

EDITORIALS

THE OMAHA GUIDE

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION \$2.50 Per Year

All News Copy of Churches and 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 time.

James H. Williams, James E. Seay, Linotype Operators and Pressmen
Paul Barnett, Foreman

Published every Saturday at 2418-20 Grant Street, Omaha, Nebraska—Phone WE. 1517
Entered as 2nd Class Matter March 15, 1927 at the Post Office at Omaha, Nebr., under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Soviet Parliament Outlaws Barring of Vote to Any Race

By Austin Worth, Moscow Correspondent CNA,

MOSCOW, USSR—(By Airmail)

—The recently held second session of the Supreme Soviet of Sussian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR), one of the eleven republics without the curse of racial prejudice comprising the Soviet Union, adopted unanimously its election rules which the franchise and election democracy on a scale and equality such as the Negro people everywhere have long dream of but never achieved.

Neither race or color, creed nor education, possessions nor social descent can stand in the way to disfranchise a citizen of the RSFSR, who is also at the same time a citizen of the RSFSR under the election rules. Thus, a citizen here is doubly guaranteed the franchise, that is, by the election laws of the USSR and by the separate election rules of the FSFSR.

The forthcoming general elections in the FSFSR this coming fall will be such a mass turnout of citizens—black and white, yellow and brown—as Ga. and Arkansas, Miss. and Fla. and the rest of the Bible Belt find impossible under their bourbon-landlord rule.

—No Place for Ku Klux Klan

It was during just an election as the forthcoming one is expected to be that the American Negro worker, Robert Robinson, was elected by the people as one of their deputies in the Moscow Soviet, highest governing organ of the city of Moscow, capital of one sixth of the earth. Paul Robeson has declared himself so delighted with all-round Soviet democracy, politically socially and economically—that he wants his son to be educated and grow up under such a system.

The Ku Klux Klan and all of its cohorts would soon find themselves behind the bars under the RSFSR election rules. For here is what the election laws declares (and enforces):

"Any person who by violence, fraud, intimidation, or bribery, hinders a citizen of the RSFSR in the exercise of his rights to elect and be elected," faces a term of imprisonment up to two years.

There are no loopholes or subterfuges in this law, no way to beat round the bush or raise "Grandfather Clauses," etc., to deprive citizens of their birthright and citizen rights. In this respect the election rules lay down the inviolable law that "All citizens of the RSFSR who have reached the age of 18, irrespective of race, nationality religion, standard of education, domicile, social reign, property status or past activity" as the right to vote and be elected, and no power, individual or group of individuals can deprive him of this right.

Oppression Abolished

About the closest approach that the American Negro people have ever made to the franchise democracy universally existing in Soviet Russia was

during the Reconstruction period, when Negroes sat in the Southern state legislatures, had their own armed people's militia, and gave the South its first public school education system.

How comes it, then, that more than three-fourths of a century later the huge RSFSR, sprawling over vast stretches of Europe and Asia and with a population of colors in excess of 60 millions, can put the vote into the hand of every citizen, as well as social and economic equality?

The answer seems not far to seek. Primarily, it is that oppression of races and exploitation of man by man has been abolished, there are no possessing and nonpossessing class, and equality of all rights have been granted to all citizens without any distinctions, racial or otherwise.

HEADACHES FOR THE TAXPAYER

The American public is, unknowingly, being taxed gigantic sums of money annually as a result of our haphazard transportation policies.

That is the opinion of M. J. Gormley of the Association of American Railroads, who points out that, according to a recent authoritative survey, highway transportation was subsidized to the tune of \$10,000,000,000 between 1921 and 1932—and that it is reliably estimated another \$3,000,000,000 has been donated by general taxpayers since then, and the subsidy is now about \$680,000,000 per year, which is the amount in excess of what motor vehicles pay.

Another survey indicates that, on the basis of 1929 tonnage, it costs the taxpayers of this country \$4.50 for every ton of freight moved on the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to the mouth.

A report of the National Resources Committee found, on the basis of 1928-29 tonnage, that the taxpayers were subsidizing shippers on the Lower Mississippi River to the extent of about nine mills per ton mile.

What this amounts to is that apparent differentials between railway rates and the rates charged by other carriers, are usually a delusion. The lower rates charged by the latter are made possible only by handsome subsidies—which all of us are taxed to contribute.

As Mr. Gormley says, "There is no economic health or vigor in such a policy." What we need today is a cohesive transportation policy under which all carriers will stand on their own feet, all be subjected to fair regulation all pay their own way. Any other course spells continued chaos in transportation—and more unnecessary headaches for taxpayers.

HELPING WITH PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

If for no other reason than the fact that they are the promoters of nationwide "producer-consumer" campaigns, the retail chain stores are entitled to an established niche in the economic structure of the nation.

Since the food chains inaugurated this organized plan of agricultural assistance three years ago, more than 65 campaigns & promotions have been conducted. On a number of these, figures are available with which to measure concrete results. They indicate startling and gratifying success. For example, a national beef campaign in 1936 brought a 34% increase in beef sales over a comparable period in 1935. Large percentages increases in sales were reported for similar campaigns in grapefruit (274%, lamb (42 percent), apples (46 percent), eggs (16 percent), beans (45 percent), oranges (64 percent), dairy products and other citrus fruits.

In the face of demonstrable proof of this kind, of the economic value of mass merchandising, it is hard to see how politicians and short-sighted business men will be able to talk the public into condemning the chains to death with "chain store taxes" and other forms of punitive legislation. Even now the tide appears to be turning. And undoubtedly if given a fair opportunity, mass merchandising will do still more in the future to ameliorate the evils of farm surpluses.

THE PLIGHT OF WIDOWS

Most of us have seen, in some individual instance, the tragic problem of men grown old without financial resources, and forced to subsist on the bounty of relatives or public charity.

The plight of thousands of widows is equally grave. According to the U. S. Census Bureau, 32 per cent of all the widows in this country must work for a living.

Many of these women once had fine homes. Their husbands earned good salaries, or owned prosperous businesses. But no bulwark was established against the future, and when death came to the wage earner, there was little or nothing left for dependents.

It is an encouraging thing, going by the records of life insurance sales, that more and more men are making sure that their widows may never be in that unhappy position.

"Like it or not, we have got to make the choice between free enterprise and Fascism—or economic planning. Let us revive the capitalistic system by restoring the flow of venture capital through a basic correction of our system of taxation. Let us battle for free enterprise by putting up a real fight for free and open competition. If we are willing to fight not for special privilege but for such objectives, it won't take long to put those ten million back to work, to insure a continuation of the American way of life, and to bring back that singing, surging America that we all love."—Paul G. Hoffman.

SHIRT TAILS

By E. HOFER

ARE Americans irresponsible spendthrifts?

This would appear to be the only logical conclusion to be drawn from the fact that during the past eight years the yearly additions to the public debt have averaged three and a half billion dollars, which is more than the total cost of government in 1929, notwithstanding new and heavy taxation that has been imposed since then. By July 1, 1940, the President estimates that the Federal debt will be \$44,458,000,000, as contrasted to \$16,000,000,000 in 1932. Interest alone on this vast amount now consumes 20 cents of every dollar of tax revenue, or over \$1,000,000,000 a year.

All the flag waving in the universe cannot save a spendthrift nation from revolutionary chaos. And that is something that the general public does not yet seem to realize. Public officials in the nation's capital are now almost helpless to stem the tide of spending, even if they so desired. The desire to stop spending the nation into ruin has got to start at home. Every man and woman must come to realize that the Federal debt is rapidly approaching proportions that threaten the very foundations of individual liberty.

There is no such thing as "free money." As one public official, a United States Senator, recently pointed out: "We get the money from you and you don't get it all back. We take your shirt and give you a little piece

of the shirt tail. Then you go back home waving it and shouting, 'Look what Uncle Sam gave me.'"

"SUPERVISION" SHOULD NOT MEAN MANAGEMENT

One essential of national prosperity, observed a recent economic survey, is the existence of "a private banking system, publicly supervised, operated primarily for the benefit of individuals, industry, commerce and agriculture."

It should be kept in mind that there is a world of difference between government "supervision" of banking and government "control" or management of banking.

Government supervision is proper and necessary. Government "control" of banking, on the other hand, would amount to government control over practically all of the financial resources of America. Every bank account would be more or less the plaything of politics. Immense financial power could be used for political ends and purposes.

Our American private banking system has worked. It has built our industries and homes, and has done much to help give us the highest working and living standards in the world. It has been largely responsible for our world supremacy in every field of commercial endeavor. To weaken banking as a private enterprise is an invitation to disaster. That would place the savings of the American people more and more under the not-so-tender mercies of politicians, few of whom would be employed by a private citizen to invest his savings or manage his business.

NOT FOOLED

The farm marketing cooperatives have been subjected to many attacks. They have been denounced by selfish dealers, who dislike doing business with organizations which can meet them on equal terms in deciding prices. They have been reviled by others with an axe to grind at the farmers' expense.

But the farmer, by and large, has not been fooled. The membership rolls of the marketing co-ops have steadily increased. So has their volume of business. And this has happened because the organizations have produced results. They have broadened and stabilized markets. They have often improved prices. They have helped the consumer, by assuring him of a trustworthy supply of farm products. And they have done invaluable work in improving standards of farm maintenance and operation.

The cooperative marketing movement brings business principles to the craft of agriculture, and provides the eventual solution to many of the farmers' most difficult problems.

Whether taxes are or are not business deterrents depends to a large extent upon whether government activities are necessary activities, whether they are efficiently performed, and whether government policies as a whole are sound. Given a certain amount of revenues to be raised, however, for whatever reason, it is obvious that certain ways of raising them will have a more deterrent effect on business than others. What the present advocates of tax revision are now advocating is merely the adoption of the least harmful ways of raising the existing level of revenues and the repeal of the most harmful ways. That problem should present insuperable difficulties. In fact, there is remarkable agreement among the tax revisionists concerning the necessary program.—New York Times.