



THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

And Evening Chronicle
Published Every Afternoon Except Sunday By
The News Publishing Company, Inc.
W. C. Dowd, Jr., President
Mrs. Dowd Jones, Secretary
Gen. Manager
W. C. Dowd, 1865-1927

The daily edition of The Charlotte News was established 1868. The Evening Chronicle (established 1863) was purchased by and consolidated with The Charlotte News May 8, 1914.
The News desires to be notified promptly of errors in any of its reports that proper correction may be made at once.
MEMBER ASSOCIATED PRESS AND AP FEATURES
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news published herein.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES
By carrier: 20 cents a week, one month, \$7 cents. By mail: One month \$7; three months, \$20.00; six months, \$35.00; one year, \$60.00.

SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1942

The Calendar

Complete With Facts, It Dams John L. Lewis

The most important review of days and events for Americans who are bedeviled by the actions of their Government and John Lewis in the coal strikes.

March 10—With the two-year contract in the Appalachian Field due to expire on March 31, the union asks for \$2 a day more, with a minimum of \$8 a day in the Northern field. The union demands also coverage of supervisory employees (50,000). The Appalachian situation controls the entire industry.

March 11—Operators reject demand, putting it at \$750,000,000 a year.

March 20—Operators reject union proposal to continue talks to April 30, with increases retroactive to April 1, and ask President Roosevelt for intervention.

March 22—Roosevelt orders both sides to continue under the old contract, retroactively, after April 1. He upholds the powers of the War Labor Board over the controversy, and says that coal price increases will be considered, if necessary. The Northern operators agree and, two days later, the union.

March 26—The Truman Committee of the Senate questions John L. Lewis, who declares that the No-Strike pledge of Labor of December, 1941, is "not necessarily binding," inasmuch as WLB has banned all wage increases.

March 29—Southern operators agree to carry on under old contract.

April 2—Truman Committee, in report, denounces Lewis' position on No-Strike pledge, and says that Labor must not repeat "capitalistic evasions."

April 8—Lewis offers to "revisit" demands if operators guarantee a six-day week throughout the year; the operators reject the proposal.

April 13—Dr. Steinhilber, Government mediator, urges operators to accept the Lewis proposal of April 8; they again refuse.

April 22—The negotiations collapse and Secretary of Labor Perkins certifies the dispute to the War Labor Board.

April 23—Roosevelt appoints Ickes sole fuels administrator.

April 24—WLB hearing attended by the operators, boycotted by the union, which says WLB has prejudged their case. The Board orders mining continued. Walkouts begin.

April 26—Walkouts spread and WLB asks Lewis to stop them. It names a three-man panel on the controversy after Lewis refuses to name a member.

April 29—Roosevelt in message to Lewis promises to use all powers of Government to prevent interference with the war effort, condemns strikes now as against Government and like a defeat in the field.

May 1—Government, through Ickes, takes over mines. Roosevelt calls on miners to work for the Government, but strike begins in both soft and hard coal fields.

May 2—A few minutes before Roosevelt's radio speech, Lewis calls Ickes five-day week, saying he will treat with Ickes. On air, Roosevelt promises coal will be mined, blames the union officers, upholds WLB and its powers over the dispute.

May 4—Ickes says negotiations can be only between operators and operators, subject to WLB approval. Ickes' stand is denounced by union as a trick.

May 7—Roosevelt says the miners, now Government employees, have no right to strike.

May 13—Ickes praises Lewis for having called truce.

May 16—Lewis again refuses to attend WLB hearings, now saying Board has been superseded by Ickes.

May 17—Lewis extends truce to May 31.

May 21—WLB panel issues fact-finding report, interpreted as supporting union's partial-to-partial demand, which would give union most of the pay increase asked for.

May 25—Full WLB report issued. It rejects the \$2 increase the labor members demanded; also double wage on Sundays, but suggests other wage demands. It says the annual five-day week demand should be referred to a body of experts and the partial-to-partial demand should await a pending judicial decision. WLB orders collective bargaining resumed, with both sides to report to it by June 9 on remaining issues.

May 26—Negotiations re-open between

June 1—Negotiations again fail and strike again goes into effect. House Military Affairs Committee has added Smith bill to Connally bill. Former was passed by House in December, 1941, after strike broke out in captive coal mines for closed shop. Closed shop, was gained.

Smith bill requires unions strictly and limits strikes. Miss Perkins and other Government spokesmen deplore the Connally-Smith bill. The operators reject a temporary compromise on partial-to-partial demands estimated to cost an additional \$1.50 a day. Many of them believed willing to grant a slightly lower sum. Ickes orders the strike to cease, calling a few powerful operators as much to blame as the union for the impasse.

June 2—WLB certifies the dispute to the President, orders negotiations ended, inasmuch as any agreement reached would be rejected by the Board as made under duress, says the strike involves the supremacy of the Government. Lewis says WLB order violates the Labor Relations Act, avers willingness to continue negotiations, as previously suggested by Ickes. House votes 211 to 163 to take up Connally-Smith bill.

June 3—Anthracite negotiations scheduled to resume. Roosevelt about to take action of some kind.

June 4—Lewis gives in to President's demand, but puts blame upon WLB. How many possible conclusions do these facts allow?

June 5—WLB certifies the dispute to the President, orders negotiations ended, inasmuch as any agreement reached would be rejected by the Board as made under duress, says the strike involves the supremacy of the Government. Lewis says WLB order violates the Labor Relations Act, avers willingness to continue negotiations, as previously suggested by Ickes. House votes 211 to 163 to take up Connally-Smith bill.

June 3—Anthracite negotiations scheduled to resume. Roosevelt about to take action of some kind.

June 4—Lewis gives in to President's demand, but puts blame upon WLB. How many possible conclusions do these facts allow?

June 5—WLB certifies the dispute to the President, orders negotiations ended, inasmuch as any agreement reached would be rejected by the Board as made under duress, says the strike involves the supremacy of the Government. Lewis says WLB order violates the Labor Relations Act, avers willingness to continue negotiations, as previously suggested by Ickes. House votes 211 to 163 to take up Connally-Smith bill.

June 3—Anthracite negotiations scheduled to resume. Roosevelt about to take action of some kind.

June 4—Lewis gives in to President's demand, but puts blame upon WLB. How many possible conclusions do these facts allow?

June 5—WLB certifies the dispute to the President, orders negotiations ended, inasmuch as any agreement reached would be rejected by the Board as made under duress, says the strike involves the supremacy of the Government. Lewis says WLB order violates the Labor Relations Act, avers willingness to continue negotiations, as previously suggested by Ickes. House votes 211 to 163 to take up Connally-Smith bill.

June 3—Anthracite negotiations scheduled to resume. Roosevelt about to take action of some kind.

June 4—Lewis gives in to President's demand, but puts blame upon WLB. How many possible conclusions do these facts allow?

June 5—WLB certifies the dispute to the President, orders negotiations ended, inasmuch as any agreement reached would be rejected by the Board as made under duress, says the strike involves the supremacy of the Government. Lewis says WLB order violates the Labor Relations Act, avers willingness to continue negotiations, as previously suggested by Ickes. House votes 211 to 163 to take up Connally-Smith bill.

June 3—Anthracite negotiations scheduled to resume. Roosevelt about to take action of some kind.

June 4—Lewis gives in to President's demand, but puts blame upon WLB. How many possible conclusions do these facts allow?

June 5—WLB certifies the dispute to the President, orders negotiations ended, inasmuch as any agreement reached would be rejected by the Board as made under duress, says the strike involves the supremacy of the Government. Lewis says WLB order violates the Labor Relations Act, avers willingness to continue negotiations, as previously suggested by Ickes. House votes 211 to 163 to take up Connally-Smith bill.

June 3—Anthracite negotiations scheduled to resume. Roosevelt about to take action of some kind.

June 4—Lewis gives in to President's demand, but puts blame upon WLB. How many possible conclusions do these facts allow?

June 5—WLB certifies the dispute to the President, orders negotiations ended, inasmuch as any agreement reached would be rejected by the Board as made under duress, says the strike involves the supremacy of the Government. Lewis says WLB order violates the Labor Relations Act, avers willingness to continue negotiations, as previously suggested by Ickes. House votes 211 to 163 to take up Connally-Smith bill.

June 3—Anthracite negotiations scheduled to resume. Roosevelt about to take action of some kind.

June 4—Lewis gives in to President's demand, but puts blame upon WLB. How many possible conclusions do these facts allow?

June 5—WLB certifies the dispute to the President, orders negotiations ended, inasmuch as any agreement reached would be rejected by the Board as made under duress, says the strike involves the supremacy of the Government. Lewis says WLB order violates the Labor Relations Act, avers willingness to continue negotiations, as previously suggested by Ickes. House votes 211 to 163 to take up Connally-Smith bill.

June 3—Anthracite negotiations scheduled to resume. Roosevelt about to take action of some kind.

June 4—Lewis gives in to President's demand, but puts blame upon WLB. How many possible conclusions do these facts allow?

This Is The Porcelain Clay Of Humankind.—JOHN DRYDEN.

A New Tune The Nazis Are Crying

By Raymond Clapper

STOCKHOLM
SIGNIFICANT changes are taking place in the Nazis' explanations to the German people. Nazi newspapers come over here from Germany every day and are sold at the Grand Hotel newspaper stand, but there is no large sale to the public. The leading Nazi newspapers are taking a defensive line that corresponds to the defensive military stage into which the Nazi fortunes have declined.

For instance, formerly the Nazis attempted to conceal the extent of Allied bombing damage in Germany. Now the German Government has issued long reports of the damage to various cities. The purpose is to take control of the terror which the unprecedented bombings have created and try to convert it into a grim anger which will sustain the fighting morale of the public. It is exactly what the British and the Allies attempt to do in capitalizing the disaster to the Government when British bombs are dropped on the receiving end of the blitz. Unquestionably such tactics hold up the spirit of the people temporarily, but numerous Britishers have told me that it lasts only for a limited time and that persistent pounding wears down, even the most intense anger as a feeling of helplessness grows night after night.

The Nazis also are promising the German people that Germany will have revenge for what she is suffering now from Allied bombs. Hitler's party organ, the Volkischer Beobachter, tells the people that the Anglo-Saxons will pay for it. Provincial papers tell the Germans that the Jews will pay for the casualties and damage now being suffered in Germany. A curious, cryptic line is attached to some of these reports in the Swedish press. One correspondent in Berlin makes the double-meaning observation that it is "impossible to say what is behind the German threats. This is a backhanded way, I suppose, of suggesting that it is all talk.

Nazi papers are devoting long articles to the Hot Springs Food Conference with the line that instead of pushing to free Europe, America is simply looking for postwar markets for farm surpluses. The Nazis say it is part of American imperialism, and that the actual scheme in Washington is to force Europe into growing fruit and vegetables only, in order to leave a better market for the major American crops. When you are the controlled press full of such stuff, you know they must be having hard going in Germany.

Add War Inconveniences

—By Dorman Smith



Cruiser's Luck Of The Navy

By Peter Edson

HOW a lucky chance enabled a U. S. battle cruiser to escape five submarine torpedoes, while protesting the landing of American troops at Casablanca during the war, was a story that the Philadelphia Yard the other day when the ship was taken up with the commanding officer of the French submarine. That is the great importance. The last member of the great club which believes in freedom was made ready for admission by an upheaval amongst its emotional people.

As the American and British convoy filled into Casablanca in the morning, all of the Vichy French naval vessels supposed to be defending the harbor were under orders to fire on any United Nations ships which should attempt to force an entrance or a landing. The French submarine commander had his best in excellent position to shoot and his hose. He did not have to give away his position by moving. Here came the convoys, straight at him. He fired at the convoys, but the French commander picked out the cruiser as his first victim, waited patiently, then gave orders to fire six torpedoes at the supposedly unsuspecting American ship. Miraculously, every torpedo missed.

After Casablanca, of course, Admiral Darlan turned the French fleet over to the United Nations forces because allies of the United Nations. The commander of the French ship which had fired at the U. S. cruiser became a supporter of the Free French and in time was sent to the United States as part of a naval mission from the headquarters of General Girard, who has succeeded Darlan.

When the French sub commander got in Philadelphia on his tour of inspection, one of the

Platform Of The People Protect The Water

Editors, The News:
When comes the anxious awaiting of our sons, the fact millions of unemployed will create a situation less serious than that of the war itself. There is no evidence of either ability or desire to protect our resources.
History of city growth in America shows that populations are always reaching out for more water. The history of our civilization in considerable measure, is the history of water development and conservation. For example, the Romans built great aqueducts 2000 years ago, some of them still in use, and their cost repaid countless times. The waters of the state should be conserved.
The people of this state should take heed of the value of the water resources.

Side Glances



"I promised I wouldn't tell you we crawled out of the creek soaking wet today when a U-boat hit his destroyer after he sank four subs!"

Whose World? One Or All

By Samuel Grafton

THERE are two possible approaches to post-war planning. You can study the world, and decide what it wants. Or you can study yourself, and decide what you want. The second approach to post-war planning is likely to be narrow, or even petulant. When Governor Bricker of Ohio announced a post-war plan, that we ought to have less central government, I do not think he is telling us what the world wants. I think he is merely telling us what Bricker wants.

When Senator Taft says this is not, and should not be, a war for the four freedoms, I think he, too, has confused himself with the world, a natural error. He may not want a crusade for the four freedoms, but the world certainly wants it.

The business of feeling one's own pulse to seek the future of the world can take a man only so far. It will be noticed that both Bricker and Taft are fundamentally against war aims, in post-war planning. Mr. Taft would like to get rid of sweeping claims, on a world scale. Mr. Bricker is opposed to sweeping aims, on a national scale. They are still sort of in favor of state governments, perhaps because state governments are too small to have big ideas.

And both Bricker and Taft have turned up on Mr. Harrison Spangler's new national Republican advisory committee on post-war planning. With a committee of this sort (and most of it of this sort) the official, national Republican organization is almost committed to a policy of anti-planning. It is the chief post-war plan, I think Republicans must, very soon, face the question of whether this is a heart to find a plan for the post-war world, or a plan to keep the post-war world from doing very much planning.

In this a plan-finding agency, or is it the general staff of those who detest planning? These questions are raised, not by me, but by such newspapers as the Republican New York Tribune, which finds the planning committee to be overloaded with aims, who may contentedly be expected to do nothing at all. In fact this committee, setting up on the business of planning the post-war world, has started life by blizzarding and largely omitting those groups within its own party which favor planning.

The very act of creation of this board is a defeat for planning, for it is a defeat for planners within the Republican party. It is an anti-planning coup, within the organization, brought off as a pretense to carrying the fight against planning to the Allies. And this is a tragedy, for Americans who have a much bigger part to play in the world to come than merely to say no to it.

A tight little group of professional party-managers has embarked on a program of declaring war on the future as its plan for the future. It seeks to impose its own plan for the future on a major party, as that party's platform. It is trying to make Harrison Spangler look like a movement.

Tunisian Loss Nazi Education

By Fletcher Pratt Of Overseas News Agency

ALL military operations are in a certain sense experimental in that our business is constantly searching for better methods to carry out their business.

From the way it looks now some of the Axis operations in Tunisia had even more of the research angle than usual. The Germans are great hands at cutting out the loss by cheerfully kissing goodbye to anything that cannot be held, as an example, they cheerfully used up the Italian troops in the retreat from the Axis. After the Desert Line broke, it must have been quite evident to the High Command that the Axis could not expect much more out of the Tunisian operation, and that fact they had good evidence that all they did expect out of it was a little delay.

Delay and information, especially with regard to a system of tactics which appeared for the first time in the operation between Zaid Pass and Kasserine Pass. At the time of Rommel's breakthrough at Faid it looked as though he were going to push through to Tebourts and try to disjoin the whole Allied offensive. Actually he did nothing of the sort. As soon as the Allied heavy stuff started to come up around Kasserine he pulled out quickly.

In one sense this was no doubt a mistake because he might have gotten more if he had pushed on harder. But there is something that he didn't want more; that the operation was an experiment in an unusual extent, in which was trying out for the benefit of future operations, a technique of sharp, snappy counter-attacks of limited objective and penetration, followed by a quick getaway. Nobody had ever anything like this in the war before and in any war it presents a difficult problem of split-second timing and co-ordination. It is, in fact, a kind of Commando raid carried on a large scale.

Even if this were not the original intention the Germans are bound to have learned something from this operation which, within its limited field and duration, was a considerable success. The suggestion is, of course, that a variation on this method, perhaps on a larger scale, is what they mean to use both against the Russians in the summer and against any Allied landing force on the continent. Military thinkers both in Washington and London have pointed out that no large-scale German offensive stands much chance of success this summer, and at least one military thinker who has made an especially painstaking study of German military methods thinks the Germans are pretty well aware of this.

That is Dr. Herbert Rossmann, and he believes that although the Germans have their own ideas about attacking methods, they are psychologically incapable of passing to the kind of defense that is now their best chance. But it could be that, in view of their own handiwork, they mean to combine a strategic defensive with a tactical offensive of snappy jobs like that Rommel delivered in Tunisia.