











## What Attitude on U.N.?

The United States was credited with another "victory" in the United Nations last week. The headlines said: "5 to 4 Vote Clips Wings of U.N. Social Council." Once more our delegation had succeeded in whittling down the prestige of the organization on which millions of Americans pin their faith for peace.

At issue was the case of Yugoslavia's gold. The United States has frozen \$47,000,000 worth of Yugoslav gold on deposit in this country, and Tito's government has been trying to lay hands on it. Yugoslavia asked the U.N. Social and Economic Council to study the case and make a recommendation.

Our government has so far succeeded in blocking such a study. Apparently it does not want to run the risk of being on the losing end of a U.N. decision.

Who is right and who is wrong in the gold dispute may be a relatively minor point, but Americans who believe in the U.N. can only deplore our State Department's constant effort to narrow, rather than broaden, the U.N.'s scope and jurisdiction.

In the Palestine case we are pursuing a policy which tends to minimize the standing of recommendations by the General Assembly. The Assembly, we say, can only recommend. That is true, but when the Security Council is asked to accept the Assembly recommendations, our delegation raises manifold constitutional doubts and legal niceties.

Now we carry this process one step further in the Social and Economic Council, which was established to deal with international problems in the economic and social field. Under the charter the Council has power to "make recommendations to the General Assembly, to the MEMBERS of the United Nations" and to U.N. specialized agencies.

Our Government claims that the council can recommend to all or several member nations, but not to a SINGLE MEMBER nation. The U.N. legal staff offered a contrary interpretation, but our American representatives refused to take that view of it. So far they have succeeded in narrowing the interpretation of the Council's powers.

The unhappy truth seems to be that the policy-makers in Washington are willing to use the U.N. when our strictly national interests can be advanced, but determined to restrict it when some temporary advantage can thus be served.

In this attitude the administration is far behind public opinion. A recent Roper poll shows that 55 per cent of the people of our country think we should continue to count on the U.N. and do everything possible to make it work. Another 20 per cent believe that we should go farther in the direction of converting U.N. into a world government.

That is a total of 75 per cent in favor of a positive INTERNATIONAL policy. When the administration uses U.N. only as a vehicle for NATIONAL policy, it is ignoring the plain wishes of the people.

American constitutional history has been marked by a struggle between narrow and broad constructionists. On the whole, the strict constructionists have been those who wanted to block the development of a strong and flexible union, and history has repudiated them.

Today the U.N. faces a similar struggle. Our government seems to lean toward the side which would prevent development of the organization into a strong and flexible organ of international policy. If that is where the administration stands, the people have not willed it so.—Chicago Sun and Times.

## Henry Wallace and Glen H. Taylor Will Appear at Chicago Stadium April 10

Senator Glen H. Taylor of Idaho will join Henry A. Wallace on the platform of the Chicago Stadium Rally, April 10, the Progressive Party announced.

This will be Senator Taylor's first appearance in Chicago since announcement that he would cast his lot with Henry Wallace in his campaign for the presidency on a program of peace and security.

Citing reports of crowd's at Wallace's Minnesota speaking tour, the Progressive Party is looking forward to a repetition of the political phenomenon last year. At that time more than 21,000 people packed the Stadium and paid admission to hear Wallace report on conditions in Europe.

The Stadium Rally is being sponsored under the auspices of the National Wallace for President Committee and the Progressive Party in Illinois.

Winner of the contest to find a dynamic slogan for the Progressive Party will be introduced to Henry Wallace during the weekend of April 10.

Tickets for the Rally have been selling fast at prices from 60c to \$3. Some are still available at the Progressive Party Headquarters, 112 E. Walton St., SUPERior 7035.

## 'Industry Boosts Prices \$2 for Every \$1 Rise in Wages

Industries which boost prices unconsciously and then try to "pass the buck" to labor were denounced by Senator Wayne L. Morse, progressive Oregon Republican.

"There hasn't been a substantial wage increase in any basic industry in this country, in which the industry did not raise at least twice the amount needed to meet the wage advances," Morse declared.

If Congress doesn't take drastic steps to hold prices down, then labor will be fully justified in demanding further wage adjustments, he said.

"You cannot expect workers in this country to continue along on wage scales that don't meet their living needs," Morse added.

The Oregon senator also came out with a new blast against the Taft-Hartley Act as a "legal monstrosity."

"Millions of dollars are being spent in propaganda to convince the American worker that the Taft-Hartley Act does not destroy or injure any of his legitimate rights," Morse said.

"However, the propaganda is not fooling the workers because they are already beginning to experience the injustices of the law, including its return to government by injunction."

## Don't Forget Housewife in "Oleo" Fight

This newspaper has always been friendly to all farmers, and certainly has no reason to side with one group of them against another.

Now, however, when the House Agriculture Committee will soon begin hearings on the bill to lower barriers against use of oleomargarine LABOR would like to say this:

Only very strong reasons could justify continuance of the special taxes on "oleo," and the law that makes busy housewives waste time and effort mixing yellow color in to it.

Unless convincing reasons can be produced—and we have not seen them yet—both butter and "oleo" should have "a fair field and no favor," with no artificial handicaps on either.

The big dairy interests and farmers who produce milk are on one side. On the other are "oleo" manufacturers and farmers who raise the crops from which that product is made—soybeans and cotton seed.

In between are millions of workers and other people who need to save every cent they can in these days of high prices. Their interests should receive serious consideration.

## THE MARCH OF LABOR



## Broadcasters Demand "More Freedom"

Should the owners of broadcasting stations be permitted to "editorialize"? That subject is now being discussed by the Federal Communications Commission. The broadcasters are indulging in the old twaddle about "freedom of speech." Nothing like that is involved in this controversy.

A broadcasting station is a public utility, using the people's property without paying a "thin dime" for it. Among other things, the broadcasters carry news to those who listen in. They should present the undiluted facts and permit people to do their own "editorializing."

The broadcasters resent "regulation." They demand "a free hand." Because they can employ lobbyists and because most of the big newspapers own broadcasting stations, they get almost anything they ask.

We hope this time the Commission will put its foot down, cut out "editorializing," which is only another name for propaganda, and also lay down the law on another point. When controversial questions are being discussed, the "other side" should be given a chance to reply. If that isn't done, then the man with the longest purse will have an unfair advantage.—Labor.

## REFLECTIONS

By Raymond S. Hofses

Herewith submitted is a statement attributed by Federated Press to Sen. Glen Taylor, vice presidential candidate on the Henry Wallace ticket:

"You've got to believe it's possible to cooperate with Russia or just give up and accept the end of the world."

Is it as bad as that? If the "end of the world" is not to be taken as an absolutely literal alternative, perhaps it is. For inability to cooperate must eventually either lead to war or compel a capitalist United States to isolate itself from Europe. And either course is going to jar our economy so hard that the world Americans now know about will cease to exist.

This is not a Wallace and Taylor column. Nevertheless, it would be foolish not to view realistically what now is and promises to continue to be an established fact. Certainly the United States will have to do SOMETHING about the circumstance that the spread of Russian influence and power throughout Europe is closing a large section of the world against economic practices that are normal and necessary to a capitalistic nation.

Well, what does the dominant class—the capitalists who call the tune—propose? Do the policy-makers of our nation want to turn back the Soviets with atom bombs? Evidently not now. On the contrary, they are accepting a "Marshall Plan" that is completely out of keeping with the "good business" principles upon which a private-profit economy must be based. It isn't good business to give wealth for nothing; it is a sign of desperation when capitalists do that. Socialists can and do accept the Marshall Plan without revising any of their basic economic or social theories. But when capitalists go along with a program for pouring billions into other nations without even presenting a bill they are embarking upon a way of life that, carried far enough, is certain to bankrupt their system and compel the acceptance of new standards of social conduct.

RULE OUT WAR as a solution to the Russian problem, and then ponder the question of how American surpluses can be profitably disposed of in a "free" market.

Who will be the customers? Certainly not a communized Europe with which America finds it impossible to cooperate.

And will the American people be their own customers? Will the workers of this country be permitted to enjoy the full fruits of their labor? Will production be planned to meet our peaceful needs and maintain high living levels?

Desirable as that would be, there is nothing on the record to indicate that the owner-employer class, as represented by the National Association of Manufacturers, will either initiate or accept so radical a change in economic customs—at least not without demanding that the working people sacrifice freedom and surrender full power of economic control to a class of economic royalists.

## Hugh Increases Over 1929

Why Are Meats Skyhigh? Read These Profit Figures

This may explain why housewives pay through the nose at the nation's meat counters.

The magazine "Business Week," which can hardly be accused of unfairness to corporations, reveals that the "big four" meat packers in 1947 rolled up profits ranging from 150 to 550 per cent higher than in the boom year of 1929.

Here are the figures: Armour's, profits up from \$4,970,000 to \$30,950,000; Cudahy, from \$2,513,000 to \$7,122,000; Wilson's from \$2,305,000 to \$15,449,000, and Swift's from \$13,077,000 to \$22,335,000.

There's a "joker" in the Swift's 1947 figure. "Business Week" lets it be known. It doesn't include a \$12,000,000 special reserve set aside to cover "high costs of additions to fixed assets."

It takes \$824 to buy now what \$500 bought in 1939, according to the U.S. Treasury.

## We See by The Papers . . .

Harold Moseley, owner of a Louisville, Ky., auto repair shop, ran a help-wanted ad in the Courier-Journal of that city for automobile metal men, "preferably drunks."

He told inquiring reporters his ad meant just what it said. "Alcoholics do better work and they do it quicker," he explained. "Of course," he said, "the men aren't drunk when they work. They stay sober and work for about three weeks, then they go out on a bender for about a week, then come back to work."

In his ad, Moseley said that men hired would be paid after each job "in cash or whiskey, so if you feel you need to go on a 'between-the-job' spree, you will have all that is necessary."

The New York State Labor Relations Board has issued an order for an election "by secret ballot among the employees" of a Bronx apartment house.

The only oddity in this is that the said employees consist of one man and his wife, who will vote on what union they want to represent them in future collective bargaining negotiations.

Converting the building and construction industry from the closed shop, now illegal under the Taft-Hartley Law, to the union shop, permitted by T-H, is going to cost us US taxpayers between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000, official sources estimate. And this is not counting what the contractors and unions will have to spend in the process.

More than 10,000 of these elections will be held on an area basis this year, as the closed shop pacts expire. Results of these elections are conceded—the unions will win throughout—but under the T-H Law the conversion from closed to union shop must be formalized and legalized and the only way this can be done is by NLRB elections.

The Senate War Investigating Committee revealed recently that Standard Oil Co. of California was advised in 1940 by an official of two of its foreign subsidiaries to be pro-Japanese in order to maintain "very large business" with Japan.

The official, James A. Moffet, wrote that the company he headed, Caltex Oil Co., was, however, "pro-English from the standpoint of the war." While the parent company, Standard Oil, was to be pro-Japanese, Moffet explained, "Caltex must really be anti-Japanese because we have a large business in China, and our main business is in the British Empire, which must be anti-Japanese at this time."

One of those win, place or show deals that just couldn't fail.

According to a textile trade paper, Daily News Record, Joe Rothschild, manager of a Wisconsin department store, told a Ft. Atkinson, Wisconsin, Junior of Commerce meeting that "the public are just plain suckers and are compounding a felony" by paying present exorbitant prices.

"We're in the midst of the greatest 'sucker market' the world has ever known," he declared. "It's also the period of greatest prosperity in history. Wages are high, but the people aren't getting anything for their money."

His advice? Complain about high prices every time you go into a store to buy anything. Yell your head off, he says, and finally maybe big business and big industry will get the idea the people don't like it.

## People Do It!

(HENRY JONES in "Industrial Worker")

"IT'S AN ILL-WIND that blows no one good." The Army announces that because of Russian recent squeeze-plays, it will try to get more food for German workers to ward off the perils of communism.

YOUR PERSONAL PRIVACY: Wisconsin citizens trying to avoid a sales tax on cigarettes ordered them by mail from out of state. Now they get bills for the tax plus a 15 per cent penalty. The state has been given records of all such purchases that were viewed as

## America Can 'Afford It' If It's Essential To the Well-Being of Our People

Reports on Hospitals, Schools, Rural Electrification, Show Some of Our Needs; Let's Ignore Pessimists and Push Forward! Suppose, for just a minute, we stop trying to settle other nations' problems and take a look at a few things that need fixing in our own country. Three remarkable documents provide examples.

First, a hospital "survey" made by the New York "Times." That paper did a fine job; all the more impressive because the "Times" cannot be called a radical critic of "the American way of life."

Of the 145,000,000 men, women and children in the United States, 15,000,000, or about one in each 10, entered hospitals as patients last year. The "Times" found. That gives some idea of the importance of hospitals to our people.

Of the 15,000,000, over 9,000,000 were cared for in hospitals supported by "churches, fraternal and racial groups, and philanthropists."

These hospitals, on which more than half of all patients depend, are "going broke" because of rising prices and costs.

As a result, many people who need hospital care; but cannot afford it or get it in hospitals maintained by cities or other government units, will have to get along without it—in the richest country in the world. That means despair and even death for the sick poor.

Moreover, we need many more hospitals, and many of those we do have are ancient, obsolete, should be torn down and replaced.

Second, two members of Congress pointed out that, while Uncle Sam is sending billions of dollars abroad, he is cutting down on the comparatively small sums needed for "Rural Electrification."

So millions of farmers and their wives become toil-worn for lack of "electrical servants," and their children try to read and study by dim oil lamps of a bygone age.

Third, and perhaps most impressive of all, a report on the needs of the nation's schools.

More than 12,000 school superintendents and teachers, assembled in convention, approved in spring proposals, among them these:

Replace present ramshackle old buildings, and huge overcrowded ones with "schools of the future." Each of these would "be planned for not more than 500 children," would have modern equipment, and "a library open every day of the year," and an adequate playground. In addition, each school would have a summer camp for its children.

Schools would be open 12 months a year, instead of closed three months in summer. "Every day would be promotion day. When a child is ready to move to a higher grade, he should be permitted to do so."

Teaching would be made "a real career," by paying teachers more and picking the best ones, and sending about 2,000,000 more children to school.

The present cost of the schools is \$2 billion a year. The proposed program would add another \$2 billion.

That is much less than the \$3 billion a year the army is asking for peacetime conscription. It is only one-tenth the \$20 billion annually we are spending for "national defense" and "security," and is a small amount in comparison with the billions we are sending abroad.

America is rich enough to afford what is good for its people. Don't forget that when you hear some one complaining that up-to-date schools and hospitals, electricity for the farm, and other modern conveniences "will cost too much."—Labor, Washington, D. C.

strictly personal transactions.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE: In Georgia the tax collector or county registrar decides whether applicants for votes are of good character and whether they understand the constitution properly. If they don't pass, they don't vote; and while the law says nothing about color discrimination, the decisions seem to correspond to the amount of pigmentation in the hide.

MARRYING AMERICA — Who said the family was going to pieces? We're more of a marrying nation than ever. Census says that 66.2 per cent of the eligible 52,350,000 males are married compared with a mere 59.7 per cent in 1940, and that 64.2 per cent of the 54,806,000 more or less marriageable females are married, though they scored only 59.5 per cent before the war. (That works out to half a million more married females than married males, but you figure that one out.) The big boost was in the age group of 20-29 years, where the percentage of married people jumped from 54 per cent to 63 per cent. Another oddity: the census points out that most of the higher educated males are domesticated but that most of the higher educated females are single. Could it be that with budget and similar troubles as they are that it's a bright idea for a man to get his socks darned at home, but a sort of dumb arrangement for the woman?

There is still much the monkeys have to learn about this system—taxation for example, and inflation, or does anyone know what it is, or rather why it is?

How about an experiment in which the monkeys are placed on an island where there is more than enough for all to eat? What would the monkeys do? Our guess is that they would settle down to a happy life of abundance for all. They wouldn't bother about "mediums of exchange." They wouldn't worry about wages or profits.

Now, contrast that to the system man has evolved for himself in a world where we could produce enough for all but where only a small minority lives in abundance.—Industrialist.

Interest rates in St. Louis for negro realty loans are 6 per cent, whereas white loans can be obtained at 4½ per cent.