

AN EDITORIAL
(Continued from Page 1)

the Union's attorneys that a settlement could be reached on the basis of re-employment of SOME of the former printers. Mr. Jack Whiting, representative of the International Typographical Union, explained at the August 1 conference that four of the six union journeymen printers who worked at The Herald prior to the strike had obtained regular situations elsewhere and would not be interested in re-instatement; but that the remaining two union printers on strike would possibly be interested in coming back to The Herald.

It was upon this premise that negotiations continued at frequent meetings for the past four months. However, each time the publisher would agree to meet the demand of the Union, Thomas and VanKralingen would ADD something NEW. Whenever an agreement seemed imminent, another log would be thrown across the road to thwart settlement by Thomas or VanKralingen.

These stumbling blocks were thrown in, time after time, until the original understanding of offering to re-employ the two union printers as suggested by the Union representatives at the opening of the conference had pyramided, first to three printers, then to four, and finally on November 22, to a flat demand by Thomas that ALL SIX FORMER PRINTERS and an APPRENTICE be re-hired, (apparently regardless of their satisfactory employment elsewhere.)

Numerous other impossible and unpredicted "conditions" were thrown in to impede a settlement. VANKRALINGEN EVEN ASKED THAT THE WOMEN PICKETS, WHO ARE NOT MEMBERS OF ANY UNION, BE PUT TO WORK BY THE HERALD.

Thus, it became more and more obvious that the obstruction blocking a settlement of the dispute was not any fundamental issue but rather a matter of personalities. These two negotiators were using the Union as a cloak to cover up their selfish desires to work out their grudges and inflate their egos. They were sacrificing the welfare of their own members who wanted to come back to work in their selfish zeal to harm the very newspaper from whom the other workers hoped to obtain regular employment at good pay.

It was at this point that The Herald notified the Union representatives that unless the last offer was accepted by Friday November 25, that all offers would have to be withdrawn and any additional printers that might be required would be hired without regard to their union or non-union affiliations.

Under the terms of its last offer, The Herald expressed its willingness to re-employ the two former union printers who had signed a desire to return, and also to hire TWO ADDITIONAL UNION PRINTERS. All four new union printers were to be given a full week's work at current union wages of \$87.50 to \$101.50 for a 37½ hour week consisting of five shifts of 7½ hours each, and under the same conditions as prevail in all union newspaper shops in the harbor area. This is the same pay now being received by The Herald's present staff members. Wages have never been an issue in this dispute as The Herald has consistently paid the going union scale or higher.

Because Thomas and VanKralingen have been the ONLY members of the San Pedro Typographical Union who have met with The Herald publishers during the entire 42 weeks' dispute, The Herald feels it will be useless to continue to meet with these two negotiators who have blocked every honest and sincere effort on the part of the employers to reach an agreement.

It is regrettable that two such autocratically minded men have joined forces with San Pedro's Haskell Tidwell to lead the San Pedro Typographical Union into such a bad situation.

For years, prior to Thomas' reign, the San Pedro Typographical Local had been lead by intelligent, fair-minded union officers. The publishers of The Herald have always respected the high-type of Union representatives with whom they annually negotiated a workable contract with complete understanding of mutual employer-employee problems.

But harmony and sympathetic understanding went out the window when Thomas took over the presidency of the San Pedro Local, and VanKralingen and Tidwell became his chief "advisors."

To the obviously inconsistent and insincere tactics of Thomas and VanKralingen to force unlawful labor practices upon The Herald have been added the wholly untruthful and libelous statements which have been published over their names during the past nine months.

Against such activities, The Herald has but one course to follow. It will seek recourse and judgments through the Courts and other impartial tribunals.

Don't Let Anybody Fool You!

These Things Will Happen If The Anti-Trust Lawyers Have Their Way

When the anti-trust lawyers from Washington filed their suit against A&P, we told the American people, our customers, our suppliers and our employees how this attack would affect them.

We said that this attack, if successful, would mean the end of A&P as you know it.

We said that it would mean higher food prices for American consumers.

We said that if they succeed in destroying A&P the way would be cleared for the destruction of other efficient large-scale retailers.

We thought the American people were entitled to know about this threat to their welfare and standard of living.

Since that time, however, the anti-trust lawyers have been making speeches, talking over the radio, writing letters and giving stories to the newspapers, in which they say we are all wrong.

They say that this suit will not close a single A&P store; and that instead of raising food prices it will lower them.

And they have tried to give the impression that nobody will be hurt by this decision except the present owners of A&P.

We don't think that the American people want to be confused by these statements. We know that when they have the facts, they will understand that this case can affect the living standards and the way of life of every American citizen.

Here are the facts:

It Will Destroy A&P

The anti-trust lawyers have repeatedly stated that "the suit will not result in the closing of a single A&P store", and that "the purpose of the suit is to enjoin A&P from continuing activity which has been held to violate the law."

The fact is that the suit is designed not only to "enjoin" A&P from alleged illegal activities, but actually to destroy the company.

Here is what they have asked the court to do:

Break up A&P's retail stores into seven groups, each of which must be sold to different owners, and operated under new management.

Order us to sell A&P's factories, which produce many of the fine foods you find in our stores, to still other new owners.

Prevent any of the seven groups of stores from operating any of the factories.

None of the present owners, who have made A&P what it is today, can have anything to do with either the stores or the factories.

The first A&P store was opened 90 years ago. For the past 50 years the

company has been managed by George L. Hartford and John A. Hartford.

These are the men who have pioneered the policy of low-cost, low-profit, low-price food retailing which has won A&P the patronage of millions of American families and given them more good food for their money.

If the anti-trust lawyers have their way, these men and other company executives will be completely out of the picture. No one can predict what the policies of the new owners of the various parts of A&P will be.

No one can predict that they will sell the same quality food at the same low prices, or that they will keep the same employees, or give them the same high wages, short hours, pensions and security.

Nor, despite the anti-trust lawyers' statement, can anyone tell how many A&P stores will remain open or will be closed.

So, while there may be a food store where your A&P is now located, it won't be your A&P store.

Make no mistake about it. If the anti-trust lawyers win their suit it will mean the end of A&P as you know it.

Your Food Will Cost More

The anti-trust lawyers have repeatedly stated that the suit will not increase, but should decrease, grocery prices.

Anybody who has ever shopped in an A&P store, or has ever taken a high-school course in economics, knows better than that.

Everyone knows that A&P's policy has always been to keep costs and profits at a minimum so that it can sell good food cheap.

The very heart of the anti-trust lawyers' case is that A&P's methods, which they claim are illegal, have enabled the company to undersell competitors. How can anyone possibly say that you will get lower food prices by eliminating the company that has done so much to bring them down?

Actually, there is no question that this suit, if successful, will mean higher food prices for A&P customers.

Here is just one of a number of reasons:

We manufacture many of the quality foods we sell in our stores, such as Bokar, Red Circle and Eight O'Clock coffees, Ann Page foods, White House milk, and many others.

The anti-trust lawyers admit that we pass along these manufacturing savings to our customers in the form of lower prices.

But, the anti-trust lawyers have asked the court to order us to get rid of our manufacturing facilities, which would put an end to all these savings.

This means that if these A&P brands continued to be manufactured, you would have to pay higher prices for them wherever you found them.

The anti-trust lawyers say that food prices would go down in other stores. They claim that food manufacturers would be able to sell cheaper to other grocers because they would not have to make up alleged losses they now incur in selling to A&P.

This, of course, is pure nonsense. The suppliers who voluntarily seek our business and are now rushing to our defense obviously find it profitable to deal with A&P. Actually, their sales to this company enable them to build up their volume, reduce their costs, and sell more cheaply to all grocers.

The elimination of A&P from the picture would tend to increase, rather than decrease, the wholesale cost of food; and this, in turn, will be reflected in increases in retail prices.

Make no mistake about it. If the anti-trust lawyers succeed in putting A&P out of business you will find your food bill is higher.

Others Will Be Hurt

The anti-trust lawyers have insisted that this suit will not affect other distributors, "nor will it destroy any efficiencies of mass distribution."

The fact is that the anti-trust lawyers ask the court to break up the company, make it get rid of its admittedly legal manufacturing operations and in general destroy many of the efficiencies which have enabled it to sell food cheaper.

If such an attack is successful, it immediately raises the likelihood of similar attacks on other chain stores.

The anti-trust lawyers are saying that they "do not contemplate any other suits of this nature at this time."

But that does not mean that they cannot undertake such suits at any future time if they win this case.

As a matter of fact, the anti-trust lawyers made practically the same allegations against two of our largest competitors that they are making against us. And it can also be used as the basis for an attack against other grocers and merchants in other lines.

There are today literally thousands of chain stores, voluntary groups and individual merchants operating with the same methods and in the same pattern here under attack.

If A&P is destroyed, no businessman could safely pursue an aggressive sales policy designed to lower prices and give his customers a better deal if by so doing he takes business away from any competitor.

Even if the anti-trust lawyers have no intention now of prosecuting other suits, a decision against A&P will establish a precedent that could be used by the present anti-trust lawyers, or any future anti-trust lawyers, to destroy any efficient business that buys cheaply, sells cheaply, and grows big in the process.

Such a decision would mean the end of the vigorous, healthy price competition which has given this country the highest standard of living ever enjoyed by any people anywhere in the history of the world.

The anti-trust lawyers are trying to give a new interpretation to the anti-trust laws that, instead of preserving competition, will reduce competition.

They are trying, by court decision, to impose a new kind of economic policy on the people of this country.

Make no mistake about it. If they succeed in destroying A&P they will be destroying the method of distribution that has helped make the American standard of living the envy of the world.

Breakfast or Dinner

... No matter which meal of the day you eat here ... you're sure to enjoy it ... Our menu is carefully planned to avoid monotony ... Our dishes, ample, and temptingly prepared ... Come in and eat with Charley ...

—Charley

Charley's

GUESTS OF HONOR

—for the following week are:

- THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1—
Edward E. Conroy and Son, 13707 Crenshaw, Hawthorne
- FRIDAY, DECEMBER 2—
Mr. and Mrs. Jimmie Meyer, 21730 Figueroa
- SATURDAY, DECEMBER 3—
Mr. and Mrs. Karl Frieberg, 1307 Fern ave.
- SUNDAY, DECEMBER 4—
Mr. and Mrs. Ches. D. Metro, 20637½ South Vermont
- MONDAY, DECEMBER 5—
Mr. and Mrs. Dick Cowshaw, 723 Sartori
- TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6—
Fred S. MacIntosh, 1614 Crenshaw
- WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 7—
Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert Bennett, 2424 Cabrillo

You Folks Please Come In—
DINNER IS ON THE HOUSE!
JUST IDENTIFY YOURSELF
WE FEATURE NAVY BEAN SOUP DAILY

Eat with Charley at

Daniels Cafe

1625 Cabrillo — Torrance

Look for Your Name Next Week!

We Never Close!

THE GREAT ATLANTIC &



PACIFIC TEA COMPANY