EDITORIAL PAGE

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

W. C. DOWD, JR.
PUBLISHER
J. E. DOWD EDITOR
BURKE DAVIS, ASSOCIATE EDITOR

MONDAY, APRIL 2, 1945

The Molehill

Where we leave the new labor-management charter worked out by Eric Johnston, Phil Murray and William Green to work out its own destiny, there is this:

"The fundamental rights of labor to organize and to engage in collective bargaining with management should be recognized and preserved, free from legislative enactments which would interfere with or discourage these objectives."

That sentence is from Article 4 of the charter worked out by the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, the CIO and AFL. And there are some who are questioning the validity of the new labor-management peace on the basis of that sentence. There is, for example, Raymond Moley, the reformed New Dealer, who says that this thing must be made clear before harps and wings are in order. He's full of questions.

He wants to know if that statement means that all three organizations are pledged to sustain present labor legislation—and to seek no changes in it? He wonders if it means that the Wagner Act will stand—an act which Mr. Moley says is "palpably unfair to management." He thinks the Wagner Act is just about half what a fair law should be, and points out that it affords no quasi-court to which management may repair. A court, that is, supported by taxpayers, empowered to compel the obedience of all citizens.

With an eye to the shortcomings of the Wagner Act, and to the upper hand which it gives organized labor, we suspect Mr. Moley is picking at trifles just for the sport of the thing. When the U. S. Chamber of Commerce and the CIO, with the AFL thrown in, can sit down and agree upon everything from a high-wage formula to foreign trade policy, that is indeed a red-letter day in American history. You'd scarcely have thought it possible, back in November when the nation appeared to be split asunder.

We can see nothing in the general language of Article 4 to arouse suspicion, or to divide the contracting parties. And we hope that Mr. Moley and other onlookers will come to accept this attempt at peace-making in the spirit in which it was written. If the Big Three had meant to endorse the freezing of present labor legislation, they'd have said so, we suppose.

D-Day For Peace

Now we're getting down to brass tacks. We've fought for peace, and still fight. We've dreamed it and talked it, and tried to side-step the fatal errors of Versailles. We've plotted a new scheme of Unconditional Surrender, which is still a best-selling novelty in Europe. We've made international powwows on aviation, business, finances. And we've broken a trail to a world order, backed by tremendous force. We've been on the level, open and above board. No secret treaties—and a minimum of expediency in worming our way toward victory. But that, you see, was all just preliminary. It doesn't really matter. The vital steps are still ahead.

Secretary Stettinius let the cat out of the bag. Unfortunately, there *was* a secret agreement at Yalta. To wit: Russia would have three votes in the world order, the British Empire six — and the United States three. There was something of a howl, but the new secretary of State grinned and tossed off pleasantries. One sinister phrase even described the way he "licked his lips and grinned." It was not only that the agreement was secret. There were kicks because the British Empire was to be given twice as many votes as Uncle Sam at the table of peace and post-peace.

West Virginia's Senator Revercomb, Republican, thought it "degrading" that we should be outvoted by those Redcoats. South Carolina's Senator Olin Johnston hoped that people would not "pick out small things" and wreck the San Francisco Conference and the world organization. Reporters kept prodding, wondering if there were more secrets. Positively no, the State Department said, that's all. Just that one little thing ole secret, otherwise our intentions are strictly honorable.

And so the debate ended, but not for long. It will boil before and after San Francisco—and on into the years, if the British get those six votes and we get but three. The Britain-baiters will see to that. And they're going to test the peace in advance, severely.

In Perspective

Fleet Admiral King, old Cominch himself, was asked the other day if the Navy's campaign in the Pacific wasn't ahead of schedule. We never had a schedule, he explained. We just did what we could when we could. But he admitted that the progress of the war against the Japs was exceeding his expectations.

Documenting that sanguine view was the Navy's action last week in cutting its program of construction from 84 warships to 12. Included in the first proposal was a whole new fleet of battleships, cruisers, lesser war craft and their auxiliaries. The total, as first announced, came to 636,800 tons. Revamped in the light of developments, it called for twelve escort carriers of 12,500 tons each, hardly more sizable than Liberty ships.

This, clearly, is worth putting down as good news. But before anyone starts running around shouting the U. S. equivalent of *banzai*, the good news needs to be looked at in perspective.

The building of the Navy's wallowing fortresses is a long-time procedure. Battleships, especially of the 45,000-ton (or?) class, may take up to two years from the laying of keel to shakedown. These, then, were 1947's ships of the line which the Navy was foregoing. It evidently believed that, with U. S. might augmented by the Royal Navy, it had enough to finish the job.

And Admiral King was at pains to point out that only now, three years and four months after Pearl Harbor, have we crept back across the Pacific to the point where we may anticipate coming up with the bulk of Japanese land forces and engaging them. V-J Day is still blood, tears and sweat away.

OPA's Own Panics

If you enjoy small panics and scenes of polite violence, drop into your nearest grocery on the day of an OPA announcement. Particularly if the stalwart anti-inflation agency is making an advance announcement of reduced point values—as it did last week.

You'll see the ladies, all and sundry, lugging out all the goods they can afford, in points and money. Their reaction is perfectly normal, you know, even if they storm in and out wild-eyed, pushing and shoving. They are only householders who have been frightened once more by an OPA policy so strange that it is entirely beyond us, and beyond the grocers, too.

Three or four days in advance, the stories come out from OPA. Points are going up on pork, they'll say. And on fats, oils and shortening, too. Thus warned, nearly every housewife in the country hotfoots it to the grocery with every available ration point, and stocks up while stocking's good.

We think it's a stupid policy, and so do grocers we've talked with. It surely helps to create the very shortages OPA is trying to avoid, and makes hoarders out of housekeepers who'd like to be honest, though no less well-fed than the next one. It rewards hoarding, enforces it, and immediately aggravates the very shortage OPA meant to relieve.

A couple of grocers we talked with reported veritable stampedes in their stores last week. When the first rushes were over there was no more shortening, margarine or cooking oil on hand. One of them, to defend himself, immediately placed a limit on purchases. And both of them were puzzled as to just why OPA chose to create its own buying sprees by giving advance notice. Their recommendation was that every announcement involving changes in point values of rationed goods be made suddenly, at the very moment the change went into effect. Otherwise, they say (and we say) the rationing program will continue in a stew.

In behalf of the early strawberry, just now appearing on the northern market, it is hereby conceded that it is early.

Statesmen At Work

(Serious, facetious and comic excerpts from the Congressional Record).

THE House was debating the Mexican Water Treaty, having waived rules of order:

Mr. RICH (Pa.) When you go home for your vacation in the next couple of weeks and the people of this country look you over and think of the legislation that we passed here today, waiving all points of order, and thinking that the Subcommittee on Appropriations is going to write legislation, what are you going to say to them?

Mr. TARVER (Ga.) I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech. Let me say that by the waiving of these points of order we shall have saved many millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States which would have been spent had the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania been sustained.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I have just got my second wind. I have been working pretty hard all this afternoon trying to save a few dollars in this bill.

Mr. TABER (N. Y.) Is it not a fact that as a result of the adoption of the rule this morning waiving all points of order we have decreased by a hundred million dollars the amount of money that will come out of

Mr. RICH. Absolutely; absolutely. I cannot understand how the members can say the things they do on the floor of the House and get away with it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if the gentleman thinks he is getting away with it?

Mr. RICH. No; I do not; I do not think I am getting away with anything. I have tried it and failed at every point. I have tried to economize, but there is none in the Congress. But when the chairman of the subcommittee states that to go along the way the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have us go means an increase in expenditures, there is not a word of truth in it; absolutely not a word of truth. I defy him to point out one instance in which increased expenses would result from a decrease in the appropriation. . . . The conferees of the House should have backbone and intestinal fortitude when they meet the Senate conferees on these items in the bill. If the House conferees had a little fight in them, they would not have to be afraid of those conferees from the other body. But that is not the case when there is a wishbone where the backbone ought to be. That is the trouble with many of the conferees. . . .

The Merry-Go-Round

By Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON

ARMY AIR FORCES insiders are literally tearing their hair over Army plans which, after the war contemplate a big ground force and a relatively small air corps. It looks as if the mistake of the early part of this war, when both Jap and German planes romped all over the Allies, might be repeated.

It is being kept a top-drawer secret, but Army planners already have mapped out the relative size of the air force after the war. And it is to go back to about the same strength as the air corps in 1936—about 18,000 men.

Simultaneously, ground force Army men are promoting the idea of a huge land army, and are pushing the idea of peace-time conscription. Under-secretary of War Patterson is one of those who favor putting through a conscription bill now, apparently with the idea that the bill would not pass after the war.

Air experts meanwhile point out privately that if we are to prevent war under the United Nations security plan, we will need not a big land army, but a fast, powerful air force which can get to any trouble-spot in a hurry. Also, if this nation should be attacked, the first line of defense, they say, is the air, then the Navy—both of which would give time to mobilize a land army.

Finally the air experts point out that future development of the rocket bomb will be such that land armies may not be important in the initial stages of a war. It will be the nation which has rockets and planes most efficiently mobilized at the start of a war which probably can win. They say the time will not be far off when rocket bombs will be able to cross the ocean, and what the nation needs is not conscription, but experimental laboratories both for air and rockets.

NOTE—In the Army budget of 1940, one year before Pearl Harbor, Gen. Stanley Embick, deputy clerk of staff and a very competent coast artilleryman, dictated an appropriation for only six long-range Army bombers—until other officers and world events forced a revision upwards. This indicates the type of thinking of ground officers. Airmen are now afraid of a repetition of this after the war.

Pat Hurley's Blues

When handsome ex-Secretary of War Ambassador Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley went to China, the State Department made him discard the uniform and two silver stars of a major general and dress as all other American ambassadors—in plain civilian clothes.

This didn't please Hurley at all. But he conformed. However, when he got back to Washington and went in to see the President the other day, friends say that Pat had in mind getting special permission from the President to wear his Army uniform while ambassador in China.

Perhaps the State Department tipped off the White House about Hurley's sartorial ambition, or perhaps it was just accident. Anyway, the President beat him to the gun.

"Well, Pat," FDR said to Hurley who was wearing a blue serge suit, "you certainly look fine in blues."

Hurley murmured something about that the last he thought his Army uniform was more appropriate. But the President replied:

"Oh no, Pat, you look fine in blues."

That ended that. Hurley is going back to China wearing civilian clothes.

Frankfurter Picks 'Em

It looks as if Justice Felix Frankfurter is going to pick the next solicitor general—the man who presents the Government's cases before the Supreme Court.

There has been a long backstage controversy over this important post. Democratic Chairman Bob Hannegan wanted Democratic Vice-Chairman Oscar Ewing to get it, and at first Roosevelt backed him up. However, Attorney General Biddle stuck to his ground that the lawyer for the Aluminum Corporation of America should not be solicitor general of the United States. Roosevelt in the end agreed.

After that, Justice Frankfurter telephoned the President, putting in a plug for Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State. Acheson, one of the best lawyers in Washington, never has been too happy in the State Department, undoubtedly would make an A-1 solicitor general. He is not the man proposed by Biddle, who wants able Hugh Cox, now assistant solicitor general. However, it looks as if Frankfurter will win out.

Bluebirds In The Springtime

Growing Impatience At Home

By Marquis Childs

WASHINGTON

WE will win this war and win it overwhelmingly. The Germans know that today and probably even some of the Japs. But we can throw away the victory in chaos and confusion here at home.

That is the thing that hits me coming back from the disciplined world of war to an America in the rip tide of boom-time prosperity.

The clamor to take off the controls is growing louder. Let her rip, they say. They talk about the right to profit. I saw a lot of men on the other side of the Atlantic who were not making very much profit out of the business they were in.

The killing business pays its dividends in death or, if you're lucky, in the loss of a leg or an eye or an arm.

It is precisely now, it seems to me, that we need a little discipline here at home. We can so easily toss away the greatest heritage, the greatest hope, the world has ever known. You can almost hear the Ultimate Auctioneer saying, "Going, going, gone . . ." and for a nickel's worth of nothing!

When I was in Belgrade, I hired a woman to do some translating and interpreting for me. She had lived for a few years in Chicago, where she became an American citizen by virtue of the naturalization of her parents.

Most of the members of her family were massacred in Herzegovina last year. She has been unable to get any definite word. A young man whom she was to marry was killed by a German machine gun in the battle for the liberation of Belgrade.

"I wonder," she said, "if people in America really appreciate what they have there. Sometimes I've thought that they wouldn't really appreciate it until they lost it."

We do have so much here. Every time I have come back from Europe during the past fifteen years, I've been impressed all over again by that. But it is not enough simply to sit down and congratulate ourselves on our good fortune. That way, it seems fairly certain, we shall lose what we have. You can't build a wall around a lonely island of prosperity and keep that prosperity.

In Europe there is little hope. They are going to have to try to patch up a shattered and broken continent under the careful tutelage of state control. Few choices will be left to the individual in a society that must almost necessarily be regimented if it is to survive.

Even in England, where the framework of democracy has survived in the patient loyalties of an extraordinary people, they are thinking in terms of monopoly fostered and protected by the state. They are talking in terms of huge subsidies to underwrite the export trade essential to life on John Bull's little island.

Here in America, the individual still has some free choices. In spite of all the nonsensical talk about "dictatorship" under the New Deal, in spite of wartime controls, even, the pattern of individual freedom is intact. And I hope to God we keep it so.

Coming Change

By Samuel Grafton

NEW YORK

SOME change is bound to come over our political climate after the war in Europe ends. All our sense of the moment should be stirred by what is now happening. First there will be an elevation of the spirit; then, perhaps, a flattening out, and a letdown. The Isolationist dormouse will stick his nose out, and sniff the new air, and he will ask, perhaps, that our boys should be sent home at once. That cry is standard politics after any war; it will not be neglected, after this one. If the isolationist dormouse meets with a good reaction on that slogan, he will go further, he will demand a new automobile and the end of price control. Then he will count every mouthful of food we send to Europe, and he will be against sending any, because, after all, the war is over.

Something tells me that the Isolationist dormouse will take over the war against Japan, as his war, his particular and special war, and he will demand that we almost physically turn our backs on Europe in order to win it. The dormouse will also have many comments to make about Britain and Russia. It will be safe to be nasty again.

Yet will be a strange, twilight period, between the end of the one war and the end of the other. One seeks for indications as to what its special quality will be, its feel, its smell. One thing to guard against is a general feeling of disappointment, an unexpectedly bitter taste.

We have made "the end of the war" a Cinderella symbol, shorthand for glory. But as the smoke blows away, there will be Europe, ruined; and its politicians bickering, and of gratitude to us, not much sign. Europe, leaning against its ruined walls, will not somehow feel it has much to be grateful for. We shall look at the mess, and there may be a tendency for some to say, "What did we do it all for?" and the remark may again seem profound, though it will be infantile enough.

We shall be healthier if we can force ourselves to understand that we face an unending, more than lifelong task, of making this a somewhat saner world; that sometimes we have to use war as our method, and sometimes other methods, but the task goes on. It has no end. The sensible among us have promised ourselves nothing for after the war, except a chance to fight for progress in a less bloody way; but that is a good thing, too; you don't get that for two cents and a wish.

The coming period will put a strain on our unity; for Hitler will not be at his desk any longer, working so hard to keep us together. It will be polite to have private emotions again; or perhaps we might say semi-private emotions, for the war with Japan will still be on. The earlier question, of who gets into the war first, will be replaced by the later one, of who gets out first; and there will be a kind of tension, a cautious circling about of commercial interests, like wrestling bears; and this will take place in a bleak sort of domestic atmosphere, as our troops move across the country from Europe to the Pacific, hello, good-bye.

SIDE GLANCES

"When I gave orders to the men they respected me as a sergeant, but when I frown and growl at these kids they just laugh!"

Where's The Meat?

(This explanation of the meat shortage was written by F. W. Specht, vice president and general sales manager of Armour & Company, and addressed to salesmen and managers of his plants all over the country. We present it as the view of a great packing house on the problem which has reached into every American home.—Editors, The News)

THERE exists great confusion as to the reasons for the present shortage of meat—so much in fact that Congress has decided to investigate. Because the shortage is a matter of vital concern not alone to consumers, but also to all the elements in the livestock and meat business from the stockmen and the packers right down through the list of wholesalers and retailers, it is important that the situation be understood.

When the U. S. entered the war, it was recognized that more meat would be needed than the 130 to 140 per capita supply customarily produced. Farmers and ranchers were requested to increase production, and there were substantial increases in the supplies of meat in 1943 and in 1944. The latter year set a record growing out of the marketing of almost 100 million hogs, 20 million cattle, 35 million lambs and 14 million calves. After filling the Government's meat requirements for the armed forces and for lend-lease, there remained enough meat to provide a per capita supply of about 145 pounds.

This supply should have taken care of civilian needs, but a new factor completely upset previous estimates. With over 60 million Americans employed, the national income jumped from 92 billion dollars in 1941 to 156 billion dollars for the year 1944. As consumers had previously demonstrated would be the case, their larger incomes coupled with stability of meat prices, inspired a demand for more meat than they consumed in pre-war years and as a result, and even with an increased per capita supply last year, the Government found it necessary to ration meat. Despite a reasonably successful effort to effect equitable distribution of the supply, many millions of consumers were unable to get as much meat as they wanted, and complaints were widespread.

In the past several months the meat situation has undergone a change for the worst in that demand has increased while the supply has decreased. There are several reasons for the decrease. Apparently believing that the European phase of the war would end in 1944, and that there would be neither a demand for meat nor a feed supply warranting continued high production, agencies of the Government took steps last year to bring about a reduction in supplies. Cattlemen were urged to liquidate their herds so as to get their herds nearer to a pre-war basis, and hog growers were urged to reduce their output by at least seventeen per cent for the year 1945 as compared to 1944. Supplementing these urges was the expectation (now realized) of ceiling prices on cattle and revisions of the floor and ceiling prices on hogs which many stock men interpreted as discouragements to production.

It takes longer to affect cattle supplies than it does hog supplies, and while cattle are coming to market in numbers which result in continued high production of beef, hog receipts have dropped tremendously, indicating a reduction of far beyond that urged by the Government. The February production of pork was down 55 per cent as compared with February, 1944. Estimates indicated that the March production of pork will be down about 50 per cent as compared to March, 1944. The six months April to September inclusive, are expected to show a reduction in pork output of 29 per cent, and for the entire year, 1945, the federally inspected production of meat of all varieties is expected to be no less than 15 per cent under the 1944 figure.

In the face of these tremendous reductions in the meat supply, the Government's meat orders have been substantially increased, and packers whose output is federally inspected and consequently acceptable to the Government are required (as of March 22) to set aside for the Government, the following percentages of their available supplies:

BEEF

60 per cent of choice, good and commercial grades of steers and heifers.

70 per cent of utility grade steers, heifers and cows.

80 per cent of cutters and canners.

PORK

(Set aside orders as converted into actual cuts)

55 per cent of the pork loins.

50 per cent of the hams.

60 per cent of square cut and seedless bellies.

50 per cent and upwards of the shoulders.

65 per cent of the fat cuts.

70 per cent of the lard.

LAMBS

40 to 50 per cent of the choice and good lambs.

VEAL

50 per cent of choice, good and commercial grades within Government specified limits.

It is obvious that when these quantities of meats are set aside for the Government, the portion of the total supply available for the civilian population results in a per capita supply smaller than at any time in a great many years — possibly smaller than at any time in the nation's history. Furthermore, the meat which is available for civilian consumption is what is left after the Government has had its pick. Naturally and justifiably the Government is taking the best parts of the meat supply for the men and women in the armed forces. No good American will complain about this, but the net effect is that the meat available to civilians consists in large degree of the less desired parts of the carcass: hearts, livers, kidneys, tails, ears and snouts — all perfectly edible, perfectly wholesome foods, but not the kinds of meats Americans are accustomed to buying.

Aggravating the situation brought on by the current shortage of livestock receipts is the fact that storage stocks of meats of all varieties are at the lowest point in many years and whereas in normal times they would be at their peak at this time of the year, they are actually decreasing rapidly. Storage stocks do not hold any hope of an increased meat supply in the immediate future.

We are prepared to handle millions of meat animals beyond the number we are able to buy; we have the equipment to process and distribute great quantities in excess of what is available, but we can't process and distribute something we do not have and cannot get.

Our company is not in any degree responsible for the meat shortage nor for a situation which threatens the existence of many of the agents of distribution to whom we would willingly be of service if we had sufficient product.

Quote, Unquote

The free enterprise system is too often misunderstood by labor as only something a company's president or general manager wants.

—Joseph W. Fraser, chairman Graham-Paige Motors Corp.

Citizenship must include a sense of our responsibility to community, nation and planet. It begins, like charity, at home, but it would better not stop there.

—Dr. Everett Case, president Colgate U.

We could pretend to withdraw from the world, as we did to some extent after World War I. But we would probably have to come out of our hermit's cave again anyhow, along about 1970, and fight another war. And next time we would be the first to be attacked.

Assistant Secretary of State James C. Dunn.