

Wars Must End

For centuries the nations of Europe have lived in uneasy dread of war. The smaller countries, knowing they were only pawns in the war game and that no effort on their part could assure them peace, tried only to get the best possible working relationships with the key nations in the existing balances of power. Until war was mechanized, it did not completely divert nations from the pursuits of civilian life, and the dangers and horrors of war were largely restricted to those who did the actual fighting in the field. But today all that is changed. Today the whole nation goes to war. War's carnage may come to any part of the nation. War has become so expensive in both material and human tolls, so subversive of civilized life, so horrible for those behind the front—that we must find a way to put an end to wars.

In our national life we deny individuals the right to decide disputes by force or to take personal vengeance on their enemies. Affairs of "honor," not so long ago settled by duel, must now be referred to courts. This development has not restricted personal freedom, but it has assured community peace and freedom from violence. The community, in turn, assures personal freedom for all.

Twice already in this twentieth century the world has been at war. Our country had no choice but to defend itself against aggression. The record tells us in unmistakable terms that we cannot have peace unless we unite with other nations of goodwill to defend our right to have peace and to be freed from war's horrors.

It is, of course, equally plain that there is some danger in forming alliances which include nations with ideals and institutions that differ from ours. But all progress involves venture and risks. If we can rid ourselves of world war by setting up international agencies to deal with the causes of war and to nip any future aggression in the bud we cannot afford not to take the risk.

The risk involved is possible loss of free institutions. We shall have full opportunity to safeguard our free institutions if our international agencies are based on the right to representation and majority rule in making decisions. With representation fully accorded nations and groups affected by decisions, democratic nations will be able to present their views.

Increasingly, citizens of free countries must scrupulously perform their duties which are necessary to assure the maintenance of rights. The duties of free citizenship cannot be delegated to party members or office-holders. Unless the citizens know how to evaluate the services of those persons elected and appointed to places of service, democracy fails to achieve its purposes. With the development of world organization the responsibilities of citizens will increase.

It is high time to begin planning to fit ourselves for these new responsibilities in order that the United Nations shall increase opportunities for our democracy while at the same time protecting us against future war.

Our nation wants peace and freedom from war. A United Nations need not limit our sovereignty. And it is the only way in which we can attain our supreme objective—freedom from war. — American Federationist.

Backwardness in Texas

The unhappy people of Texas, represented in the United States Senate by a clown and in their own Governor's mansion by a Babbitt, may soon see their state university lose its standing as an accredited school. Responsibility for the university's plight rests with the board of regents appointed by Governor "Calculatin' Coke" Stevenson and his predecessor, "Pappy" O'Daniel. Seven of its nine members are either corporation lawyers or owners of vast corporate wealth, or both, and they run the University of Texas as if it were their private property and its faculty their employees. President Homer R. Rainey, a brave man and an articulate one, has finally been dismissed after struggling for five years to maintain academic decency at the university. The showdown came when two of the regents, as individuals, ordered Dr. Rainey to curtail his speaking engagements, "especially to religious groups." Dr. Rainey, a Baptist, announced publicly that the order had been received and would be disregarded. The day before his next speaking engagement he read to the faculty a statement recapitulating the sordid history of the board's interference with his administration—orders to remove professors because they were "personally unsatisfactory" to individual members of the board, the appointment of a dean without consulting him, the banning of books which met the personal disapproval of individual board members. A few days later he was dismissed. The faculty met and unanimously voted its confidence in him, the students marched on the State House, and the Association of University Professors made public its report on the dismissal of three economics professors, over Dr. Rainey's protests, in 1942. Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, executive secretary of the association, said the dismissal of the three professors, and now of Dr. Rainey, "bodes ill" for the university. Governor Stevenson has the power to save Texas from the shame of Georgia and Mississippi. We hope he has the will.—The Nation.

Uncontrolled Capitalism No Longer Able To Meet The Needs Of The People

By RAYMOND HOFSES, Editor Reading Labor Advocate

To those who are certain to cry "sour grapes," we want say in advance that we didn't expect the election of Norman Thomas at any stage in the recent campaign. So we just can't have been disappointed on that score.

That's our preliminary statement to the claim that, while the Socialist candidates were rejected as expected and as usual, some of the things for which Socialists have been fighting for many years and the Socialist principle of a planned economy have, in a very real sense, been endorsed by the majority of Americans who voted Franklin D. Roosevelt into the White House for the fourth time.

Now that we are among those people who think we see a Socialist when we look at the President; we'll let Republicans and reactionaries generally have a corner on that hallucination.

But the fact can not be argued that ever since Roosevelt took office back in 1933, the government has been used as an instrument for planning the nation's economy to a greater degree than was ever considered compatible with "free" enterprise before that time.

Planning and control came because, as we Socialists have been pointing out for so many years

that we got tired of hearing it ourselves, it was necessary... because the anarchy of uncontrolled capitalism no longer was able to meet the needs of the people and was, in very truth, threatening the nation with collapse.

We Socialists prophesied just that—and were roundly condemned and maligned for it. But our prophecy came true and made the Roosevelt brand of control just as inevitable in America as the Hitler brand in Germany.

And so the majority of the American people voted for some more of the same because they had not had time to forget what capitalism did to them at the end of that era during which the controls were exercised in Wall Street instead of Washington.

Well, having tried a controlled economy, the people aren't likely to be frightened by that phase of the Socialist program any more. And that's a victory for the Socialist idea.

LESS MEAT IN 1945

An 8 per cent reduction in the amount of meat available to consumers in 1945, and even less in 1946, was predicted by the Department of Agriculture. The drop was attributed to the liquidation of cattle by livestock raisers.

THE MARCH OF LABOR



Musicians Win a Smashing Victory

Subsidiaries of Radio Trust "Surrender Unconditionally" As "F. D." Refuses Further Aid in Attacks on Petrillo

Labor takes its hat off to James C. Petrillo, president of the Musicians' Union. He has won a great battle under conditions which would have caused a less courageous leader to run up the white flag.

Seldom in the history of trade unionism has the chief of any labor organization been subjected to such a barrage of undeserved criticism and appalling misrepresentation. The War Labor Board, the newspapers, the magazines, a flock of paid propagandists and any number of political demagogues joined in the attack. Even the President of the United States was induced to give approval to the disreputable affair. Fortunately Mr. Roosevelt discovered, before it was too late, that he was being used to advance a very bad cause.

The "crime" committed by Petrillo was that he attempted to save the members of his union from economic catastrophe. Being a man of vision, he recognized that the making of "canned" music would eventually deprive thousands of musicians of a livelihood. So he proposed that the makers of records should put into a sort of unemployment insurance fund one-sixth of one cent for every record made.

The money thus secured, Mr. Petrillo agreed, should be used to supply various communities with free concerts of high-class music. Thus the American people would be taught to appreciate good music and the members of the Musicians' Union would be enabled to keep the wolf from the door.

More than a hundred small concerns agreed to the proposition, but the three big companies, subsidiaries of the Radio Trust, refused to go along. They enlisted the support of virtually every newspaper in the land. They induced the War Labor Board to order Petrillo to abandon his fight on the theory that he was "interfering" with the war effort—as silly an argument as was ever advanced by public officials in their right minds.

When Petrillo and his union refused to obey, the board called on President Roosevelt to take drastic action, but "F. D." refused when he was told by advisors, who had their feet on the ground, that the Labor Board didn't have a legal leg to stand on, because the making of records was manifestly not a part of the war effort.

So Mr. Roosevelt urged President Petrillo to be a "good sport" and "all off the fight." The executive committee of the Musicians' Union refused to do anything of the kind, and the three big companies "surrendered unconditionally."

Now the record-making companies will contribute \$4,000,000 a year to the musicians' unemployment fund; there is no reason to advance the price to the consumer; millions of Americans will have additional opportunities to hear good music.

The big recording companies complain that "the government refused to enforce its order." Of course, the government refused, because the law of the land did not justify the order. In other words, the musicians were well within their legal rights and all the talk about Petrillo being a "czar" who flouted the statutes enacted by Congress was just unadulterated piffle.—Labor.



IN THE WIND

From THE NATION

Education: The University of Alabama is on the War Department's list of approved schools giving correspondence courses to men in the armed forces. A Negro soldier in the Pacific applied for enrolment in a course that was not offered by any other school on the list. But the university refused to accept a Negro student even by mail.

Religion: Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen, in a speech at Boston, said the American family is disintegrating. "The family is higher in Russia than in the United States," he said, "and God looking down from heaven may be more pleased with Russia than with us."

Small business: The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America devotes most of its current bulletin, Information Service, to an article entitled Are Funerals Being Commercialized? The answer, given in details, is yes.

Interstate Commerce: The Regional Plan Association reports, "For every three New Jersey residents commuting to offices in New York there are now two New York residents traveling to jobs in New Jersey."

Brotherhood: A Nation subscriber in Florida passes on to us an anonymous handbill he found in his mail box, which maintains that Northern agitators "antagonize the black race against the white, until the Southern Negro is losing the only real friend he ever had—the Southern white man... The Thirtieth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth amendments to the federal Constitution, shoved down the throat of a defeated and helpless South after the War Between the States, are to be literally enforced... While our boys fight all over the world for liberty, we lose it at home."

Sour Grapes: Time, which stressed the importance of the P. A. C. throughout the campaign, now implies (November 13, page 22) that Roosevelt's victory was due less to the P. A. C. than to Republican apathy.

Festung Europa: The conduct of Nazi soldiers in Denmark is such that the National union of trade and office clerks has organized a "convoy service" to escort girls home after work, and other organizations are planning to take similar precautions... The German Propaganda Ministry, for reasons of its own, has ordered all newspapers henceforth to print the texts of the Führer's speeches in small type. Some Berlin wits say the purpose is to keep people from reading between the lines.

OTTO MOVES FREELY

Otto of Hapsburg is again in the news. After the collapse of the ill-fated "Hapsburg Legion" in 1943, almost everybody forgot about Otto. But not his friends in the State Department. On November 2 the Archduke arrived in Lisbon, "allegedly" as Frederick Kuh cables PM, "in possession of assurances from the U. S. A. that he would be allowed to return to Austria when that country was freed." It is really touching—this eagerness of our officials in Washington to see that European emigres who desire to return to Europe are given all the necessary facilities. But it would be still more praiseworthy if equal facilities were extended to those who are not of royal blood. While Archduke Otto found it easy to settle the usually complicated problems of exit permits, visas, and transportation, Julius Deutsch, the Austrian Socialist leader, has been waiting for months and months, according to our information, to leave for England. Many well-known anti-Fascist Italians have been denied permission to go back, to say nothing of Spanish Republicans. In order to travel through Allied countries today, a Spaniard must be a pro-Nazi Franco agent, like those who compose the Spanish delegation to the International Aviation Conference in Chicago, and whose presence there has provided one of the motives for Russia's refusal to participate. Yesterday Carol of Rumania; today Otto. Freedom of movement for kings and archdukes, but not for anti-fascists.—The Nation.

MORE EGGS NEXT YEAR

A more bountiful supply of eggs in 1945, at lower retail prices, was promised by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Law and Order for What?

Conflicts now under way in much of liberated Europe between forces of "law and order" on the one hand and various resistance groups on the other present a difficult problem to the Allies. They should serve as a warning of problems that should be avoided inside Germany after victory.

In Belgium, as in Greece, Allied authorities support disarmament of the members of popular resistance movements. Particularly in Belgium, as a field of vital military operations, this is probably unavoidable. The same would hold true if opposition to the Netherlands government should lead to outbreaks.

Yet more than the essential conditions of immediate military operations is involved. Opposition to the Pierlot government of Belgium is strong and is by no means confined to Communists. Similar criticism of Queen Wilhelmina's Dutch government, coupled with cries for "more economic democracy," appears to be widespread. Obviously, it is not the rightful task of the Allies to perpetuate any government in liberated territory; in effect, however, when we enforce law and order as a military necessity, we support the existing government. Nor can popular confidence in Allied motives for this be enhanced by memories of Giraudism in North Africa, Badoglioism in Italy or Mr. Churchill's recidivism for royalism and reaction in other lands.

There can be a great difference when Germany is occupied. "Law and order" will not then be necessary to win battles. Yet it is next to impossible to believe that it would not be basic in any Allied military government. For Army rule is always wedded to it.

That is an important reason why the actual military occupation and government of Germany should not be prolonged beyond the period necessary to disarm the enemy, punish war criminals and set up a working program for detection and control to prevent rearmament. Germany may or may not produce in early years the democratic revolution which must be had if she ever is to be a peaceful country. But prolongation of military government—with or without Robert Murphy as American political adviser—would weight the scales for reactionary forces.—The Chicago Sun.

Man-hours of Work Lost in the Recent Campaign

Now that the election is over and a national leader has been selected by majority decision of all the people (with the exception of those who were barred from voting by sectional prejudice) the entire country can again turn its undivided attention to winning the war. We venture to say that more man-hours of work were lost to the general war effort during the past few months, and particularly during the past few weeks, because of political campaigns—national, state and local—than were lost because of strikes in all the months before, although, happily, it wasn't the workers who took time out to make political hay while the sun shone.

Congress hasn't done a lick of work since the political campaign proper got under way. Most of the forty-eight Governors of our States, together with their deputy State officials, have had little time in recent weeks for anything else but campaign matters, while several of them became virtual strangers in their own home States, so often or so long were they absent therefrom in the interests of their party. Counties lost the services of their top officials, and cities their mayors, for weeks on end as the battle of politics waged fast and furious throughout the length and breadth of the land, and even the Chief Executive of our nation was forced (in self defense) to take an active part in it, though his office carries more of the war burden, measured in terms of immediate responsibility for the prosecution of the war, than any outside the military forces.—The Brewery Worker.

A Clash Between Free Enterprise Nations for a Lucrative Air Roads

By SCOTT NEARING

Great Britain and the USA are the only two powerful countries that will stand for free enterprise and competitive capitalism. They are far from agreement, however, on the way in which free enterprise should operate.

British delegates at the Chicago conference on civil aviation have proposed that the world's most lucrative air routes across the North Atlantic be divided on a 50-50 basis so far as Britain and USA are concerned; that there be established a British and an American private monopoly or cartel and that these cartels reach a working agreement under a competent world air authority. This world authority would be empowered to determine air routes, decide national traffic quotas, supervise rates and administer other matters concerned with air travel. The proposed air authority would have far more control over civil aviation than the existing Universal Postal Union has over the world's postal system. Australian and New Zealand delegations went so far as to propose international ownership of airways.

United States proposals contrasted sharply with those of the British. A. A. Berle jr., chairman of the USA delegation, insisted that: "The US believes in and asserts the rule that each country has a right to maintain sovereignty of the air... There can be no question of alienating or qualifying this sovereignty."

USA therefore proposed a competitive struggle in the realm of civil aviation. Minimum safety regulations and the like Mr. Berle accepted, but on the question of sovereignty he was explicit.

There are two explanations of this clash in attitude between the free enterprise nations. The first is that British capitalism has evolved to a point at which government regulated cartels express the best interests of the businesses concerned. The second and more likely explanation is that British economy can defend its relatively

inferior position as compared with USA by active government backing of private business.

The second explanation is rendered all the more probable by the proposal, broached by Prime Minister Churchill at Quebec, and now under discussion at Washington, to have the US government lend the British government a supply of non-military goods (worth from \$2.5 billion to \$6.5 billion) that the British can sell in their export trade. J. Maynard Keynes, British Treasury advisor, is reported to be heading the British delegation that is carrying on the negotiations for a USA treasury subsidy to British economy.

Whatever the correct explanation of the conflicting points of view, it is increasingly evident that British business is prepared to advocate and accept a large measure of collaboration between government and business, while USA business interests stand for a greater degree of business autonomy and a very high standard of national sovereignty.

5-Cent Cigar Coming Back; But Going to Cost 7 1/2c

Cigar manufacturers have won their "sutdown" strike for higher prices. The Office of Price Administration this week revised ceilings upward. Cigars which formerly sold at 5 cents hereafter will cost 7 1/2 cents, 10-cent cigars will be two for 29 cents, and 25-cent brands sell at two for 65 cents.

The change was necessary, according to Chester Bowles, O. P. A. chieftain, to bring back into the market lower-priced cigars. He contended it would result in a saving to consumers of about \$50,000,000 a year.

Bowles admitted that smokers had been forced to pay 15 cents and over for cigars that formerly were in the low-price range. No one has gone to jail for this robbery.