

W. C. DOWD JR.
PUBLISHER
J. F. DOWD, Editor
BURKE DAVIS, Associate Editor

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1945

You And Billions

We'll gamble that \$3 billion dollars doesn't mean a thing to you, and that you didn't turn a hair when President Roosevelt was delivering that figure in his budget message. But perhaps we can help you work up a long face, and in our role as public servants, were more than willing.

The President was talking primarily about national finances of 1946, for the fiscal year beginning six months from now and ending eighteen months away. So, in reality, he was almost guessing—for estimates are generally quite some thing else than actual expenses. The year 1945 (and we're already half through it, as Federal books go) is much more to the point. In this fiscal year we will have spent \$9 billion.

That means \$717 for every man, woman, child and child—or about \$2.75 per family. Are you ready to pay? And every dollar of that out-sized lump of cash is split like this:

War Department, 49 cents; Navy, 28.2 cents; Maritime Commission, 4.1 cents; Agricultural Lend-Lease, 1.4 cents; Executive war agencies, 2.6 cents; Miscellaneous war purposes, 3.5 cents. That's 38.8 cents of our dollar, and the rest goes to non-war use, for debt retirement, refunds, veteran's aid, civil departments (they're getting only 1.1 cents), and social security.

And this is how we get that dollar:

Borrowing (the deficit), 53.7 cents; personal income tax, 15.6 cents; corporation excess profits, 11.8 cents; corporation income tax, 5.0 cents; liquor, 2.1 cents; cigarettes, 0.9 cents. The other eight cents is taken from assorted excise taxes, contract regulations, social security taxes and the like.

That's about it, as far as your dollar is concerned. Direct and indirect taxes collected in fiscal '45 will run to \$331 per person, about \$1,258 per family.

In this year alone we are spending about 20 times what the U. S. spent in the Civil War, four and a half times what we spent in the whole World War. And by June 30 every American will be in debt to the tune of \$1,820, every family will owe \$6,915. Costs like blazes, doesn't it?

Cash And Carry

Just a glance through the report of the Advisory Budget Commission will tell you volumes about North Carolina. You have only to note the cautious words outlining general fiscal policy to see that this is a commonwealth concerned to live within its means—for the balanced budget is still a State passion. On the other hand, you have only to run out the digits of the total appropriations recommended (almost \$220,000,000) to see that North Carolina is also of a progressive mind, and has no idea of sloughing off her responsibilities.

The report, if its figures were laid cheek to jaw, should reach from Mantoo to Murphy and back again, but you don't need a digest of the whole volume (it's an inch and a quarter thick, at it came from the printers). You need only to hark back to the parous times of 1933, when the Legislature made an heroic effort to pull us out of the red, yet steadfastly refused to wreck our school system by a drastic slash in taxes. You need only to look at this new budget and muse that recommended expenditures for the coming biennium, for the General Fund alone, are more than three times what they were ten years ago.

That means that North Carolina wants to spend it when it has it—up to the very limits of its ability to spend. And it also means that it won't hear to spending it when it doesn't have it. The heels are not alone in looking up on this kind of government. Here is an available index shows that they are alone in the South, where our sister States trail us in virtually every public service. And you don't see any signs of the negative side of this attitude in Washington, do you?

We can't pick out all the significant facts of the Budget as it stands today. That will remain for piece-work reporting while the legislative mill grinds. But there are a few that can't be missed.

Our anticipated revenue is going down. We expect only \$129,000,000 income for 1945-47. But we'll make up the difference with the surplus now on hand, chiefly through debt retirement.

Schools have been the heart. They'll get 76 per cent of the General

Fund appropriations—a little item amounting to over \$97,000,000 in all. Mental hospitals and their Board of Control were to receive over \$10 million—a substantial increase, even over the doubled appropriation of the last biennium.

The list goes on and on, of course, throwing in the figures as they come down the line. And all this is based on the supposition that the people of the state want their services improved, provided there is enough money in the Treasury. This was the sentiment of the Budget Commission that the \$70,000,000 surplus should be put to work, along with current revenues. Otherwise, these gentlemen believe, there would be no need in continuing to collect relatively high taxes just to pile up the checks. We believe the people share that sentiment, and that they will look upon this budget with as much pride as if they'd written it themselves. And they did write it, come to think of it. They've been working toward it since we went into business as a state, and they'll be working toward bigger and better ones in the future.

The Battle Ahead

The triumphant return of American troops to Luzon, the thrilling evidence of the array of military and naval might we have assembled for the final phase of the battle for the Philippines. The great convoy which threaded through dangerous waters to disgorge its burdens of men and weapons on Lingayen Gulf suggests the enormity of the operation. And the deadly planes which raked Japanese holdings for thousands of miles on every side, giving protection to the new invasion, bespeak confidence and power.

The news recalled those dark and uncertain days when America was hearing the dread reports, "Japanese ships still Lingayen Gulf. In the last 24 hours 80,000 enemy troops have been landed." For near the same spot on which the Japs landed, three years ago, a vast number of our Sixth Army troops have landed, and, surprisingly, met little resistance on the beaches.

Though the great fleet was given incredibly effective protection by naval guns and carrier planes, though losses were light in the first hours of invasion, and though there is open country between our troops and Manila, we cannot assume that the coming battles will be easy. Progress thus far is no measure of what is to come. We have learned by painful experience of the past that progress against Japanese defenses, though it may be all too easy at first, is inevitably difficult and costly in the end.

Americans at home must realize that, beside meeting a challenge and fulfilling a promise, General MacArthur has also cut out a man-sized job for his troops. Luzon is a big island. Its open country, though it gives our mechanized equipment opportunity for most effective work, also gives the Japs a chance for a full scale war of movement between two large armies thus far in the Pacific war.

General Yamashita, a skilled tactician who proved his worth in Malaya, will undoubtedly put up determined and able resistance. If he did not offer battle on the beaches that was because he realized he would have done so under a fierce barrage from ships and planes. He will fight for Luzon to the last, for this island is a veritable keystone of Japan's stolen empire. Without it, the enemy's war machine can't run for very long. The fighting will be fierce, and it is reasonable to expect that casualties here will be higher than in any previous Pacific operation.

In the end, Yamashita will be defeated by several means. He will be defeated for no other reason. But before that day our men on Luzon must go through some of the bitterest fighting of this war. The stakes are high enough to justify that, but we must prepare in advance for a long, bloody struggle.

The new merchandising calls for some slight amending of the earlier slogans, thus: "Not a cough in a carload. In fact, not a cigarette."

Let's see—East Poland becomes West Russia, and East Prussia becomes West Poland. Anyone dithering his new nationality is invited to step outside.

They Didn't Say It

MANY people today go right on attributing well-known sayings and phrases to the wrong persons. Here are examples of this ingrained custom:

Go West, young man—Attributed to Horace Greely.

The famous editor used this admonition in a N. Y. Tribune editorial after reading in the Terre Haute (Ind.) Express in 1881. When it became popular Greely tried to give credit to the originator, John Babson Lane Boud, but it was too late.

Everybody talks but nobody does anything about it—Attributed to Mark Twain.

Charles Dudley Warner, editor of the Hartford Courant, is now believed to have coined this epigram. Mark Twain did say: "If you don't like the weather in New England, wait a few minutes."

They shall not pass—Attributed to Marshal Petain.

Instead of Petain, the man who uttered this historic challenge was his successor in command at Verdun, Gen. Robert George Foch.

Lafayette, we are here—Attributed to Pershing.

Not the commander of the AEF, but Col. E. Z. Stanton of his staff said that.

The fifth column—Attributed to Gen. Franco.

One of Franco's commanders, Gen. Emilio Mola, thus described Franco's followers in Madrid.

The forgotten man—Attributed to President Roosevelt.

The forgotten man in this case seems to be the author of the expression, Prof. William Graham Sumner of Yale.

—Dorothy Richardson, New York Times Magazine.

The Merry-Go-Round

By Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON
NOT many outside the White House realize it, but there is little joy lost between the President of the United States and his assistant President, ex-Judge Jimmy Byrnes. In fact, most of the recent recommendations which Byrnes made to Congress for tightening up the war were made without consulting FDR. Byrnes not only made these recommendations on his own, but announced the fact in a press conference.

Furthermore Byrnes floated one of the standing rules laid down by the White House in this and other administrations, not to issue policy recommendations affecting other departments without consulting the departments involved.

In his recommendations to Congress, the popular South Carolina Justice abruptly threw all this to the winds. He talked about taxes without even a whisper of consultation with Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau, the man who has to handle taxes.

He let loose on labor strikes without a word to the chairman of the War Labor Board Will Davis, the man who has to handle strikes. He even made a crack indirectly against Davis about handling the Petrolins in the same way as the Army, despite the fact that Byrnes himself had advised Davis not to crack down on Petrolins when the Musicians' Union chafed out of bounds.

The result is Morgenthau is irked, Will Davis is irked, and most of all the President is irked.

FR's Hands Tied

However, there isn't much the President can do about it. He persuaded Byrnes to remain on the job as War Mobilizer after the National Democratic Convention in Chicago when Jimmy's feelings were hurt over the Vice-Presidential turn-down. He also went over Byrnes' head to pick Stettinius as Secretary of State when Jimmy thought he was going to get the No. 1 Cabinet post.

So Jimmy, being one of the shrewdest men in Washington, knows FDR can't fire him, and it looks as though he is going to throw his weight around.

Almost every observer who watches Washington work feels it is an excellent thing to have a No. 2 man around the White House to handle the domestic problems—provided he is pulling together with the President. The President, concentrating on the war and Foreign Relations, now as never before needs such an administrator.

Byrnes is able, astute, influential. The trouble is, however, Cabinet members are not quite sure at the moment whether Byrnes, when he makes certain moves, is really representing the President. Also, relations between Byrnes and Harry Hopkins are not too good beneath the surface; so with FDR frequently away or tied up with the war, it is harder to get co-ordinated decisions than at almost any time in years.

Note—One thing which hasn't helped the Roosevelt-Byrnes relations is the suspicion that Jimmy originated the "clear it with Sidney" slogan which caused so much damage during the campaign. When Jimmy applied to his Vice-Presidential running-mate, FDR was reported to have told him to get the OK of Sidney Hillman. Any leak from Byrnes about this probably was inadvertent, but his close friend Bernard Baruch has been given credit for helping put the story into wide circulation.

Under The Dome

Looks like some of the dictatorial tactics previously attributed to Democrats were spreading to the other side of the aisle. Republican Leader Joe Martin cracked down on two GOP congressmen, Clare Luce of Connecticut and Christian Herter of Massachusetts, when they refused to vote for a new Dies committee. He punished them by refusing covered places on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The GOP National Chairman, Herbert Brownell, believes that the Republican Party should steer its own course and not tie up with the Southern Democrats. But Joe Martin doesn't agree.

Justice Louis Brandeis will resign from the Supreme Court of Montana soon to enter the Navy. Erickson will run against Senator Rufus Wheeler in the Democratic primaries in 1946. To improve Parliamentary relations, Congressman Kefauver of Tennessee, George Outland of California and Charles La Follette of Indiana, three live wires on route to England, will give the old Inter-Parliamentary Union; the French Chamber of Deputies will be in on the meeting.

The "Yuh Gotta Coax Me" Type



No Draft For Labor

By Marquis Childs

WASHINGTON
WHILE Congress may not vote national service legislation as asked by President Roosevelt in his message on the state of the Union, the probability is for some form of work or fight law that would grant powers to compel men to work in war plants.

Many Republicans appear to be skeptical of national service legislation as such. They are reluctant to hand over their services to the Roosevelt Administration. They feel that adequate use has not been made of the powers already existing.

But if, in the course of hearings, a strong case is made that American soldiers will be handicapped by a large majority of both Republicans and Democrats are likely to go along with a compulsory labor bill.

One danger is that it may have a strong anti-labor animus; a carryover of the bitterness stirred during the election campaign. If the legislation takes that form under the spur of the coalition of Southern Democrats to the Roosevelt Administration, it could conceivably do more harm than good. For it would chiefly serve to fan the quarrel over labor, strikes and mass unionism, and more to the point, it would chiefly serve to fan the fire of the labor movement.

In asking for national service legislation the President took a moderate line, relying, as he did in a similar plea last year, on the appeal of the Secretaries of War

and Navy. The request for a national service act followed a review of the course of the war which seemed to squeeze out more optimism than the present situation would justify.

Or, to put it another way, the President seemed to glance over the significance of the German breakthrough. He said it had been stopped, while headlines the same day reported another Nazi offensive in the West, threatening some of the hardest won gains around Strasbourg.

If the message had a thin sound, leaning heavily on generalizations, it may well have been because of the President's advice. Before very long, he is going to meet with the other two partners of the Grand Alliance fighting the European war. They are going to have to try in and some of the thorny controversies that have recently been aired in public.

Obviously, the President feels that no good is served by discussion in advance of these controversies. He is much more likely to urge patience and forbearance in the face of inevitable differences.

But Senators critical of the absence of any definition of American policy are not likely to accept the President's advice. Since Vandenberg of Michigan, a former isolationist who has "gone along" with the objectives of a world organization to secure the peace, has become more and more uneasy and correspondingly critical of the drift toward what seems on the surface, at least, to be a revival of the old jealousies and rivalries.

Criticism at this moment is, of course, a cheap luxury. It is our thing to talk, and another thing to have to try to find the answers to the problems that face a bewildered and tragically muddled world.

The Perfectionist Wants It All

By Samuel Grafton

NEW YORK
THE perfectionist would like to see us "end power politics," even as we have to impose our will on other nations, and use our power against them, to do so. He sometimes says, innocently, that the United States is too big and mighty a country to have to stand for power politics.

The perfectionist believes that we ought to call on Britain and Russia and bank our fists on their desks, and remind them of how strong we are, and that by that method we can persuade these countries that no one country can have its own way.

The perfectionist believes in friendship and accord among the great nations. But he is disturbed because President Roosevelt is so friendly with the other great nations, and gives signs of understanding their problems, and shows reluctance to oppose them, in their quests for friends and security. The perfectionist does not see how we can hope to build a real international accord, unless we begin to stand up against the other countries.

The perfectionist does not trust Churchill, because he regards him as wedded to the last century, and he regards him as having drifted too far to the right, judging from his recent State Department appointments. In some of his judgments, the perfectionist may be correct. But he does not believe that these national differences are real, or that they are based on genuine national needs for security and friendliness. He regards these differences as instances of perversity, and he would like to use his great power to lay aside their doubts and ambitions, at his say-so, because he knows himself to be

a moral man. He considers this attitude of his to be truly intellectual.

The perfectionist is in favor of international agreement. But he is suspicious of treaties between Britain and Russia, Russia and America, Russia and France, or any talk of a treaty between Britain and France. This is the one field in which it is not admitted that a little progress is better than none.

The perfectionist wants all the nations of the world to agree to one treaty, and he will not settle for less, even during a transition period. Having set up this great goal, and in a great hurry, he expects to see it accomplished, and considers himself to be the world's only internationalist. He does not believe in the idea of nations acting unilaterally, even when they make a treaty; and he considers himself the only multilateral advocate alive, even when he stands by himself.

The perfectionist believes that if we can only find the right gadget, world politics will come to an end forever. He believes that there will be no politics after 1945, if 1945 produces a gadget. He believes in a flat future, no hills or valleys. He is a terminal futurist, and he does not believe in change. He believes only in transformation, and he is not interested in it. He uses the United States as an example of successful organization of mass action. But he ignores the point that the United States, though it is indeed a great example of organization, has been the scene of bitter political battles ever since it was organized.

The perfectionist is morally right, and we could not do without him. He is a good guard himself sufficiently against the old logical fallacy which might be described as jumping out of the window to prove one is in favor of fresh air.

SIDE GLANCES

By Galbraith



"The patient just ahead of you bragged that he had four cartons of cigarettes—I hope you're not inclined to be nervous, because I'm still pretty sure!"

The Need For Nurses

By Dorothy Thompson

NEW YORK
THE proposal to draft nurses has already been the subject of mathematical investigation. It furnishes startling testimony to the devotion and patriotism of the nursing profession, and raises the question of whether this matter cannot be better settled on a volunteer basis than by compulsion. Here are the facts:

The total of active trained nurses in the American nursing is, in round numbers, 265,000. Of these it is estimated 25 per cent are over the age of 40, and therefore ineligible for Army service. That reduces the figure to about 199,000. Army nurses may have no dependence on the services for various reasons. In 1943, when the last full survey was made, 40 per cent were married.

There are no figures available to show how many have children, but it is conservative to estimate there are 40,000. If this is correct, there are, altogether, only 159,000 trained nurses eligible for the service. And 75,000 nurses have already volunteered for the Armed Forces, half the eligible nursing profession of the United States.

I submit that in no other profession of our population is there so high an average of the volunteer spirit.

Forty-three per cent of the 75,000 volunteers were rejected or released by the services for various reasons, most of them involving physical unfitness. The services will not accept a nurse who goes anywhere, under any circumstances, with an extraordinary degree of physical, mental, and emotional superiority.

The Procurement Assignment Service of the Manpower Board, has found only 41,000 who can be considered eligible. None of these are over 40, and none have children. Presumably they are no better nor worse than the 75,000 free-willers. And 41,000 would be down to 26,000.

And what is actually needed is 100,000 replacements at the rate of 250 a month.

I submit the question of picking up the 100,000 replacements now in the military service, and (2) the 25 per cent of the population who would have to be dropped if the demand were made for their full time.

There are armed services for which the volunteer is inadequate. Only volunteers are pilots, paratroopers, submarine crews and spies for various reasons. Nursing is a calling. And the only nurses who will do overseas work well

are those who want to do it. More of them—and certainly 100,000 more—would choose to do it under the following conditions:

1. That physicians for whom they work would encourage them to volunteer instead of pressing them to stay.

2. That their boy friends in the armed services, who have themselves never been wounded, cease discouraging them by saying "no."

3. That a better organization of civilian hospitals were set up, so they would not feel the pressing need for their services at home. No trained nurse is shirking a duty. The Army has 14.15 per cent of all trained nurses, of any age group, or any status. Civilian hospitals have 85.85 per cent, for the 11,000,000 men in the armed forces are the healthiest part of the population, and as normal rate of sickness is concerned, there has never been surplus of nurses under any conditions, and those serving at home are greatly overworked.

The Navy has always had trained men nurses. There are no women nurses on battleships, though each of them has a hospital and five or six physicians. Trained nurses, even overseas, are doing work that men, unfit for combat duty, could perform with six weeks' training.

Trained nurses are essential in operating rooms. But neither in the Army nor in civilian hospitals are they essential for emptying bedpans, making beds, taking temperatures, or administering prescribed medicines. One experienced trained nurse could train four of men or women for such services, and rapidly.

Desperately needed are large numbers of nurses' aides, both in civilian and military hospitals here at home. Of Army nurses, 70 per cent are overseas. The other 30 per cent could be immediately available for service in both civilian and military hospitals here.

But it is doubtful whether you can find 100,000 trained women as nurses' aides. Most nurses' aides are doing part-time work, for which they are paid. They could arrange their household and family duties so as to be able to work two or three days a week in hospitals—and this is what most nurses would prefer. They would have to be dropped if the demand were made for their full time.

To issue an order and draft women seems to be quick and efficient. But in this particular case, it is the least efficient, and longest way to solve the problem.

—ARTHUR D. GORE, Rarford, N. C.

Posies For Miss Knox

Editors: The News:
I wish to thank you for being honored with a nice write-up in Miss Dorothy Knox of the Railway Express Agency in December.

The clipping was sent to New York to our President, also to Washington to our Vice-President, and to Atlanta, Ga., to our Southern vice-president. All of these gentlemen complimented Miss Knox very highly for the manner in which she wrote.

I wish to take this opportunity in thanking you and your brilliant columnist Miss Knox for the splendid way she handled this interview.

My family enjoys reading your good news and bad news, and your outstanding writers, including Miss Knox and C. O. Paul.

We have been subscribers to your paper for the past 10 or 20 years, and have enjoyed every issue and we consider it one of the best afternoon papers published in the South.

—R. M. SMITH, Charlotte.