

THE OMAHA GUIDE

Published Every Saturday at 2418-20 Grant St.
Omaha, Nebraska
Phone WEbster 1517

Entered as Second Class Matter March 15, 1927,
at the Post Office at Omaha, Nebr., under
Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00 PER YEAR

All News Copy of Churches and add Organizations must be in our office not later than 5:00 p. m. Monday for current issue. All Advertising Copy or Paid Articles not later than Wednesday noon, preceding date of issue, to insure publication.

Race prejudice must go. The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man must prevail. These are the only principles which will stand the acid test of good.

James H. Williams & James E. Seay—Linotype operators and Pressmen. Paul Barnett—Foreman.

EDITORIALS

ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

Should the United States be a military participant in the next world war? To that question, going by recent public opinion polls, the American people answer NO by a tremendous majority.

Will the United States be militarily involved in the next world war? To that question, according to the same polls, a small majority of our citizens pessimistically answer YES.

There's no question in the public mind as to who will be the participants in that threatened war—a war that many experts believe will be incredibly destructive and horrible. On one side will be arrayed Germany and Italy. On the other will be Great Britain and France, and a number of minor powers. At the beginning, say the experts, the Axis powers have the edge, due to their superiority in air power. Then, if the war settles down to a slow conflict of attrition, as did the last, the superior resources of the democracies will gradually take command. The reader will notice that Soviet Russia is not mentioned here as a belligerent. She is the question mark. Ideologically she is a natural enemy of the fascists and nazis. But so far she has not definitely responded to suggestions that she pledged herself to aid France and England, and there is a belief in some informed quarters that she hopes to stay out of the next war, so that, once peace comes again, she will dominate Europe.

To go back to this country's part in world affairs, it is apparent now that—whether or not AEF is ever sent to Europe—we are already involved. The Administration has gone about as far as it can in denouncing the dictator nations without completely severing relations. (And in this regard, it should be remembered that the U. S. Ambassador to Germany has been recalled and kept home for some months, as has the German Ambassador to the U. S.) We have thrown the whole weight of our moral influence behind England and France. This Administration is strongly internationalist in character. It is said that the man who has the most influence with the President in determining foreign affairs is Ambassador Bullitt, who is a firm believer in the necessity of internationalism on our part.

The President has said, through his spokesmen in the Congress, that he feels it necessary to change our present neutrality law to allow him to give the democracies immediate economic and material aid (such as munitions, wheat, cotton, etc.) if war comes. Opposing him or the isolationists, led by Senators Borah, Nye, Clark and Johnson, who feel that we should let Europe fight its own battles and go to its own ruin without ruining ourselves in the process. Against this argument is the point, often brought up by Administration men, that a victory in Europe of the Axis powers would probab-

ly be at once followed by a really strong drive on South and Central America—in which case this nation would be open for the first time in its history to territorial attack and potential conquest. Without debating the merits of any of these arguments, it can be said that the President's proposition has an excellent chance to be made into law. Many a conservative in House and Senate, as well as the New Deal "100 per centers" are behind it, in the belief that it represents the lesser of two evils.

It is a question, in the event of war, whether or not we could aid the democracies without aiding them eventually with troops. Past history would seem to answer No. Every expert is convinced that the next war will see incidents affecting American citizens far more important, say, than the sinking of the Lusitania—a bomber, after all, doesn't differentiate between nationalities when it strikes at great cities. If Hitler fulfilled his rumored threat, and sent a gigantic air fleet over Paris and London at the outset of hostilities, our emotions would be stirred to the utmost by the resulting slaughter of non-belligerents. And then, what?

The President's dramatic telegram to Hitler asking him to pledge non-aggression against 31 nations met with thinly veiled derision in Berlin. The dictators are desperate—faced with the most pressing internal problems, they apparently can see no solution save to press on.

From our point of view, there is one bright spot in the international picture—our relations with Japan have steadily improved. Japan, though theoretically a member of the Rome-Berlin axis, seems to be getting farther away from fascism. And, curiously enough, the improved relations largely stemmed from a trivial incident. When the late Japanese Ambassador to the U. S. died suddenly in this country, his ashes were sent home with great formality on an American battleship. The Japanese are the most formal of the world's peoples—and this gesture of goodwill found an immediate response in the Japanese press, and in the feelings of the Niponese.

BUYER'S GUIDE by Clarence H. Peacock

After two years of study, the temporary commission on the "Condition of the Urban Negro Population" of the state of New York, reports to the legislature on their findings. In the summary of their report, they charge wide discrimination of the Negroes of New York numbering 500,000, in the fields of employment, housing, education, recreation and hospitalization.

Because the commission believes this discrimination to have been practiced by local government agencies, and by labor unions, they have proposed fourteen legislative reforms. In a joint statement used in the summary of the report, Senator Schwartzwald who was chairman of the commission, and Assemblyman Andrews, vice chairman said—

"We realize that no successful attacks can be made on the secondary problems of New York's citizens, until the basic handicap of inadequate income is removed. Bad housing, juvenile delinquency, high mortality rates and attendant evils, will continue as long as vast areas of possible and preferred employment are barred to a large percentage of the colored population.

"We realize that there is need for State Wide action beyond what can be accomplished through legislation alone. Laws can set the pattern for

community improvement, but they reach the maximum effectiveness only with the support of an aroused public opinion which understands their importance.

The commission also said "Your commission feels justified in stating that the principle and intention, frequently avowed by the State Government and the people of the State of New York to accord all constituents of the population equal opportunity to share in the rights and privileges of citizenship, have been disregarded by many local government authorities, who have been reluctant to remedy unfavorable conditions which make it impossible for Negroes to share equally such rights and privileges of citizenship.

"Failure of these local government officials to act—and the additional fact that these conditions have State wide implications and seriously affect the general public welfare of the State—makes it imperative that action be taken by the State Legislature—'Legislative action' in the words of His Excellency Governor Lehman, that will give real significance to the declared principle of equal protection of the laws, irrespective of race, creed or color."

The Railroad Omnibus Bill

The so-called Railroad Omnibus Bill (H. R. 4862) which was recently introduced in the House by Representative Clarence F. Lea, marks the first attempt in many years to adequately reform and equalize our transportation policy.

In general, the bill is designed to put into effect the recommendations of the President's Committee of Six, which has made an exhaustive report on the transportation problem. This report met with the almost unqualified support of railroad management and railroad labor. It was widely praised by completely unprejudiced economists and educators, and was generally given the full approval of the press. The Lea bill takes its recommendations, phrases them in legal form, and makes them part of a proposed law whose primary purpose is to place all commercial carriers on an equal footing in order that all may serve the public to the limit of their capabilities.

The bill lays down the principle that all forms of transportation shall be equal in the eyes of the law, and that none shall be favored and none penalized. It provides that all carriers shall charge reasonable rates, and that there shall be no unjust discrimination. It gives the Interstate Commerce Commission power to establish both minimum and maximum rates for all carriers under its jurisdiction. It replaces the present obsolete rate making rule with a new, equitable rule, designed to fit the actual conditions and needs of the present time. Of vital importance, it provides for creation of a Transportation Board which is to review all proposals for water projects before they are submitted to Congress, which is to study the subject of subsidies to various forms of transport, and which is to have authority over certificates of convenience and necessity, etc. It provides for fair tolls on inland waterways, and the discontinuance of that costly white elephant, the Federal Barge Lines.

In reading the Lea Bill, one is impressed by the fact that every conceivable protection is given to the shipping and traveling public, and that all carriers shall be subjected to adequate, sweeping public regulation. There may be differences of opinion as to specific sections of this measure—but it certainly seems as if it marks

a realistic approach to a vital problem, and that Congress should give it immediate attention.

PLAGUE

The Georgia State Senate decisively defeated a bill to levy a punitive tax against the chain stores of the state. During the early stages of the bill's progress toward a vote, it was believed that it would become law. But when this possibility became widely known, manufacturers, farmers, labor union officials, real estate owners and consumers raised so strong a protest that enough Senators switched from their previous position to defeat the bill, 30 to 15.

About the same time a similar bill was beaten in the Kansas legislature.

Looking over this year's legislative sessions in general, it is no exaggeration to say that there is a genuine undercurrent of public resentment against any and all kinds of punitive tax legislation which raises the cost of depressed property and rental values by driving stores out of business, and penalizes the many to benefit the few. In several states strong support has gathered behind movements to repeal laws of this character passed by previous legislatures. In other states, new punitive laws have been buried in conference rooms, due to the fact that there wasn't enough support to bring them to the floor for a vote. In only one state has a new anti-chain law been passed—and in this case, according to observers, the need for additional tax revenue superceded every other consideration.

One interesting phase of the question is that an increasing number of thinking independent store operators have gone on record in opposition to "soaking the chains." These men realize that once the principle of punitive class taxation is firmly established, it will be only a matter of time until their own and other businesses come in for attack. Unfair, unjust taxation is like a disease—unless it is firmly checked in its infancy, it is likely to spread to plague proportions and no one will be safe from its ravages.

SAFETY FIRST

An authority on life insurance observes that during depression, the statistical and analytical sections of the companies' investment departments have been increased, and more and closer attention has been paid to digging out investment possibilities.

The job this industry has done in protecting its policyholders, and at the same time obtaining investments which pay a reasonable rate of return, has been nothing short of miraculous. And it wasn't done by accident. It is the result of expert analysis of the investment field, under management which holds as its cardinal principle that "safety comes first."

That's why, in spite of hard times and ups and downs in the business cycle, your life insurance policy will be paid, in full, on the day it comes due.

"The soi-disant Liberals of today are the people who feel that if they adopt the identical measures and methods used by Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini, the results must be entirely different because of the excellence of their intentions—And it is no use telling the perpetual-motion genius that his machine, whatever it may be, will not work because of friction and the law of conservation of energy—He will only reply happily that in his machine friction is eliminated."—Isabel Paterson.