina's representatives in the Congress who brought their influence to bear, is understandable. We share it.

The Chamber of Commerce is entirely within its rights in trying to find out all the facts behind the VA decision, and it would be wise to look out for (1) discrimination in cancellations: that is, are we entitled to one of the hospitals that are still to be built? and (2) the possibility that the mood of economy will pass and that these cancelled hospitals will be ordered built after all.

And, since the VA apparently plans to go ahead with a $20,000,000 neuropsychiatric hospital on a yet unselected N. C. site, Charlotte would be completely justified in scrapping vigorously to have it placed here.

But if the decision is not a political one, it it is truly part of a sincere move to cut down unnecessary Federal expenses and achieve greater efficiency in the mass of Federal health services, then there is nothing for the city to do but swallow the pill.

There is but one question: Is it needed?

The Veterans Administration, which presumably knows more about the needs of servicemen than any other department of the Government including the Congress, says it is not needed. The VA estimates the maximum possible load of service-connected patients at 51,000, and points out that more than 100,000 beds will be available under the reduced program. By cancelling 24 hospitals and scaling down fourteen others, the country can save $280,000,000, Administrator Gray estimates.

There is other authority. The Hoover Commission's recent report on waste and inefficiency in the Federal health program was particularly critical of over-expansion in the VA.

The Commission said the VA program conflicted with the Government's policy under the Hill-Burton Act of aiding non-Federal hospitals "for the purpose of establishing a sound hospital system for the country as a whole." Moreover, patients stay in Government hospitals "two or three times as long" as they do in voluntary hospitals and VA construction costs range from $20,000 to $51,000 a bed as compared with $16,000 per bed in private hospitals, it said.

The Commission pointed out that although a great shortage of medical personnel exists, the Veterans Administration is going ahead with hospital construction "far outstripping the available manpower."

Finally, the Hoover report pointed out that the whole question of medical care for servicemen and ex-servicemen and their dependents is hopelessly confused, having exploded in all directions with no co-ordination on the basis of an appropriation act passed more than 60 years ago authorizing medical officers to care for dependents "whenever practicable."

This is imposing evidence which must not be forgotten in the tirade of protest which is sure to come from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and from affronted Congressmen and Senators.

There is no way to reduce Federal expenditures except to reduce them. Someone is going to holler every time an appropriation is cut. Yet nothing would be more foolhardy than to plump seven million dollars of U. S. money into a hospital that isn't needed.

The News has consistently held out for economy in government and the elimination of overlapping and inefficiency, and does so in this case, even though it hurts. Let it not be said of Charlotte as Thomas Hardy said in *The Hand of Ethelberta*, that "like the British constitution, she owes her success in practice to her inconsistencies in principle."

STRETCHING THE PAROLE SYSTEM

THE North Carolina parole system is based on the modern sociological theory that justice triumphs when a man is reasonably punished for a crime and then given an opportunity, under careful supervision, to make himself over into a law-abiding, productive member of society. It is an enlightened approach, and undoubtedly salvages a large number of citizens who otherwise would serve their full penance at public expense and then return to society with no guidance and no help in rebuilding their reputation and earning power.

But, like any good system, it can be abused, and there is evidence that it is being abused today in North Carolina.

Superior Judge Frank M. Armstrong thinks it is. This week he demanded an investigation of the parole system, charging that hardened criminals are being freed in wholesale lots after serving a fraction of their sentence. A judge frequently has to give a defendant a longer term than he ordinarily would simply to be sure the man will serve a reasonable sentence, he said.

Several cases picked at random from recent parole actions by Governor Gregg Cherry would indicate that Judge Armstrong has some grounds for complaint.

Paroles announced December 29:

Roy Hayes, sentenced in Massachusetts in June, 1944, to 15-20 years for manslaughter; served three and a half years.

Johnny Smith and Mitchell Smith, sentenced in Burke in December, 1946, to 7-10 years for felonious assault; served two years.

Robert Wesley Lowder, sentenced in Stanly in April, 1947, to 6-8 years for forgery; served one year, eight months.

Lemuel Pritchard, sentenced in Pasquotank in November, 1946, to seven years for forgery; served two years, one month.

Paroles announced Jan. 5:

Earl Sasser, sentenced in Wayne in August, 1937, to life for accessory before and after the fact of first degree murder; served eleven and a half years.

E. L. Bell, sentenced in New Hanover in August, 1948, to five years for incest; served four months.

Berlin Blue, sentenced in Robeson in June, 1941, to 30 years for second degree murder; served seven and a half years.

Paroles announced Jan. 6:

Gaither Ledbetter sentenced in Cleveland in January, 1946, to 15-20 years for manslaughter; served one year, eleven months.

John Peterson, sentenced in Beaufort in September, 1945, to 12-18 years for manslaughter; served two years, three months.

William W. Jones, sentenced in Durham in June, 1946, to ten years for robbery with a deadly weapon; served one and a half years.

It is undoubtedly true that Governors are somewhat more lenient toward the end of their terms, but it would seem that the difference between the terms meted out and the time actually served is too great in many of the cases.

If the Superior Court judges, who generally favor the parole principle, are getting disturbed over the way it is being carried out in North Carolina, the Legislature could well afford to look into the matter.

FROM DEFENSE TO OFFENSE

IT BECAME obvious during the protracted battle in the 80th Congress that the days of the discriminatory tax against colored oleomargarine were numbered. A movement in the House to force from the committee a bill abolishing the tax succeeded, and the measure passed, only to die in the Senate. Backed by the Administration, such a proposal will surely pass the 81st Congress.

The trade publication, *American Milk Review*, admits as much in a remarkably frank editorial which is of interest primarily because it shows the fundamental fallacy of trying to push ahead by holding back. If the dairy industry goes along with the publication's philosophy, it will mark a sharp reversal in its thinking.

The battle over oleo, says *The Milk Review*, has done the dairy industry more harm than good by diverting its energies to protecting butter's favored position instead of promoting its good qualities. There are two significant points in the American epic of selling:

1. Most of the markets were created and somebody did the selling.

2. Competition is the unyielding taskmaster that makes people go out and sell.

"One of the surest techniques of taking a licking is to underestimate the caliber of the opposition," the editorial said, adding that the industry should recognize (1) the improvement in the quality and merchandising of oleo, (2) its cheaper price, and (3) the wasting of the industry's energies by "trying to restrict competition by legislative means, when the real avenue of attack was and still is to beat the living daylights out of the competition by superior merchandising.

"We can fight oleo to the last ditch. We can fight in the courts and in the legislatures. And we may possibly win a continuation of restrictions. But it will be an endless battle and it will call for the expenditure of large sums of money for public relations purposes. Or we can retire from that phase of the conflict, making tremendous capital out of the reasons for doing so, and join the battle anew where it must eventually be joined—namely in the market place.

"We do not believe that the first course, even though successful, will regain the market that has been lost. We do believe that butter is a product superior in every way to oleo. We believe that butter can lick the vegetable fight out of oleo in any kind of competition, fair or unfair, if given the change.

"We think that the time has come to stop arguing with the umpire over the ringers on the other team. We think that the time has come to bust a couple of long ones right out of the park."

The American Milk Review is quite right, and the philosophy it expresses is very basic in the American system of free competition. The wonder is that it has taken so long for the dairy industry to admit as much.

'You Just Missed Him'

People's Platform

A Defense Of Dr. Holt

MONROE

Editors, THE NEWS:

IT IS one thing for a contributor to open forums in our newspapers to oppose writings of individuals of differing opinions and it is quite another thing to slander and abuse a man's character in objecting to his point of view. In the Jan. 7 People's Platform of The News one of America's most outstanding educators, Dr. Hamilton Holt, president of Rollins College, was scurrilously and libelously attacked by one A. W. Black.

We have no brief to hold with Mr. Black in his attack on the theory of World Federation, as that is his own privilege which all of us enjoy. The writer is not a member of the United World Federalists or of any similar group, but there are thousands of our leading Americans who are and they, like Wendell Willkie, are perfectly sincere and honest in their hope for one world where peace will reign and where the Brotherhood of Man will not be a dream, but an actuality.

They differ from Jesus in this plan in only one aspect—they think we should, through due process of law in the best traditions of our democratic way of life, bring the world into a oneness of purpose. That is exactly what Jesus taught and believed.

However, when one attempts to villify and call Communists those who believe in this theory of one world, it evinces a complete lack of knowledge of the movement. Too, if Mr. Black will take the trouble to refer to Who's Who or any other standard biographical text, he will quickly see that he attacked the character of one of our most beloved and respected American citizens when he wrote his article against Dr. Holt. It is such unwarranted and unjustified attacks that remind us of the tactics of that movement in another nation which would destroy all that is good and great in democracy.

All too often, otherwise well meaning persons are playing into the hands of those who want one world only on their own terms, namely an undemocratic world—an authoritarian Federation of Communistic States.

—J. RAY SHUTE.

Indonesian Squabble

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

ON Dec. 27 a story came from the United Nations Security Council which again screams to the world of the impotency and utter helplessness of that organization in settling disputes and maintaining the peace of the world.

The story recounted the ridiculous situation in which the Council rejected a proposal because the Soviet and the Ukraine abstained from voting when the United States proposed it, rejected it for a second time because the U. S. and Britain abstained when the Ukraine proposed it.

This proposal concerned the withdrawal of troops in Indonesia to positions held before the Dutch renewed military operations against the Indonesian Republic on Dec. 18. On Dec. 24 the U. S. and two other nations introduced a resolution calling on both sides to withdraw to previous positions. It was not passed because it received only five favorable votes, two short of the required majority of seven.

Three days later the proposal came up again when the Ukraine introduced it. The U. S. and Britain abstained this time, Russia voted for it.

It appears that, at first, Britain and the U. S. favored the proposal because they felt that it was right and just to check this violation of the treaty but during the next three days, on considering the situation from the angle of national defense, they realized that, with increasing loss of China to Western influence, they needed strong Dutch influence in the East. Furthermore, they must rely on the Dutch in Europe when negotiating with Russia. So they reversed their original stand for national defense reasons.

The original Soviet refusal to support the withdrawal of Dutch troops has been explained by observers: that the USSR thought it would gain propaganda advantage out of the failure of the U. N. to act. This was changed when the Soviet saw the advantage of embarrassing the U. S. and Britain when they changed their positions.

Result: The U. N. Security Council refused even to make recommendations on the situation.

This story makes one thing quite clear; that the Indonesian situation is being handled with no regard to the welfare of either of the two major parties concerned. Indonesia has just become one more battlefield of the cold war.

If Indonesia, Palestine or Berlin or any of the troubled spots are to be brought back to peace, the U. S. and Russia must resolve their differences through the creation of a world federal government which will guarantee to each security from its fears of the other. Within the framework of a world government the mad scramble for military allies would no longer be necessary. The U. S. could condemn Dutch aggression without fearing that such a move could undermine its defense against Russian aggression. World federation could come about through the strengthening of the United Nations by giving it power to enact and enforce world laws to prevent war.

—FRANCES B. FARMER.

Quote, Unquote

When a successful office-holder grows old, when his legs begin to shake so that he cannot run and his head paralyzed by the weakness of his legs, he retires from politics in what he thinks is the last term to which he can be elected and becomes a statesman. —**Charleston (S. C.) News & Courier.**

The Smithsonian Institution ought to be looking around for an American who thinks he ought to work for his own living and does not believe anyone should give him anything but a chance. —**Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial-Appeal.**

Marquis Childs

Deliberate Move

WASHINGTON

THE staff planning leading up to the appointment of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State and James E. Webb to be Under-Secretary gives some justification to talk of a "new Truman Administration." It is not merely that new faces have been added.

The whole approach to the State Department and the issues of foreign policy, brought to the fore by Secretary of State Marshall's enforced resignation, was carefully thought out and the choices deliberately made. The goal, particularly as reflected in the selection of Webb, is to re-shape the State Department as an instrument of foreign policy.

Webb will step into the department without any prior prejudices or convictions and the President intends to back him to the limit in the changes he considers essential. As it was phrased when the White House was planning the appointment, Webb has no "entangling alliances" within the department which might hamper him.

With respect to Acheson, there will certainly be an opposition, and a noisy one, if only from such personal antagonists as Sen. Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska, who frequently in the past made Acheson a whipping boy. The opposition is not, however, likely to cause the Administration any serious embarrassment.

This phase of the appointment, too, was thoroughly considered in advance. The White House staff discussed with Acheson his relationship with Alger Hiss and Donald Hiss, brother of the former State Department assistant charged with perjury in connection with confidential documents removed from department files.

Donald Hiss is a partner in the large law firm of which Acheson is a partner and which he will leave to become Secretary. The White House was satisfied that not a single scintilla of evidence developed by the House Un-American Activities Committee touched Donald Hiss.

Moreover, whatever the outcome of the case against Alger—it will not come to trial until late in February — the White House was convinced that his role in the State Department had been greatly exaggerated in the reckless publicity growing out of the House inquiry. Part of this recklessness was the effort to smear Donald Hiss in the technique of guilt by association.

FANTASY

There have been efforts to make it seem as though Alger Hiss, who was present as a technical adviser at the Yalta conference with the Russians, actually played a leading role in dividing Roosevelt to make major compromises with Stalin. It is intimated that he sat at the elbow of the ailing Roosevelt and influenced his decisions.

This is malicious fantasy. From one of those present at the conference, and one with no political ax to grind, I have learned that at Yalta Alger Hiss saw Roosevelt perhaps once, or twice, and then only with a number of others in a conference of the U. S. delegation.

Acheson worked with Alger as he worked with other technical assistants in the department. He admired his efficiency and his intellectual capacity.

One thing that pleases the White House is that there were no last-minute leaks. They were carefully guarded against. At 10:15, with his press conference due to assemble in a quarter of an hour, the President telephoned Democratic and Republican leaders on Capitol Hill. Most of the speculation had centered on Chief Justice Fred Vinson.

The President could not reach Sen. Arthur Vandenberg, now ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, because Vandenberg had been called to New York by his wife's illness. From the Republican perspective, the appointment is a controversial one; only less controversial than if the appointee had been Justice William O. Douglas, who was also rumored as a possibility.

But therein lies the chief significance of Acheson's appointment, politically speaking. If Marshall had suffered his illness and operation a year ago, then the President would have had to placate the Republican majority in the Senate with a "non-controversial" nomination.

That is not true today. The action of the Democratic majority in the Senate reducing the number of Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee may, it seems to me, properly be considered a violation of the bipartisan approach to foreign policy. It can hardly be argued, however, that bipartisanship should apply in the naming of a Secretary of State who will be a member of the President's intimate official family.

James Marlow

Will Taxes Rise?

WASHINGTON

WILL my tax be raised this year and, if so, why?

This question probably hits closer home with most people than anything else in President Truman's budget message.

This much is certain: There will be no boost in the tax you have to pay on your 1948 income. The deadline for paying that is March 15.

Mr. Truman is talking about increasing the taxes that apply to 1949 only. And he wants Congress to do that by July 1. Will it be done?

At this moment no one has the answer. Congress will do a lot of figure-juggling and arguing before any decision is reached.

But Mr. Truman is talking about two kinds of taxes:

1. He wants a straight-out tax increase of $4 billion. This he wants mostly from the profits of corporations and—maybe — from the income of individuals in the upper and middle income brackets.

2. He wants the Social Security tax raised and wants Congress to create a health insurance plan, which would call for a brand new tax.

The Social Security tax now is paid by employers and employees; and the health insurance tax would come out of your pay check, too.

How much would all this come to as a tax increase on business and the public? About $6 billion altogether the first year—$4 billion under No. 1 above and about $2 billion under No. 2.

Roughly, and in round figures, this is how Mr. Truman explains this call for new and higher taxes:

TAX BOOST

Take the $4 billion tax raise first—

To stay out of the red, the Government must collect in taxes as much money as it pays out in expenses.

But in the fiscal year beginning July 1—so Mr. Truman says—the Government should spend $42 billion, or $1 billion more than it expects to collect in taxes.

Avoiding that debt is one of his reasons for wanting the $4 billion tax increase. But he has another reason:

The Government debt—built up tremendously when the Government had to borrow money to run the war—is running around $252 billion.

Mr. Truman says — and most economists agree — a government should try to pay off its debts, or some of them, in a time of prosperity like the present one.

That's why Mr. Truman is asking for that $4 billion: to keep the country from going further into debt and to help pay off some of the present debt. But what about the Social Security and health insurance tax?

SECURITY

The Government can't use that money for paying its expenses or paying off debt. That money goes into a trust, or set-away, fund.

Right now employers and employees are each paying one per cent of the pay roll money; 1 per cent by the employer on his pay roll, and 1 per cent by the employee on his pay. Mr. Truman wants this raised to 1 1/2 per cent each.

At the same time he wants 35 million people not now covered by Social Security brought within the protection.

The 1/2 per cent increase on those now covered, plus the tax obtained with the new people taken into Social Security, would add about $1,700,000,000 to the tax on pay rolls.

As for a tax for a health insurance program, top officials say this would bring in about $300,000,000 in new taxes the first year and would add another 1/2 of 1 per cent tax on pay rolls.

This health insurance tax money, like the Social Security tax, would go into a special fund.

No one knows whether Congress will meet any of these tax requests by the President.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Taft, Ellender Part Over Housing Bill

WASHINGTON

THERE has been a divorce between two of the big names in public housing—Sen. Bob Taft, Ohio Republican, and Sen. Allen Ellender, Louisiana Democrat.

For several years, their names have been linked on the controversial Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which has never quite sneaked through Congress. Today, however, Ellender is leading a group of Democrats and Taft a group of Republicans in separate, though similar bills.

Here is the inside story of what happened:

The Government housing agency hatched a bill which they rushed over to Ellender's office to be introduced in the very early days of the new session. The Senator from Louisiana promptly phoned Taft and invited him to join as co-sponsor.

Taft wanted to study the bill first, but Ellender insisted upon introducing it that same day.

So Taft asked for an explanation of the bill over the phone.

"Oh, it's the same as the T-E-W bill," Ellender replied, in effect.

"Have you read it?" asked Taft.

"No," admitted the Louisianan.

"Then how do you know it's a good bill?" demanded Taft.

"They told me it's a good bill," assured Ellender.

The Senator from Ohio then asked how many public housing units the new bill would authorize.

"Wait a minute," retorted Ellender, and he put the question to someone who apparently was sitting in his office.

"A million," he finally answer.

"Over five years?" asked Taft.

"Yes, five years," agreed the Senator from Louisiana. But he was interrupted by a protest from the unknown visitor.

"No, seven years," he corrected himself.

Taft, therefore, refused to put his name to the bill until he had read it, and Ellender stubbornly refused to delay the bill more than a day. That was how the two former partners on public housing happened to part company and go their own separate ways.

One Southern Lady OK's Truman

WHEN President Truman came to the crucial civil-rights issue in his State of the Union address, he had at least one sympathetic Southern listener—eight-year-old Tolise Gathings who sat on the lap of her daddy, Rep. E. C. Gathings of Arkansas, while the President spoke.

As the white-haired man on the rostrum intoned all those big words, little Tolise listened profoundly and caught enthusiastically in the outbursts of applause. This caused Papa Gathings to beam proudly—until the President started talking about civil rights.

Suddenly the Southern solons froze in their seats, their hands folded in the weakness of his legs, he retires from politics in what he thinks is the last term to which he can be elected and becomes a statesman. —**Charleston (S. C.) News & Courier.**

The Smithsonian Institution ought to be looking around for an American who thinks he ought to work for his own living and does not believe anyone should give him anything but a chance. —**Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial-Appeal.**

Sister Senator Smith

MAINE'S high-flying Sen. Owen Brewster is taking the bows for getting his sister Senator, Margaret Chase Smith, appointed to the all-powerful Republican Policy Committee. What happened was that the day before the announcement, Brewster ostentatiously made public a letter he had written urging Mrs. Smith's appointment.

The truth is, Mrs. Smith had already been selected well before Brewster entered the picture. And she was selected, not to please Brewster, but to appease the Republican liberals. Brewster's buddy, Senator Taft, gave him an advance tip that the appointment was to be made, so the resourceful Senator from Maine hastily dictated the letter—so he could take all the credit.

Under The Dome

SEN. ARTHUR VANDENBERG'S son, Art Jr., who has been running his father's office, has presented his dad with two-weeks' notice. Young and able, Art Jr. is dickering for a new job with some New York public relations firms. . . . A total of 662 bills and resolutions was dropped into the House "hopper" the opening day of Congress. New York's Democratic "Manny" Celler led with 35 measures, while GOP Congressman Carl Hinshaw of California introduced 25. . . . It was a great occasion for Colorado's John Carroll and Ohio's Representative-elect Stephen Young when they shook hands at the House Democratic caucus. The last previous meeting of the two Democrats was on Anzio beachhead, in Italy. . . . Phil Kaiser, now in the Labor Department, will become Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of International affairs. . . . A good man. . . . Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing's job isn't raised to cabinet status, he will run for governor of New York.

Merry-Go-Round

LAST week Sen. Estes Kefauver's father came to Washington to watch his son sworn in as a member of the upper chamber. Remarked the elder Kefauver, "They used to refer to Estes as my son. Now I am his daddy. That's what makes our country better—when a son is better than his daddy." . . . Freshman Congressman Harry Davenport, of East Liberty, Pa., who ousted John McDowell from the House, wears a yellow-colored necktie calling for the defeat of the Taft-Hartley law. Congressman Davenport is pledged to wear the tie until the act is repealed. . . . New Secretary of State Acheson is expected to resume daily press conferences, invaluable to any State Department official who wants to keep in close touch with the public. . . . Acheson is popular with diplomatic newsmen. When he left as Undersecretary of State, they chipped in four dollars apiece to throw him a farewell party.

In Capitol Cloakrooms

SEN. KEN WHERRY, GOP leader in the Senate, has just had one of his trade secrets given away. It has now leaked out that the man who has written most of his speeches since 1942 is Albion Beveridge, who ran last place in Maine's Senatorial race against Wherry's fast questions and sharp retorts were worked out for him by Beveridge.

But even more interesting: The man who spilled the beans on Wherry's ghost-writer is his GOP colleague—Senator Vandenberg. The Republican foreign policy chief got peeved when Wherry declined to step down as GOP floor leader when Vandenberg requested it. . . . Only person who knows all the new Congressmen by sight is Edith Ridgely, hostess in the House restaurant. She studied pictures of them in advance, recognized most of them the first day they came in to eat. . . . India Edwards of the women's division of the Democratic Party has submitted a list of fifteen women whom she wants President Truman to name to high posts in Government and the diplomatic service.