

FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM

Trademark Registered U. S. Patent Office
MORNING—EVENING—SUNDAY

Combining the Fort Worth Star, established Feb. 1, 1906, Fort Worth Telegram, purchased Jan., 1909, the Fort Worth Record, purchased Nov. 1, 1925.

Amon G. Carter, President and Publisher

Entered as second class mail matter at the Postoffice at Fort Worth, Texas, Jan. 1, 1909, under Act of March 3, 1879.

TELEPHONE NUMBERS
Classified Advertising Department, 2-4131
All Other Departments, 3-2301

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

Any erroneous reflection upon the character, standing or reputation of any person, firm or corporation which may appear in the columns of this paper, will be gladly corrected upon the notice of same being given to the editor personally at the office, Seventh and Taylor Streets, Fort Worth, Texas.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

BY CARRIER—
One Week, Evening Only, No Sunday.....15c
One Week, Evening With Sunday.....25c
One Week, Morning, Evening and Sunday, 13 Copies...35c
Single Copies, Evening, 5c; Morning, 5c; Sunday.....10c

BY MAIL IN TEXAS AND OKLAHOMA
Daily and Sunday Daily Except Sunday
One Month\$1.00 One Month\$.95
Three Months 3.00 Three Months 2.50
Twelve Months12.00 Twelve Months10.00

BY MAIL TO ALL STATES OUTSIDE OF TEXAS AND OKLAHOMA
One Month\$1.50 One Year\$18.00

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. All rights to republication of special dispatches herein are also reserved.

The Star-Telegram is an independent Democratic newspaper supporting what it believes to be right and opposing what it believes to be wrong, regardless of party politics, publishing the news fairly and impartially at all times.

It's an Outrage.

PROGRESS of the three-way battle in the Pennsylvania hard coal fields, a battle which engages the War Labor Board, John L. Lewis, and the miner members of Lewis' United Mine Workers, is watched with growing anger by the public elsewhere. A majority of the miners' locals voted Sunday, by a considerable majority, to make the partial strike a complete one, in spite of orders to return to work issued by the War Labor Board and despite their own officer committee's recommendation that WLB orders be obeyed. The strike was staged as a protest against Lewis and his personal staff of officials who, exercising complete control of UMW's affairs, have ordered a 50 per cent increase in union dues.

The men are striking against the increase—a strictly inter-union affair—but the shivering consumer in the East and the Nation's war effort are the real victims. One joker in the situation is that the men supposedly would welcome "punitive" action by WLB, which would consist of the taking over of the mines and their operation by the Government, and another is that a great many people are made happy as the Lewis eye is blacked by the members of his own unions.

Thus we see how difficult it is sometimes to draw a straight line between what is desirable and what is undesirable. If the gesture by the miners toward removing the Lewis foot from their necks had occurred in peacetime there would be cheers only. But it happens that the Nation is at war and that the coal which the striking miners are not producing is badly needed for purposes of that war.

Thus we come to the point that no American is entitled to strike against the safety and welfare of his country in wartime, no matter what the grievance that agitates him. There is but one thing to be done in the circumstances: The miners must keep at their jobs, and those who have presumed to walk out in the face of their country's need must return to work. If any do not, they forfeit the right to both the public's sympathy and leniency of the fundamental law which empowers a nation to protect itself against enemies domestic as well as foreign.

The situation is at such an impasse that the men will be forced to back down. The War Labor Board is "out on a limb" as a result of the Montgomery Ward decision. In that instance, the board ruled that the company must obey its orders; and, on appeal, the President held that in wartime it was the duty of all to conform to the orders of the WLB in performing its function of averting production stoppages. The President in this case, if it reaches him, as is expected, will have far more justification for similar action than was the case in the Montgomery Ward decision. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Montgomery Ward was engaged in retail trade; the coal miners are engaged in production that is vital to the war effort.

In the coal mine case, the WLB has issued a work order which has no dependence upon Mr. Lewis' order to his once obedient followers to kick in with dues at a 50 per cent higher rate. In the Montgomery Ward case, the company obeyed under protest. The miners can protest, and as eloquently as the proposition of defying Mr. Lewis deserves, but they must obey the Government's demand to return to work immediately. If they don't, the Government has but one recourse: Issue a work-or-fight order, as was done in the last war, and give the miners, and all others who may follow a similar course—the choice of continuing work on short-hour schedules, and at good pay, or being sent to North Africa, New Guinea, or some other fighting front, and serving at low

pay, 12 to 15 hours a day, and at the risk of their lives, as hundreds of thousands of other loyal Americans, many of whom, unfortunately, will not return, are doing.

Ample means have been set up for the adjudication of all labor disputes. There is no excuse for a strike or work stoppage in war industries because of any grievance.

It's time for a definite showdown.

For Victory: Buy Bonds

Pay-as-You-Go Plan.

THE House Ways and Means Committee has evidenced intention to give preferential consideration to bills establishing the pay-as-you-go plan for individual income tax payment. Several bills on this subject embody the so-called Ruml plan, with or without modifications. The bill by Representative Carlson of Kansas, whose author headed discussion on the House floor, adopts bodily the Ruml idea of "forgetting" one year's taxes—those which otherwise would be paid this year on 1942 income—and starting anew Jan. 1 of 1943 paying on current income. Dispatches from Washington indicate that the Treasury, which in the past has balked at "losing" one year's payments, has softened to the extent of willingness to accept a change dropping out the surtax of 1942, but leaving in the "normal" tax. All of which lends the color of certainty to the assumption that a change is coming soon.

The argument against the "skip-a-year" feature of proposals for getting onto a pay-as-you-go basis fades out when the long run is considered. The Treasury technically would lose a year's payments from individuals, but actually there would be no stoppage in the flow of revenue from this source into the Treasury. The longer the pay-as-you-go procedure continued, the smaller would be the percentage of even technical loss. Since it is calculated that the end of the war and the passage of an indefinite reconstruction period will eventually bring reduction of income taxes, it will always be possible for the Treasury to recoup whatever actual loss is incurred by continuing wartime rates a little longer than otherwise would be necessary.

The advantages of the pay-as-you-go plan are so great for the individual taxpayer that even real sacrifice on the part of the Government would be justified. But, since the Treasury would gain immeasurably in actual present revenue through vast reduction of individual defaults, which are inevitable under the present system, there is no question of sacrifice.

In view of the great increase in income tax rates applying to individuals and to the lowering of exemptions which has added some 30,000,000 persons to the number liable to taxation, it is essential to employ every means for facilitating tax payment. The pay-as-you-go plan is demanded by every consideration of efficiency and justice, and if Congress does not put it into effect this year the Treasury, as well as some 40,000,000 taxpayers, will have reason to regret the stupidity which prevented action.

For Victory: Buy Bonds

Bombs on Berlin.

SINCE the British have consistently adhered to a strict policy of bombing only military objectives in Germany and the occupied countries, the series of air attacks upon Berlin are evidence that superiority in planes, pilots and munitions has been established by the Allied Nations over the once "invincible" Nazis.

The weakness of resistance at Berlin and of attack in Nazi raids over London emphasizes the mounting power of the United Nations, which is already asserting itself in the Russian counter-offensive. Bombers over Berlin carry the message of ultimate defeat to the heart of the German nation. Wreckage in the German capital must be cleared and buildings repaired during the severe Winter, and these tasks will aggravate the labor shortage in Germany. Since Hitler forced total war upon Britain in the early days of the war, the German people must now endure retaliation in kind.

In addition to material advantage to the Allies accruing from the bombings of Berlin, the attacks strike at the heart of German morale, which is founded upon the legend of Nazi invincibility. The morale of British and Russians is strengthened by the realization that the war is being carried to the German people and to the heart of an empire, of which Berlin has been a symbol of supposed security. By the process of atonement, the German people are forced to realize the consequences of Hitler's philosophy of force and violence, that destruction breeds counter-destruction. In the bitter school of experience, the German people may learn the fallacy of Nazi barbarism, and having gone through the baptism of blood and suffering they may be ready to return to faith in human brotherhood and fair dealing.

Our Minister to Australia

—Dorothy Thompson

Editor's Note: Dorothy Thompson's column ably and forcefully expresses her opinions, which are not necessarily those of this newspaper.

It seems to me that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is giving undue attention to the appointment of Mr. Flynn as Minister to Australia, in view of more serious questions that it might be considering. It might, for instance, consider what, in the future, and after our victory, it recommends as an American foreign policy. That question is by no means settled. And it is difficult to find ambassadors and ministers to represent a policy that does not exist.

Until this war it has been the policy of the United States to be disinterested in the political affairs of the world. Traditionally, the United States has been unwilling to enter into any continuing responsibilities—for instance, for the organization of the world to prevent war—and it is not yet clear whether this Congress or any future Congress will change this policy. It is, for instance, unclear what the foreign policy of the Republican party is, and how a possible change of party power would affect our relations with the rest of the world.

A summary of Republican utterances since the election of the Congress reveals complete disparities.

The Republican Governor of Minnesota, Mr. Harold E. Stassen, has gone farther than Henry Wallace in advocating a world parliament after this war, and the relinquishment of a degree of sovereignty by all states, including our own.

In the House Foreign Affairs Committee the isolationist, Hamilton Fish, has been removed, but in the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, Warren R. Austin of Vermont, anti-isolationist, has been set aside in favor of Senator James J. Davis of Pennsylvania, who has been isolationist.

Representative Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota has advocated a post-war planning commission to "prepare the way for helping America play a strong role in the maintaining of future peace," and Representative Jessie Sumner of Illinois has introduced a resolution in behalf of staying out of European affairs in the future.

So, in criticizing the appointment of Mr. Flynn, the obvious question arises: Who should be appointed, and what policy should he seek to further? Up to now the criticism has been personal, negative and party-political. It has afforded an opportunity to exploit anti-Roosevelt sentiment. I believe the appointment to have been a mistake. I can discern no qualifications in Mr. Flynn justifying this appointment. And I think the action was very unshrewd of Mr. Roosevelt, since it was bound to create the reactions it has, at a moment when he ought not to make such mistakes.

But, from a larger standpoint, what have been traditionally the qualifications for American Ambassadors and Ministers? Have they ever been appointed according to their qualifications?

What were the qualifications that recommended Mr. Kennedy for Ambassador to Great Britain? Or of Mr. Cudahy to Belgium?

The highest posts in the diplomatic service have traditionally been filled for one of two reasons: Either as a reward for party favors, or as a means of getting rid of inconvenient personalities. I don't know just which motive is animating the President in this case, but there is certainly nothing new about it.

It is true that more and more career men are rising to the top posts, but even career men can not represent a policy which is not clear.

There is no objection to taking men from outside and certainly none in taking men to represent the Administration policy, whatever it may be. A proper procedure would be to ask: Who is eminently fitted for this post? A proper candidate ought to have the following qualifications: He ought thoroughly to understand the structure and problems of the British Empire and Commonwealth. He ought to have knowledge of the military, strategical, economic and national problems of the Pacific area. The Minister to Australia is the first American diplomat in the island Pacific area. He ought to have tact and the capability of amassing accurate information.

Such Americans certainly exist. Outside the Government we have a Council on Pacific Relations, a Council on Foreign Relations, and a Foreign Policy Association, in all of which are gifted men who have spent years of their lives in a study of foreign affairs. In the universities we have scholars. And, finally, we have editors and foreign correspondents who have concentrated on Pacific affairs. So we could find an excellent and qualified Minister, if finding a qualified Minister outside the State Department itself were the issue. But it never has been the issue.

It would be an excellent thing for the Senate to raise the issue now. It would be a good thing for the position of the United States in the world. But it would commit the opponents of this Administration to behave differently in the future from the way they themselves have in the past, i