

Official organ of the
American Newspaper
Guild, an affiliate of
the American Fed-
eration of Labor.

The Guild Reporter

Entered as second-class matter May 7, 1934, at the Post Office
at New York under the act of March 3, 1879

Published the 1st and
15th of each month
at Guild headquar-
ters, 1560 Broadway,
New York City.

Vol. III. No. 17

NEW YORK, AUGUST 15, 1936

Single Copy 10c; By the Year \$2

News Loss Growing In Milwaukee

**Guild Chart Shows 40 to
100 Percent Drops in
Circulation**

MILWAUKEE, Wisconsin.—On the wall at strike headquarters here there is a large map of the city of Milwaukee. Areas totaling two-thirds of the entire city have been blackened out. These darkened territories represent the districts from which the Wisconsin News has been eliminated from 40 to 100 per cent.

But this does not tell the whole story, because the darkened areas are those in which the Wisconsin News circulation was formerly concentrated. These districts have been gone through with a fine comb drive of the soundtruck cancellation crew and signed cancellations have been obtained from 40 to 90 per cent of the subscribers.

The sections of the map not yet marked are those in which the News has little or no circulation. As the cancellation squads move into these districts the strikers and their helpers find it increasingly difficult to find subscribers.

While the Wisconsin News continues to issue false statements to advertisers concerning circulation, the Guild collects an ever-growing mass of evidence to the effect that the paper is steadily being eliminated as a factor in the daily newspaper field in Milwaukee.

Local Advertising Lost

Advertisers have last awakened to the truth of the situation, and the News constantly loses local space sales. A campaign to secure national advertising to partially compensate for the disastrous loss of local advertising has resulted in some gains in this type of ads.

To combat this campaign, the strike committee last week began to mail a series of letters to national, as well as local, advertisers which will show what a mistake it is, from a purely business point of view, to continue advertising in a paper.

(Continued on page 2)

Send Your Copies of Local Codes

Guild Officers—Send copies of your local constitutions or by-laws to ANG headquarters.

Local constitutions and by-laws are required by the revised ANG Constitution to conform with it and with Convention policies, and are to be examined by the International Executive Board to ascertain that they do. (Article V, Section 3, ANG Constitution.)

To enable this check to be made the Constitution calls upon Guilds to submit their codes to the IEB not later than Oct. 1, 1936, or in the case of new Guilds, not more than two months after they receive their charter.

Please send yours in early!

ANG Headquarters Moved; Here's the New Address

IMPORTANT! Beginning August 15 the address of the international headquarters of the American Newspaper Guild will be 1560 Broadway, New York City.

Board Schedules Meeting Sept. 11-12

The International Executive Board has voted to hold its second regular meeting at ANG headquarters beginning at 10 a. m. Sept. 11 to continue for two days. The board, at its first regular meeting immediately following the Convention, decided that the September meeting should be held at headquarters.

It is expected that all board members will attend, with the exception of Vice-President Ballantine of San Francisco. Those voting in favor of the date for the meeting were: Ashcraft, Homan, Watson, Klyman and Ballantine.

Labor Cordial In Bay State

**Massachusetts Meeting
Welcomes the Guild**

BOSTON.—A close tie between the Newspaper Guilds and printing trades unions of Massachusetts was effected at the 51st annual convention of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor, second largest state branch of the A. F. of L., which ended Aug. 7 at New Bedford. This action was taken after the entire convention went on record backing Guild action and policies.

A committee consisting of officers of each of the printing trades directly employed by the Boston Evening Transcript, including the Guild, was formed and began joint correspondence with William M. Hines, publisher, concerning problems arising from the reorganization of the paper. The paper is "open shop" from roof to cellar.

Hines in his reply to the committee's first telegram said he would meet the group after returning from his vacation Sept. 1. The committee, of which Daniel J. McDonald, secretary of the Boston Allied Printing Trades Council is chairman, accepted the suggested date.

In addition, the Guild obtained unanimous action by the convention on the following points:

1. That action by the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor declaring the Wisconsin News and other Hearst publications were not worthy

(Continued on page 3)

C.I.O. Issue Enters Our A.F.L. Fete

**Green, Bringing Charter,
Hears Broun Demand
Guild Referendum**

The American Newspaper Guild's charter as an international union in the American Federation of Labor, was formally presented by President William Green at an open meeting of the Guild's International Executive Board in New York City on Aug. 7. At the conclusion of his formal presentation he discussed the "family difficulties" in the House of Labor, attacking indirectly the Committee for Industrial Organization on the charges of creating a dual movement and of failing to abide by decisions democratically made.

Hardly had Heywood Broun as ANG president received the charter when he brought the storm over the C. I. O. squarely to the Guild's door by announcing that he intended to resign as president the next day and stand for re-election on the issue of affiliating the Guild with the C. I. O.

Postponement Asked

His announcement, completely unexpected, caused a sensation. Carl Randau, president of the New York Guild, immediately asked him to postpone his decision until he had had time to discuss it with the other officers of the Guild, and prolonged applause showed the meeting's approval of this request.

Jonathan Eddy, international executive secretary, when he could at last interrupt the applause, joined in urging an opportunity to talk over the idea, pointing to the meeting's demonstration as evidence of how that audience spoke and adding his belief that he felt for members outside of New York in seconding the plea.

Withdraws Resignation

Broun acquiesced in the delay, though still arguing that a referendum should be held. When the meeting broke up many Guild officers and members surrounded him and urged him to withdraw his project. He at length issued the following statement to the papers:

"After consultation with officers and members of the Guild I have decided to withdraw my idea of resigning as president of the American Newspaper Guild.

"Nevertheless I am anxious to

(Continued on page 3)

Howard Rebuffs Request for Pact; New Drive Begun

**Ohio Guilds Back New York Demand and
Seek Chain Parley—Break Is
Marked by Critical Statements**

The battle to obtain the recognition of the American Newspaper Guild, now an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, by the major newspaper publishers of America, reached the stage of polemics on July 30, with Roy W. Howard, president and editor of the Scripps-Howard New York World-Telegram, and the New York Guild as chief combatants.

On that date the World-Telegram management issued to every member of the staff a detailed statement setting forth the reasons for its refusal to sign an agreement "with any unit of the American Newspaper Guild."

It cited four "principles" allegedly sponsored by the Guild as standing in the way of a contract. These, according to the management's statement are (1) confinement in hiring to a "closed Guild list" (2) "regimentation or even suggestion by the Guild to its members of any political or other dogma" (3) regulation of rates of pay on "rigid quantitative or time basis" and (4) raising the editorial expenses of the World-Telegram above that of its principal competitors.

Singled out for special criticism were the actions of the Guild convention in voting to affiliate with the A. F. of L. and to support independent political action.

Guild Replies

In its reply the Guild disavowed most of the objections on the ground that they were distortions of the Guild's purposes.

The texts of the statement and re-

ply are printed in full in this issue.

It is understood that the management furnished publishers all over the country with a copy of its statement.

On Aug. 2 delegates from eight Scripps-Howard units met in Columbus to discuss the coordination of their collective bargaining activities, and adopted a joint resolution in support of the New York Guild's efforts on behalf of the World-Telegram unit. The eight units represented were Akron, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Columbus, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh, Toledo and Cleveland.

Howard called his statement formally to the attention of the Executive Committee of the New York Guild in a letter dated July 31, and the Guild, viewing as serious the implications of the management's position, drafted a carefully worded reply which it mailed to Howard on Aug. 5.

The management's statement was reproduced complete in Editor & Publisher. Although the statement was issued to the staff only several hours before the deadline of Editor & Publisher, the publishers' organ

(Continued on page 5)

Ohio DC Goes Into Action To Meet Scripps-Howard Issue

CLEVELAND, Ohio.—The Ohio District Council of the ANG is being set in motion by its constituent Guilds to meet the challenge of the Scripps-Howard management, implied in its World-Telegram statement, that Scripps-Howard will not sign contracts with an A. F. of L. union in its editorial rooms.

Scripps-Howard units and executive committees in seven cities of the mid-west are circulating the necessary petitions and voting the enabling legislation to authorize the

DC to negotiate with the general chain management this and certain other major "hurdles," regarded as the present obstacles in the path of successful contract negotiations by individual locals.

At the same time the Ohio DC issued an invitation to all other Scripps units asking them to participate in the projected group negotiations if they thought it advisable.

Met in Columbus

Third Region guildsmen were informed in advance of the forthcoming Telegram statement, and a meeting of Scripps Chain Council and DC members was called in Columbus Aug. 2, two days after its publication in New York.

This meeting informally outlined the course of action and recommended it to the DC.

In attendance were more than 20 DC and Chain Council members and leading Guild officers from: Akron, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh and Toledo.

After thorough discussion of the Telegram statement, a copy of which had been received, and reports on various Scripps bargaining efforts by the locals, it was generally agreed:

Points Agreed On

THAT, issues raised in the publisher's Telegram statement, had to be met by all Scripps units, and THAT, little could be expected of local bargaining with Scripps chain

(Continued on page 4)

Papers Gave Anti-Labor Board Ruling 1428 Inches; Favorable Ruling Got 167

A survey of the comparative amount of space given by newspapers throughout the country to the two most important court decisions yet made on the National Labor Relations Act, one of them unfavorable to the labor board and one favorable, has just been made by a statistical agency whose identity the Guild Reporter is not at liberty to disclose. The survey gives more exact data than the Reporter was able to present in a previous story. Below is the report:

A survey of 400 leading daily newspapers, covering every state in the country, was undertaken for the purpose of comparing the space

given to a story unfavorable to the National Labor Relations Board with a story favorable to that agency.

The unfavorable story was that giving the decision of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals at New Orleans holding that the Board does not have jurisdiction over labor relations in a manufacturing plant. Clippings of the Jones and Laughlin decision were made from 400 final editions dated June 15th and 16th. The favorable story selected was the decision of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals at New York upholding the Board's jurisdiction in the case of the Associated Press. The Courts entering the decisions are of comparable standing, and it may be as-

sumed that both the decisions were of wide public interest.

The results were as follows (measurements expressed in number of inches of single columns, including heads):

Handling of Jones and Laughlin Decision

89 papers carried Associated Press stories, a total of 1,007 inches.

34 papers carried United Press stories, a total of 296 inches.

2 papers carried Universal Service stories, a total of 22 inches.

2 papers carried International News Service stories, a total of 7 inches.

(Continued on page 6)

ADS IN NEWS FALLING OFF

Paper Now Losing Its Delivery Boys Also

MANAGERS GO

(Continued from Page 1) whose prestige and circulation is in process of rapid deterioration. Out in the city's home districts, talking directly to thousands of citizens, the strike committee grew to know the truth about the News. South side sections where before the strike the Milwaukee Journal, rival paper, was unable to get a foothold are now virtually empty of the News. Paper managers in these areas frankly inform the strikers that their cancellation drive has added thousands of lost News subscribers to the Journal's rolls.

It has become so difficult for the News to secure delivery boys that there is a standing offer to carriers of 50 cents for every new delivery boy that they bring to the studio. Carrier strikes have been threatened in recent days in at least two sections of the city. District managers who find themselves going into debt to the News because of lost subscribers and quitting boys, are themselves quitting the paper in increasing numbers.

Hearst's Under Competition

In trying to build up state circulation, the Hearst management has now resorted to selling the paper for three cents a week in at least two cities. In other parts of the state the News is delivered for nine cents a week, with the approval of the Milwaukee Journal.

This unfair competition with local dailies has intensified the antagonism of publishers of daily papers outside Milwaukee toward the Wisconsin News. The result has been a more sympathetic attitude toward the Guild and the strikers and has brought the strike increased publicity in the state.

In Racine, second largest city of the state, the News had made a particularly sustained effort to build up circulation. The city, however, is a strong union center, and the movement has cooperated with the Guild in securing cancellations of the paper. Added to this is the new Guild Educational Forum, broadcasts over the popular Racine radio station, WRLN, owned by the local daily.

Guild Wins Point

Illustrative of the falling prestige of the Wisconsin News in Milwaukee was the failure of its efforts to secure the passage of a city ordinance that would have barred the Guild's sound trucks from the streets. The News was successful in inducing the police department to sponsor the ordinance. Meeting defeat in common council committee, the police re-introduced the ordinance a few days later, only to have it once more rejected on a technicality.

A letter sent some weeks ago to all locals of the Motion Picture Operators union continues to bring in strike contributions. A similar letter sent to hundreds of locals in the San Francisco Bay area has brought similar results.

At a general meeting of the Milwaukee Guild Sunday three delegates were elected to the Milwaukee Federated Trades Council. They were George Mann, president of the Guild; Bert L. Langendorf, striking make-up editor of the News; and Gunner Mickelson.

The same three had previously been appointed temporary delegates by the Guild council. We heard pending the general election. When the three delegates appeared at a council meeting Wednesday, they learned that the council's executive board had withheld seating on a technicality. Trade union delegates at the council meeting said that they were amazed at this action.

Firing of 4 Men Greets New Guild

A new Guild in Peoria, Ill., has just had a baptism of fire. Eleven members of the staff of the Peoria Journal-Tribune paid initiation fees and two months' dues at an organization meeting on Aug. 6, when the Guild was formally organized with the assistance of National Organizer Bill Davis.

The next morning a telegram arrived at headquarters stating that four men had been summarily discharged.

No further word had been received as this issue went to press.

Firing Line

Labor Heads Rally to Milwaukee Call

Twenty-four prominent labor leaders, including 11 presidents of state federations of labor, have agreed to serve on the Citizens Committee in Support of the Milwaukee News Strike, responding to an appeal made by Heywood Brown. Without exception the letters of acceptance urged labor as a whole to support the strike.

"The fight that the Newspaper Guild is putting up against the Hearst newspaper interests in Milwaukee, for the principle of collective bargaining is a righteous cause," wrote E. M. Nichols, secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor, "and deserves the support of the entire labor movement of this country, and the men and women who are making the fight on the firing line in Milwaukee must be financed and kept on the job until it is settled to the complete satisfaction of the American Newspaper Guild."

A. V. Lund, president of the Idaho State Federation of Labor wrote: "In my opinion the entire labor movement should realize that your movement is not only for the editorial workers, but for the public in general and the labor movement in particular."

Several also contributed to the Citizens Committee's fund. James Maloney, president of the Glass Bottle Blowers Association, and Frank Heffley, president of the Colorado State Federation of Labor, and also of District No. 15 of the United Mine Workers, each sent \$25 on behalf of their union funds. Others, including M. F. Tigh, head of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, and John C. Lawson, president of the Vermont Federation of Labor, made individual contributions.

Other presidents of state federations of labor responding were: Wendell C. Weston, Florida; Carl H. Mullon, Indiana; Thomas Crowe, Kansas; T. E. Cunningham, Minnesota; James D. Graham, Montana; Louis Marcante, New Jersey; George

AP APPEALS COURT RULE

Taking Watson Case To Supreme Bench For Review

FIRST TEST OF ACT

The case of Morris Watson, ANG vice-president seeking reinstatement on the staff of the Associated Press under the National Labor Relations Act, appears to be headed for the United States Supreme Court to become the first test of the act's constitutionality.

The Associated Press, defeated when the Circuit Court of Appeals in New York City on July 13 upheld the act and sustained the order of the National Labor Relations Board, has obtained a stay of execution from the court pending application for writ of certiorari for review by the highest bench.

The stay, issued late last month, for a review of other cases in which the act has been applied, has since it won a sweeping victory in the Watson case, is expected to well support the act.

The Labor Board has not asked for a review of other cases in which the act has been applied, and since it won a sweeping victory in the Watson case, is expected to well support the act.

The IEB had requested an opportunity to discuss the restoration of the five-day week in the New York office of the press service in accordance with the wishes of the staff and after the Guild had been chosen as the bargaining representative in an election held by the labor board.

Meany, New York, and Joseph Rosino, Virginia.

Presidents of unions who responded include: A. F. Whitley, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen; A. O. Wharton, International Association of Marine, Ship and Shipworkers; E. E. Van Horn, Clear Makers International; John P. Burke, Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers; W. W. Britton, Retail Pollsters International; Edward Fiere, Hotel and Restaurant Employees International; William J. McSorley, Wood, Wire and Metal Lathers; Harvey C. Freeman, Oil Field, Gas Well and Refinery Workers; M. S. Warfield, Order of Sleeping Car Conductors.

At the same time, with these fresh evidences of vitality and growth, comes evidence which has convinced some international officers that the publishing interests are forming a more united front than ever before in opposition to the Guild. They hold that a strike on far larger proportions than any yet undertaken by us will be the inevitable outcome.

If this be so, one thing is certain; and that is that we must not trifle our strength away in ill-conceived actions. This brings us down to a fundamental of organization which is easily lost sight of in the round of local and district Guild activities. That fundamental is the unit and the local Guild itself. A paid-up membership of 80 to 100 per cent is the prime requisite of strength. Perhaps this is a tiresome banality but it must be repeated again and again: a unit that has not learned to maintain organizational discipline on the simple elemental of dues has no spine or strength as a collective group. The books are an unflinching guide as to whether the officers and members take their organization seriously. If they don't take it seriously enough to attend properly to this constant essential of union organization, it is a foregone conclusion that they will split into dissident and impotent little cliques upon the first cape reply of the publisher to collective bargaining overtures.

Guild units that cannot build up a sweeping majority in the shop and have not established the ability to keep it together in simple organizational discipline over many months, should think twice before they attempt collective bargaining. The objectives of the labor movement, the ANG, and each local unit are not attained by impatient bravado, but by patient painstaking education of the members and prospective members, leading to discipline, confidence, strength.

Great vistas open out to ANG, to the newspapermen and women of this country, today, and greater barriers than ever are perhaps being erected. The period for fanfare is passing. Our motto in reaching our goals should be as never before that of thoughtful painstaking building. We must build our numbers, our understanding, and above all, our discipline.

The ANG Convention voted to place national advertisers continuing to advertise in the Hearst Wisconsin News on the Guild's unfair list. Write, and ask your friends to write, to as many of these as possible, telling them that you will not patronize their products as long as they support the Hearst management in its refusal to acknowledge the right of editorial workers to bargain collectively.

Below are the principal ones, with the addresses of their headquarters. Write, and ask your friends to write, to as many of these as possible, telling them that you will not patronize their products as long as they support the Hearst management in its refusal to acknowledge the right of editorial workers to bargain collectively.

Below are the principal ones, with the addresses of their headquarters. Write, and ask your friends to write, to as many of these as possible, telling them that you will not patronize their products as long as they support the Hearst management in its refusal to acknowledge the right of editorial workers to bargain collectively.

Below are the principal ones, with the addresses of their headquarters. Write, and ask your friends to write, to as many of these as possible, telling them that you will not patronize their products as long as they support the Hearst management in its refusal to acknowledge the right of editorial workers to bargain collectively.

Below are the principal ones, with the addresses of their headquarters. Write, and ask your friends to write, to as many of these as possible, telling them that you will not patronize their products as long as they support the Hearst management in its refusal to acknowledge the right of editorial workers to bargain collectively.

BUILDING

Increased Functions Force ANG to Move—Work Needed in Units

By JONATHAN EDDY

THE first office of ANG was 189 square feet down on Forty-second Street, and was shared with the New York Guild. After the latter had called the conference in December, 1933, to found ANG, it was rewarded by four might have an entire office for itself. We had to have it.

Despite this, only a few months passed before ANG had to rent 200 additional square feet. By the Fall of 1934, what with the Gums Rarvotras and the increased functions and services of the national, our headquarters again became a crowded little madhouse with everyone tripping over everyone else.

To save money for both, ANG entered on a share arrangement with the New York Guild and took 800 square feet here on Forty-fifth Street.

We thought we were all set but only a few months passed before people were again waiting turns at typewriter desks and three committees were trying to meet in the same room. In the Fall of last year, the New York Guild moved out.

Now we are in the course of the same routine again and indeed we cannot find adequate space in this building. We have just signed a new lease and hereafter visiting Guildmen will find their headquarters in Times Square. We have taken 1,100 feet at 1560 Broadway, near Forty-sixth Street (add at a savings in rent). If anyone starts that line about "There isn't enough room to turn around here" again within the next two years, he had better smile when he does it!

Secretary's Duties Change

I AM beginning to wonder if the title of my secretary ought to be "corresponding" rather than "executive." What I need is a dictaphone instead of a fat cigar. (Not that anyone has yet come across with the stogie.) Maybe it's our having become an international union that does it, but the fact is that the whole floor about the entrance is littered with letters when the office is opened in the morning. And with appalling regularity throughout the day the postman comes in with fresh batches. Never a day without its quota of telegrams, all expecting telegraphic replies.

There is a difference not only in amount but in content between our correspondence of today and of some time back. It used to be largely theoretical in nature, there seemed to be no terrific urgency. But today, upon reading most of the letters that come in here, you feel that lack of a prompt reply will actually handicap the serious practical concerns of distant groups of Guild members and others.

Districts Want Paid Organizers

THE demands for organizers continues to grow, and the IEB is moving as fast as it can to make them available. One district has already stated it will have \$500 available by the first of October and asks that the international match that amount, so as to make a full time organizer, possibly one from ANG, available for a definite period. Another large district is making similar action. By mid-autumn we should be moving fast.

At the same time, with these fresh evidences of vitality and growth, comes evidence which has convinced some international officers that the publishing interests are forming a more united front than ever before in opposition to the Guild. They hold that a strike on far larger proportions than any yet undertaken by us will be the inevitable outcome.

If this be so, one thing is certain; and that is that we must not trifle our strength away in ill-conceived actions. This brings us down to a fundamental of organization which is easily lost sight of in the round of local and district Guild activities. That fundamental is the unit and the local Guild itself. A paid-up membership of 80 to 100 per cent is the prime requisite of strength. Perhaps this is a tiresome banality but it must be repeated again and again: a unit that has not learned to maintain organizational discipline on the simple elemental of dues has no spine or strength as a collective group. The books are an unflinching guide as to whether the officers and members take their organization seriously. If they don't take it seriously enough to attend properly to this constant essential of union organization, it is a foregone conclusion that they will split into dissident and impotent little cliques upon the first cape reply of the publisher to collective bargaining overtures.

Guild units that cannot build up a sweeping majority in the shop and have not established the ability to keep it together in simple organizational discipline over many months, should think twice before they attempt collective bargaining. The objectives of the labor movement, the ANG, and each local unit are not attained by impatient bravado, but by patient painstaking education of the members and prospective members, leading to discipline, confidence, strength.

Great vistas open out to ANG, to the newspapermen and women of this country, today, and greater barriers than ever are perhaps being erected. The period for fanfare is passing. Our motto in reaching our goals should be as never before that of thoughtful painstaking building. We must build our numbers, our understanding, and above all, our discipline.

The ANG Convention voted to place national advertisers continuing to advertise in the Hearst Wisconsin News on the Guild's unfair list. Write, and ask your friends to write, to as many of these as possible, telling them that you will not patronize their products as long as they support the Hearst management in its refusal to acknowledge the right of editorial workers to bargain collectively.

Below are the principal ones, with the addresses of their headquarters. Write, and ask your friends to write, to as many of these as possible, telling them that you will not patronize their products as long as they support the Hearst management in its refusal to acknowledge the right of editorial workers to bargain collectively.

Below are the principal ones, with the addresses of their headquarters. Write, and ask your friends to write, to as many of these as possible, telling them that you will not patronize their products as long as they support the Hearst management in its refusal to acknowledge the right of editorial workers to bargain collectively.

Below are the principal ones, with the addresses of their headquarters. Write, and ask your friends to write, to as many of these as possible, telling them that you will not patronize their products as long as they support the Hearst management in its refusal to acknowledge the right of editorial workers to bargain collectively.

CHARTER ARRIVES

Green, Presenting It, Hears Plea by Brown for Guild Referendum on C. I. O.

(Continued from Page 1)

the Guild consider the problem of the C. I. O. and declare its intentions so as to be ready for any possibility.

Of course, the Guild wants a strong and united labor movement, and one that will bring peace and progress.

In the course of his speech Brown had revealed that he had previously consulted John L. Lewis, chairman of the C. I. O., about his step and Lewis had told him, "Keep your shirt on."

Three days later, on Aug. 10, he attended a meeting of the C. I. O. and at the end of it the announcement was made that he had been appointed to that body. He joined as an individual.

John C. I. O.

"Of course," he was quoted as saying, "by joining the C. I. O. I am intended to bring about speedy referendum of the entire membership of the Guild. I hope and believe that the Guild membership will support me in declaring adherence to the principles and leadership of the C. I. O."

The International Executive Board of the Guild is empowered to submit questions to referenda. The Board has just voted to meet on Sept. 11 and 12—a decision made in line with its duty of meeting quarterly, and not precipitated by the new union.

Three other Federation officials in addition to Green were present at the IEB meeting when the charter was presented, and while welcoming the Guild into the local and state bodies, showed their sentiments about holding a referendum on the basis of Brown's resignation.

They were: Joseph P. Ryan, president of the Central Trades and Labor Council of New York City, who pointed out that a referendum in which Brown's popularity was the real issue would not test sentiment regarding the C. I. O.; George Meany, president of the New York State Federation of Labor; and William Collins, New York City representative of the A. F. of L., who said he was glad to welcome the Guild "even if it's only for a short time."

Green Presents Charter

President Green delivered the charter with a pledge to place the full resources of the A. F. of L. behind the Guild, and with a challenge to publishers who attempt to deny their editorial employees the right to organize. The meeting was held in the Hotel Baltimore in New York. Many members attended from nearby Guilds.

Replying to publishers' attacks upon affiliation, Green declared neither the A. F. of L. nor the Guild had any intention "to interfere in any way whatsoever with the editorial or publication policies of newspapers." He said the A. F. of L. has always defended without reservation freedom of the press, and urged to publishers who attempt to deny their editorial employees the right to organize unrestricted and at the same time deny that right to men and women who work for wages and salaries.

Declaring the newspaper owners of the country were highly organized, Green said:

"No newspaper owner or group of owners has any right to claim the right to organize unrestricted and at the same time deny that right to men and women who work for wages and salaries."

Referring to other groups with special talents who once thought it would "lower their professional dignity" to organize, Green said 80 per cent more of the members of the C. I. O. were organized in the American Federation of Teachers and had lifted wage standards from \$18 to \$18 a week to \$75 and \$100 a week, and Actors Equity had worked a similar transformation.

The Guild is seeking only "a square deal, and newspaper owners should not oppose that, because it means better service," he said.

"It is said by some publishers that if newspapermen organize they will become autocratic and seek domination and control," he said. "I do not know how you could excel some newspaper owners in that respect."

Minority vs. Majority

Green said he believed "a basis of adjustment" of the current dispute in the labor movement would be found, and expressed the hope that "a stronger and more aggressive labor movement" would arise out of the fight.

Those who feel that they can divide and conquer labor are making a great mistake," he said, "for when the hosts of labor are attacked by a common foe our ranks will close and we'll present a united front."

Discussing the controversy, he said attempts to organize workers in one big union had failed in the past for both industrial and craft types of organization. The issue is not industrial versus craft unionism but democratic rule in the A. F. of L. he declared, accusing a minority of attempting to force acceptance of ideas rejected by the majority at the last A. F. of L. convention.

"When I was in the minority I took it on 'em chin," he said, "I was always regular. And so help me, Providence, I shall never go to my grave bearing on me the stain of having led a dual or minority group."

Massachusetts' Welcome

BOSTON—Here is the resolution of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor welcoming and giving support to the Guild and recognizing freedom of reporting:

"Whereas, the American Newspaper Guild is now an International Union of the American Federation of Labor, and for the past three years has demonstrated an inspiring ability to conduct sustained trade union activity among the editors, reporters, writers, photographers, artists, and other editorial employees of the American press, and whereas, the moral and financial support of the American labor movement, the Guild by peaceful means has improved the working conditions of newspaper men in many cities, and has conducted three successful strikes in places where its right to organize was disputed by publishers, and

"Whereas, the Wisconsin Federation of Labor at its annual convention a few days ago wholeheartedly endorsed the six-months strike of the Guild against the Wisconsin News, a Hearst Paper, and approved the joint report of its Federation officers who said, 'The Wisconsin News and OTHER HEARST PUBLICATIONS are not entitled to the patronage of union members and their friends either as advertisers or subscribers,' and

"Whereas, many printing trades local unions and international officers, as well as local and international unions in other industries, and central trade councils, have given financial and moral support to this strike in magazines, and motion pictures on the unfair list, therefore be it

Resolved, that the Massachusetts Federation of Labor welcomes the Newspaper Guilds of Massachusetts into the Labor Movement, supports them in collective bargaining attempts already begun or about to begin, approves the services and advice rendered to them by the state officers of the Federation; and urges the local unions and central labor bodies affiliated with the Federation to extend every possible assistance to this movement for the defense of ethics and objectivity in Journalism and the newspaper printing trades union, as well as to all other printing trades unions, urging upon the printing trades everywhere the wisdom and value of concerted action, and be it further

Resolved, that the Massachusetts Federation of Labor ask no other favor of the individual members of the Guild or their employees in the writing and publishing of news or opinion than that they write and publish truthfully and accurately; that the Federation recognize the cardinal principle of the Guild constitution that no Guild member shall for publication, as being important to the maintenance of a free press movement to establish decent professional standards in Journalism and the defense of ethics and objectivity in public opinion which is necessary if democratic institutions are to be preserved."

SEATTLE LABOR AIDS

May Brand Hearst Paper "Unfair"

The Seattle Guild is continuing its campaign for the reinstatement of Frank M. Lynch, head photographer, and Everhardt Armstrong, veteran dramatic editor, who were summarily dismissed by Hearst's Post-Intelligencer for Guild activity.

The Seattle Central Labor Council is considering placing the Hearst paper on labor's "unfair list" for the discharge of the two Guild members. The Council has issued a citation to the publishers directing them to show cause why the paper should not be placed on the list.

Pressures is being exerted by Harvey J. Kelly, Hearst's labor advisor, in an attempt to prevent assistance to the Guild. Kelly wired the Labor Council, warning them that under the Post-Intelligencer's contract with the International Typographical Union, the printing unions would have nothing to do with the strike by the Guild.

Should the Council vote to place the Post-Intelligencer on the "unfair list" it is expected to mean the immediate cancellation of from 2,000 to 4,000 of its 100,000 subscriptions.

Immediately upon the dismissal of Lynch, who was fired first, the Labor Council adopted a resolution upholding the Guild's aim of collective bargaining with newspaper publishers and also appointed a committee to aid the Seattle Guild in its efforts to obtain Lynch's reinstatement.

N. Y. Times Meets Guild, Hears of 'Neediest Cases'

Guild negotiations with the New York Times on Aug. 3 revealed the existence of a weekly minimum wage after one year's service of \$80 for copywriters and \$35 for reporters.

While Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher, declined to give official recognition to the establishment of a Guild grievance committee, he reiterated that "his door was always open" to any representatives of staff may choose as spokesmen for their individual or collective interests.

He reiterated his basic opposition to Guild recognition when he said "I believe that it is contrary to the best interests of objective newspaper reporting to have an editorial staff composed exclusively of members of a labor union. For this reason our position is that we will not recognize the Guild until we have to."

To illustrate the need for wage minimums, a list of "neediest cases" was submitted to the publisher, and it is likely that a number of individual adjustments both in hours and salaries will shortly be made.

The convention gave its unqualified endorsement of the Guild's constitutional provision that no member may be deprived of membership for anything which he may write for publication as necessary to "freedom of the press."

The resolution embodying these principles was written and filed by M. J. Flynn, legislative agent of the American Federation of Labor at Washington. He attended the convention as delegate of the Newspaper Writers Federal Union 17023 of Boston. Will O'Connor, member of the Boston Guild executive committee, is president of the Union, and Ed Allen, Guild president, is secretary. Through this Federal Local, outgrowth of a typographical union branch, established in 1923, the Guild is represented in the Allied Printing Trades Council and Boston Central Labor Union. Both the Guild and the Federal Local are directly affiliated with the Massachusetts Federation of Labor.

The resolution was unanimously reported by the convention resolutions committee.

Hearst was frequently denounced by guest speakers and delegates during the convention.

Several opportunities were given Guild delegates and Guild members covering the convention to test the right of "freedom of press" granted them by the federation in its resolution that it asked no favors of newspaper men or publishers except that they write and publish accurately.

An unpleasant incident which occurred when Governor Curley finished his address at the convention was ordered expunged from the official record. "What about the press?" demanded a woman delegate. The chairman made the sort of remark which is so frequently made by townsmen at public dinners in an attempt to persuade persons sitting at the press table to omit mention of a remark or incident.

Allen, Boston Guild delegate, stood up to challenge his statement. "Less than two hours ago this federation voted not to ask any favors of Guild members or their publishers except that they report and publish accurately," he said.

"What you are asking is the sort of thing which publishers pretend to demand of the press, the consequence of organization in their shops. When a reporter sits at a press table in a public meeting, he does not check his confidence at the door, nor does he give it to the chairman of the meeting. The persons at this press table, whether members of the Guild or not, will judge this incident solely on its basis as news."

The convention applauded. Considerable space was devoted to the remarks in some papers.

STATE BODY HAILS GUILD

Massachusetts Is Cordial to Actions And Policies

(Continued from Page 1)

of patronage by union members, was recognized in a resolution which was passed unanimously by the convention.

2. The fact that several local unions in Massachusetts have placed all Hearst newspapers, magazines, and motion pictures on the unfair list also was recognized. This leaves the question of action to local unions and central trade bodies.

3. The convention approved collective bargaining attempts "begun or about to begin" by the Massachusetts Guild, "promised every possible support," urged co-operation by other printing trade unions, and endorsed the advice and assistance being given Guilds by the officers of the State Federation. Robert J. Watt, secretary-treasurer-legislative agent of the Massachusetts Federation and member of the Massachusetts unemployment compensation commission, is chairman of the Boston Guild's bargaining committee.

The convention gave its unqualified endorsement of the Guild's constitutional provision that no member may be deprived of membership for anything which he may write for publication as necessary to "freedom of the press."

The resolution embodying these principles was written and filed by M. J. Flynn, legislative agent of the American Federation of Labor at Washington. He attended the convention as delegate of the Newspaper Writers Federal Union 17023 of Boston. Will O'Connor, member of the Boston Guild executive committee, is president of the Union, and Ed Allen, Guild president, is secretary.

Through this Federal Local, outgrowth of a typographical union branch, established in 1923, the Guild is represented in the Allied Printing Trades Council and Boston Central Labor Union. Both the Guild and the Federal Local are directly affiliated with the Massachusetts Federation of Labor.

The resolution was unanimously reported by the convention resolutions committee.

Hearst was frequently denounced by guest speakers and delegates during the convention.

Several opportunities were given Guild delegates and Guild members covering the convention to test the right of "freedom of press" granted them by the federation in its resolution that it asked no favors of newspaper men or publishers except that they write and publish accurately.

An unpleasant incident which occurred when Governor Curley finished his address at the convention was ordered expunged from the official record. "What about the press?" demanded a woman delegate. The chairman made the sort of remark which is so frequently made by townsmen at public dinners in an attempt to persuade persons sitting at the press table to omit mention of a remark or incident.

Allen, Boston Guild delegate, stood up to challenge his statement. "Less than two hours ago this federation voted not to ask any favors of Guild members or their publishers except that they report and publish accurately," he said.

"What you are asking is the sort of thing which publishers pretend to demand of the press, the consequence of organization in their shops. When a reporter sits at a press table in a public meeting, he does not check his confidence at the door, nor does he give it to the chairman of the meeting. The persons at this press table, whether members of the Guild or not, will judge this incident solely on its basis as news."

The convention applauded. Considerable space was devoted to the remarks in some papers.

The resolution embodying these principles was written and filed by M. J. Flynn, legislative agent of the American Federation of Labor at Washington. He attended the convention as delegate of the Newspaper Writers Federal Union 17023 of Boston. Will O'Connor, member of the Boston Guild executive committee, is president of the Union, and Ed Allen, Guild president, is secretary.

Through this Federal Local, outgrowth of a typographical union branch, established in 1923, the Guild is represented in the Allied Printing Trades Council and Boston Central Labor Union. Both the Guild and the Federal Local are directly affiliated with the Massachusetts Federation of Labor.

The resolution was unanimously reported by the convention resolutions committee.

Hearst was frequently denounced by guest speakers and delegates during the convention.

Several opportunities were given Guild delegates and Guild members covering the convention to test the right of "freedom of press" granted them by the federation in its resolution that it asked no favors of newspaper men or publishers except that they write and publish accurately.

An unpleasant incident which occurred when Governor Curley finished his address at the convention was ordered expunged from the official record. "What about the press?" demanded a woman delegate. The chairman made the sort of remark which is so frequently made by townsmen at public dinners in an attempt to persuade persons sitting at the press table to omit mention of a remark or incident.

Allen, Boston Guild delegate, stood up to challenge his statement. "Less than two hours ago this federation voted not to ask any favors of Guild members or their publishers except that they report and publish accurately," he said.

"What you are asking is the sort of thing which publishers pretend to demand of the press, the consequence of organization in their shops. When a reporter sits at a press table in a public meeting, he does not check his confidence at the door, nor does he give it to the chairman of the meeting. The persons at this press table, whether members of the Guild or not, will judge this incident solely on its basis as news."

The convention applauded. Considerable space was devoted to the remarks in some papers.

WORLD-TELEGRAM ARGUES AGAINST SIGNING PACT

The World-Telegram letter to the Guild and the reply follow:

July 26, 1935.

To the Editorial Staff:
The World-Telegram desires to make its position clear in respect to recent developments and policies of the American Newspaper Guild. Hitherto the management has, wisely perhaps, permitted to go unchallenged incorrect statements of fact or opinion, and inaccuracies or half-truths of the paper's position and as to what has taken place in discussions between management and Guild negotiators. We learn that many members of the staff have had a clear understanding of the attitude of the management or the reasons justifying this attitude. It is to dispel any such misunderstanding that this statement is made.

For about half a century this organization has fought for the right of labor to organize, choose its own representatives, and bargain collectively. Ever since the organization of mechanical department unions, we have encouraged, recognized and dealt with them. When the Guild movement first attracted attention, we hailed it both because we believed it was consistent with our principles, and because we thought that collective bargaining on a national scale would improve editorial working conditions and attract and keep better men in the profession. Our position on all these matters remains the same. But the Guild has injected new issues.

By a recorded vote of 15 to 3, taken at its 1934 Convention, the Guild stands finally committed to a policy borrowed from the mechanical trades, the effect of which is that nobody who is not committed by membership to the policies of the Guild can be employed in editorial production.

The Guild's resolution of June 15, 1934, records further resolutions condemning the two existing political parties, recommending an independent political action on the part of labor, and "co-operation (by Guilds and editors) with local and State-wide farmer-labor parties and with other labor groups for the purpose of providing independent political action of labor."

Draws Inferences From Guild Acts

The effect of these actions, taken together, is that nobody can write for a newspaper who is not of the Guild, and nobody can be loyal to the Guild who is not committed against both of the political parties of which 90 per cent of our population are members, and in favor of a movement which many farmers and workers regard as impossible and abortive.

It is along this line that minority pressure groups have proceeded in Italy, Russia and Germany with a brutal destruction of free and independent journalism. Each of these countries the entire national press is committed to the support of a single political faith, and in each, the first requirement for holding a newspaper job is adherence to that faith. The Guild formula today is the Farmer-Labor party. Tomorrow it may be Communism, Fascism, Republicanism, Democracy—or any other political dogma that appeals to its leadership. This paper can have nothing whatever to do with such an intellectual regimentation in the newspaper profession.

Returning to the Guild policy borrowed from the mechanical unions that selections for employment in editorial departments can be restricted to any list of membership chosen by the Guild, or that minimum pay in these departments can be regulated in detail by some rule of uniformity based on time or quantity (rather than quality) of work produced. Every newspaper man knows that, in editorial work, any such proposal is absurd and wholly impractical.

The Selection of Talent

An editorial staff, to produce a newspaper of balanced excellence in all departments, must be a balanced team of diverse, peculiar and preferably outstanding intellectual talent in each particular department. No newspaper can meet its competitive situation, and retain the economic independence necessary to the security of its employees and its service to the community, unless its editor has as much freedom in

selecting his editorial and reporter team with an eye to pleasing its customers, as was possessed in their respective fields by John McGraw, Elmer Rebeck or Gustav Cassius. If to pay up a paper on a weak point, an editor can't sign up a Joe Williams, a Helen Worden or Hollis Kirby, regardless of their politics or their affiliations, when in his judgment their type of service is necessary, that editor is hamstringing and the paper is on its way out.

There is another compelling reason why all the principles which obtain in the mechanical departments, in the selection and compensation of individuals, should be applied to the editorial and reporter staff. The value of the output of the former is in a tangible, measurable basis of quantity and quality. In general, uniform, therefore, mechanical employment can be put on a uniform impersonal basis of union membership and compensation can be measured by time.

The fundamental essential of editorial effort is quality. The prestige and success of the paper depends not on how much copy is produced but on how good that copy is. The effort of the individual is not and cannot be collected into an exclusive individualism. Some individuals produce excellent copy momentarily—some get the same excellence only after hours of sweat and study. Union representation in the mechanical departments is absolutely inapplicable in the editorial department.

Finally it has been contended that, no matter what salaries have been paid or are being paid for higher editorial and reporter work, organization and strong collective representation in other words, that what a paper can be forced to pay has no relation to its earning capacity. And here again the example of what has been done by union pressure in the mechanical departments is advanced as a precedent.

"This contention is wrong on two counts. First: The mechanical department is paid and contract on an industry-wide basis, at least in the separate newspaper regions. The newspaper business is competitive. When all competitors have to pay the same rate in labor costs, then

whether that rate is high or low (provided it is within the range of earning capacity) is of relatively less concern to an individual employer than when pressure is brought on him alone. It is for this reason that trade union contracts are of necessity negotiated by publishers' associations acting collectively. The present effort of the Guild to enforce orthodox trade union contracts upon individual newspapers completely ignores the competitive and economic realities which every publisher must face.

Argues Against Forcing Salaries Up

Second: The mechanical department being on a quantitative basis, vary in employment on the basis of industry, automatically and directly with the size of the newspaper as determined, from day to day, by its varying business volume. No editorial department is so large that it can be measured by time.

For a 48-page paper is not instantly reduced by 50% when its business volume drops. The second effect of the Guild's mechanical department almost as it buys paper—as much as it needs on an hourly basis and so more, it buys its editorial and reporter service on a completely different basis. The second effect of the Guild's mechanical department is that it forces the very maximum proportion of its income that it can afford to pay to be spent in a going concern for profit. If an attempt is made to force individual labor costs higher than the traffic will stand, the result is a reduction in the total number of individuals employed, a reduction of the size of the staff, and the loss of the best of the staff.

From the standpoint of minimum wages, the five-day forty-hour week, vacations, sick leaves and other conditions, etc. (all conditions outside the realm of regulation by the Guild) are demanded by the Guild. These conditions, if taken in their entirety, demonstrate a more expensive and liberal basis than obtain on competing evening newspapers. The fact known to the negotiating committee has obviously not been made clear to all members of the staff.

Sum Up Opposition to Contract
In short, in approaching the World-Telegram with the idea that the editorial margin of expense which for some time has been conceded applying to all individuals on its staff, the Guild negotiators have given no recognition to one important fact. This is

The World-Telegram faces a situation where exactly this result must come for exactly the reasons just stated. On various considerations, during the depression, we maintained a much larger staff and a much more favorable schedule of compensation and of privileges than our income, our competitive situation, or the well recognized margin of permissible editorial expense warranted.

When our income dried during the depression, instead of thinning editorial employment, we made additions. Although there has been no sufficient recovery of income to justify it, we have increased the editorial payroll considerably more than \$100,000 per year above the pre-war peak. There are today forty-two more people on the editorial staff than there were prior to the first salary cut. Of this number only fourteen were necessary to meet the requirements of NRA which have been preserved in the World-Telegram.

Of two 10% salary cuts put into effect, the first affected only those employees receiving \$40 per week and over. The second affecting the entire payroll has been completely restored. Today 70% of the entire editorial staff are receiving their peak World-Telegram salaries or better. An additional 10% of the entire staff have had increases but are not yet back to their peak. Less than 15% of the entire staff are receiving 10% less than their peak salaries of the boom years. A figure which, we believe, compares advantageously with general payroll standards today.

From the standpoint of minimum wages, the five-day forty-hour week, vacations, sick leaves and other conditions, etc. (all conditions outside the realm of regulation by the Guild) are demanded by the Guild. These conditions, if taken in their entirety, demonstrate a more expensive and liberal basis than obtain on competing evening newspapers. The fact known to the negotiating committee has obviously not been made clear to all members of the staff.

Sum Up Opposition to Contract

In short, in approaching the World-Telegram with the idea that the editorial margin of expense which for some time has been conceded applying to all individuals on its staff, the Guild negotiators have given no recognition to one important fact. This is

the fact that as an emergency measure during the depression, despite the sharp decline in receipts suffered by all newspapers, the World-Telegram exceeded all the limits of sound economy, to make a possible investment in good will but primarily to maintain and spread employment during a long period. As the demands of the emergency lessened, instead of further increasing the percentage of receipts devoted to editorial expense the figures must be restored to normal.

To recapitulate: The World-Telegram presumes to no opinion regarding the Guild's plans or policies but, for reasons stated, the paper can sign no contract with the Guild which involves any of the following principles: (a) Confinement of selection of editorial and reporter staff to any closed Guild list. (b) Regimentation or even suggestion by the Guild to its members of any political or other dogma.

(c) Regulation by Guild rules of rates of compensation on any rigid quantitative or time basis to be applied generally in the editorial department. (d) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

While we are anxious to avoid anything suggestive of an arbitrary attitude, it is a fact that of the above points have been gone into at length and on several occasions with the Guild committee, in consequence of which we can see neither wisdom nor justification for continuing argument as long as the Guild program and objective remain as announced. Such controversy seems particularly ill-advised in the management's statement, we wish to take up these four points at once.

(a) Confinement of selection of editorial and reporter staff to any closed Guild list.
The Guild has never suggested that the management be confined to a "closed Guild list." The Guild has again and again declared that in seeking a preferential Guild list it does not seek to prohibit the employer from hiring anyone he sees fit to hire. The Guild seeks an opportunity to supply a prospective employer with a list of names, but it has never suggested that the management be confined to a "closed Guild list."

(b) Regimentation or even suggestion by the Guild to its members of any political or other dogma.

(c) Regulation by Guild rules of rates of compensation on any rigid quantitative or time basis to be applied generally in the editorial department.

(d) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(e) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(f) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(g) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(h) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(i) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(j) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(k) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(l) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(m) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(n) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(o) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(p) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(q) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

AND THE N. Y. GUILD REPLIES Roy Howard Rebuffs Request For Pact With N. Y. Guild

through representatives of their own choosing to work out further agreement in salaries, hours and working conditions. We believe our interests are mutual, and that the fullest measure of success is not possible without the full co-operation of the other. From the management, we pledge continuation of that co-operation.

THE GUILD'S REPLY

August 5, 1935.

Dear Mr. Howard:
In response to your letter of July 26, you have replied under date of July 31 by calling our attention to a statement sent by the World-Telegram management to editorial employees of the World-Telegram. In that statement, after listing the management's reasons for withholding formal Guild recognition and for resisting a signed agreement, you say you will "continue to negotiate" with your employees through representatives of their own choosing, and pledge full "co-operation."

The Guild has been repeatedly designated by the overwhelming majority of World-Telegram editorial employees as the chosen negotiating representative. The executive committee of the Newspaper Guild of New York has instructed me to assure you that the Guild, too, has the fullest desire to negotiate and to cooperate.

I have been further instructed by the executive committee to send you this reply to your letter and to the statement to which you refer us.

Misconception About Closed Shop

In the body of the statement you recapitulate the reasons why "the paper can sign no contract with the Guild which involves any of the following principles: Four points are then listed. Last there is a continuation of certain misconceptions revealed in the management's statement, we wish to take up these four points at once.

(a) Confinement of selection of editorial and reporter staff to any closed Guild list.
The Guild has never suggested that the management be confined to a "closed Guild list." The Guild has again and again declared that in seeking a preferential Guild list it does not seek to prohibit the employer from hiring anyone he sees fit to hire. The Guild seeks an opportunity to supply a prospective employer with a list of names, but it has never suggested that the management be confined to a "closed Guild list."

(b) Regimentation or even suggestion by the Guild to its members of any political or other dogma.

(c) Regulation by Guild rules of rates of compensation on any rigid quantitative or time basis to be applied generally in the editorial department.

(d) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(e) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(f) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(g) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(h) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(i) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(j) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(k) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(l) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(m) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(n) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(o) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(p) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

tion by the Guild to its members of any political or other dogma.

The Constitution of the American Newspaper Guild insures against regimentation and against the application of the policies of the individual in the following provision: "No eligible person shall be barred from membership, suspended, fined, expelled or disciplined on account of his political or religious or political convictions, or because of anything he writes for publication."

These are not merely words. They are an expression of the sentiment that have marked the Guild's every action. The Guild seeks the fullest freedom for its members to tell the truth as they see it. When any "closed shop" suggestion we are at a loss to understand the meaning, unless it represents an administrative policy in direct conflict with Scripture. Howard editorial policy in opposing such oppressive legislation as the National Labor Relations Act and other efforts to interfere with the rights of free expression by individuals and organizations.

Reason for Minimum Wage Strife

(a) Regulation by Guild rules of rates of compensation on any rigid quantitative or time basis to be applied generally in the editorial department.

The Guild's efforts along this line have been directed toward the setting up of decent and fair minimum wages. There is no effort at regulation which might be in any way interpreted as placing a limitation upon those entitled to receive wages in excess of said decent and fair minimums. The management has twice accepted this view by establishing minimum wages for reporters and some other categories, and has twice refused to accept this view by establishing minimum wages for editors and other categories.

At one point the management demands complete freedom in the selection of individuals to fill some particular job in what is described as the "team," but it shows no recognition of the more or less standardized work required of very large proportion of the editorial staff. To say that persons required to do standardized work should be denied a decent minimum wage is not only indefensible in itself, but hardly consistent with the World-Telegram's editorial stand in favor of minimum wage laws.

(b) Regimentation or even suggestion by the Guild to its members of any political or other dogma.

(c) Regulation by Guild rules of rates of compensation on any rigid quantitative or time basis to be applied generally in the editorial department.

(d) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(e) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(f) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(g) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(h) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(i) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(j) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(k) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(l) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(m) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(n) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(o) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

(p) Insistence on any policy calculated arbitrarily to raise the editorial margin of editorial expense above that of its principal competitors—even though motives of self interest will prompt us to seek the advantage of the highest standard of salaries as rapidly as business conditions permit.

a city-wide agreement last that restricts you to the low minimums on a less successful paper. You will duplicate what you stated at that time that you did not wish to be that unfair to your own editorial employees.

Impelled Dictation Is Challenged

It appears to us that your basic resistance to formal recognition of the Guild stems from your opposition to certain activities of the Guild with which you do not find yourself in sympathy. To be sure, at one point you state: "The World-Telegram presumes to no opinion regarding the Guild's plans or policies." That statement we applaud. But elsewhere in your communication you state: "This paper can have nothing whatever to do with such an intellectual regimentation in the newspaper profession," and still further: "The World-Telegram cannot further discuss or sign any contract with any unit of the American Newspaper Guild as the organization is now committed involving any of the policies of the management."

These latter statements we find disturbing. Do they not mean that the management is seeking to dictate the policies and actions of the Guild? We feel that the determination of the internal affairs of the management is ours. We do not feel called upon to defend or apologize for the "new issues" which you complain of, namely, the 8 to 5 Guild Convention vote for affiliation with the American Federation of Labor and the adoption by the Convention of a resolution recommending independent political action.

"These issues were not 'injected,'" the subject of affiliation was studied in detail for two years by the national membership of the Guild. Further investigation would have revealed to the management that the Guild's views, independent of the issue of July 1, 1935, recorded, a similar resolution adopted by the June 1935 Convention.

The efforts of publishers during the past three years to frustrate the Guild's attempts to bargain collectively have taught the members of the Guild that they must have the support and confidence of other labor groups. Thus the publishers of the nation, including Scripps-Howard, have themselves to thank for the Guild's recognition of the need for political action as one of the means of improving working conditions.

Howard's Previous Acts Are Cited

The management declares that "when the Guild first attracted attention, we hailed it." Let's see. Three years ago when the Guild was being formed you expressed your opposition by saying newspapermen do not belong in an organization left they be robbed of their initiative and denied romance and glamour. Two years ago you pleaded with the World-Telegram staff to accept an agreement between yourself and your employees. The staff rejected this as an abhorrence of company unionism. Last year you opposed an agreement with the Cleveland Press because the Guild proposed joining the American Federation of Labor. This year you give us your reason for opposition our temperate recommendation that editorial workers support independent political action.

While on the subject of political action, let us pursue the question a little further. Though the management expressed concern over the policies of its members, the Guild may have in the two major political parties, did not the Scripps-Howard management 12 years ago support a national progressive ticket? Did not the World-Telegram only three years ago successfully support a local Fusion ticket?

Is such independence to be reserved solely to the management? May the Scripps-Howard management in 1924 support a national third party, in 1928 the Republican Party, in 1932 the Democratic Party, may the World-Telegram in 1935 support the Socialist candidate for mayor and in

Roy Howard Rebuffs Request For Pact With N. Y. Guild

Local Charges Attempt to Dictate the ANG'S Internal Policies

(Continued from Page 1)

not only reproduced it in full, but carried a banner head on the front page of the paper. A copy of the Guild's reply was furnished Editor A. Publisher 24 hours before its next week's deadline, but no mention of it was published.

On Aug. 6, Howard's New York Evening Journal published an editorial tribute to the Guild—and to Howard. On page 4 it carried the complete text of the World-Telegram statement under a three column headline: "World-Telegram Tells Why It Cannot Sign Contract With Newspaper Guild."

The lead on the story read: "The New York World-Telegram, of which Roy W. Howard is editor, has announced it cannot further discuss or sign any contract with any unit of the American Newspaper Guild. We feel that the determination of the internal affairs of the management is ours. We do not feel called upon to defend or apologize for the 'new issues' which you complain of, namely, the 8 to 5 Guild Convention vote for affiliation with the American Federation of Labor and the adoption by the Convention of a resolution recommending independent political action."

"This statement is in accordance with the attitude that the Hearst papers have maintained in connection with the Guild." The same day the Guild formally requested the Journal to publish its reply in the interests of fairness. This request has not been granted.

The New York Post, with which the Guild recently renewed a contract, devoted its leading editorial on Aug. 8 to the controversy, heading it: "Lucky Bountiful—Or a Con- siderable Exception." The Post's specific exception was taken to the statement of Howard that the Guild "has made any contract impossible with any newspaper that insists on intellectual freedom for newspaper men and women, and an independent paper." Opposite the editorial page the Post published the text of both the management's and the Guild's statements.

The formal expression of the management's attitude on recognition culminated three months of Guild negotiations, and followed three days after a bulletin board announcement in which improvements in minimum wages for reporters and desk men and in severance notice were established.

Lee B. Wood, executive editor, and spokesman for the management in the negotiations had previously stated that the management was quite willing to discuss matters with representatives of the staff, but that a contract with the Guild was out of the question.

In a letter to Howard on July 26 the Guild Executive Committee expressed the dissatisfaction of the unit and the Guild with the limited concessions made by the management and asked for direct dealings with him, rather than with Wood. The letter pointed out that the unit's main demand, restoration of the blanket wage cut, a signed contract, minima step-ups for all categories, including artists, photographers, illustrators, tabulators and copy boys, were refused.

"Virtually every member of the Unit—some members are on vacation—the letter to Howard further stated, 'has signed a petition protesting the meagerness of the concessions granted. By resolution, the unit took the position that the plea of the management that the editorial budget cannot be increased must be rejected as a final judgment, in view of the historic inadequacy of editorial budgets.'"

Coupling the action of the Convention in support of independent political action with the vote for affiliation, the management said: "The effect of these actions, taken together, is that nobody can write for a newspaper who is not of the Guild and nobody can be loyal to the Guild who is not committed against both of the political parties of which 90 per cent of our population are members, and in favor of a movement which many farmers and workers regard as impossible and abortive." The management then went on to say that "this paper can have nothing whatever to do with such an intellectual regimentation in the newspaper profession."

No Dictation, Says Guild
In its reply the Guild demanded to know whether the management was "seeking to dictate the policies and actions of the Guild."

"We feel that the determination of our internal policies, arrived at by democratic procedure," the Guild's statement read, "is no more the affair of the management than the determination of the internal affairs of the management is ours."

After reminding the management that affiliation with the American Federation of Labor and a recommendation of support for independent political action had not been "injected," but had been dealt with after two years of discussion, the Guild continued:

"The efforts of publishers during the past three years to frustrate the Guild's attempts to bargain collectively have taught members of the Guild that they must have the support and cooperation of other labor groups. Thus the publishers of the nation, including Scripps-Howard, have themselves to thank for the Guild's recognition of the need for political action as one of the means of improving working conditions."

Management Challenged
The reply also challenged the statement of the management that "when the Guild first attracted attention, we hailed it." Again, it said:

"The Guild must insist on the freedom and political independence of its members. The Guild must reject management efforts to dictate the policies of its members."

Very truly yours,
MILTON KAUFMAN,
for the Executive Committee.

Ohio DC Acts on Scripps-Howard Issue

(Continued from page 1)

papers, until these issues were met with firmness, jointly by the unit. The substantial correctness of the view that the Telegram statement was thrown out by the management as a notice to other Guild units and a guiding principle for local publishers was verified within a week by the announcement of Carl Gross, editor of the Cincinnati Post, that the World-Telegram policy governed that of the Post also.

Publishers' Cases Delayed
Reports by delegates of their local bargaining attempts revealed all local more or less bogged down by publisher delays and quibblings.

"It is not the intent that District or group negotiation should supersede local negotiations, but rather supplement them by making available to local Guilds, who believe they can benefit by it, a joint bargaining machinery." Carl Gross, Asst. AGU vice-president in the Third Region, who proposed the plan, said.

Accordingly, the Pittsburgh Guild was reported as not being prepared to join the others in the negotiations, because of local intra-Guild negotiating arrangements.

The minutes of the Columbus meeting reporting the discussion of the World-Telegram letter records that some delegates viewed the letter as a "blast" and

THE ANG BAILLIWICK: TWO OPPOSITE SURVEYS

Hold Broad View Needed
Say Guild Must Build on a Wide Base
For Future Security

Tell Us Your Idea
of ANG Bailiwick

Wants Limited Objectives
Claims Leadership Takes Whole World
For Its Field

St. Louis, Mo.
Editor, The Guild Reporter:
In the preceding issue of this publication Mr. Herbert Little of the Washington Guild protested, in effect, that the American Newspaper Guild was not minding its own business. Among the items which he thinks have no place on the Guild's agenda are political parties, teachers' loyalty oaths and certain bills that have been before the Congress.

We take exception to much of Mr. Little's argument and hereby elect, good humoredly, to cross swords with him. Further, we specifically charge him with taking a short-range view of the Guild, life in general, and his own pocketbook in particular, we feel that he is guilty of squinting at the American scene when now, if ever, he should be perched on top of the Washington Monument surveying the land with a spy-glass. Here is our evidence:

Brother Little contends that the New York Convention spoke out of turn when it endorsed the principle of a Farmer-Labor party. "Join the Farmer-Labor party," my loud friends, if you want, (we quote from Brother Little) but don't try to bring the American Newspaper Guild in with you. While you are cavorting with Lemke and Coughlin, or some chimera of the future, I'll be voting and talking as I damn please."

What Farmer-Labor Party Means
Now Little knows, as we all know, that the New York Convention more expected the Guild membership to support Lemke and Coughlin than it expects it to support Townsend, the Rev. C. L. Smith or any other kindred scoundrel. We'll demand that and not even ask Brother Little to apologize.

But we also know that the Convention, in coming out forthrightly for the Farmer-Labor principle, attempted to tie its membership that, here, the Republican party is your enemy, the Democratic party is your enemy, the Roosevelt is your enemy, and that not even ask Brother Little to apologize.

Mr. Little, in pushing aside political action on the part of workers, simply elects to give the privileged class a handpick, for if Mr. Little thinks the possessors of the mills and the mines and the newspapers take no part in political activity he is not nearly so smart a newspaper man as we know him to be. For the wage earner to achieve political activity when his boss dominates it is comparable with a Milwaukee worker asking a policeman to beat him on the head to cheer up Mr. Hearst.

And as for Brother Little voting and talking as he damn pleases, of course he should. Certainly no one has asked him not to. If he wishes to start a pulch for Congressman H. Telf, that's his business. We simply think his energy and talent might be better directed.

To Defend Free Speech at All Points

Again, we have little sympathy with our Washington brother in his fear of offending the American Legion. Says Mr. Little: "There probably are among us a lot of American legionnaires who may be as misguided as to agree with Mr. Hearst on 'teachers' oaths while agreeing with us on a newspaper union, and I want that Legionnaire's dues and support."

Well, we, too, want his dues and his support. But we also want the liberty of saying to this Legionnaire: "Look here! Your duty is to yourself."

and the men who work with you. These teachers' oaths are not what you think them to be. They are an attack on free speech and the free-runners of other attacks on free speech. Loss of free speech hurts only you, just as it hurts all men and women who work for a wage.

"These teachers' oaths are an effort by the unscrupulous among the privileged to set us at each other's throats so they may gain at our expense, as are the cries concerning Negroes in the Arkansas share-cropper fields, the cries concerning Japanese and Filipinos that emanate from the California fruit growers, the cries against Catholics and Jews uttered by the Black Legion, the cries against Reds which come from Gadsden, Alabama."

What of the Pay Day Twenty Years Hence?

"All these cries, rolled into one great roar, have their beginning in the desire to keep working men on longer hours and shorter wages, and the prejudicial arguments concerning Reds and Jews and Catholics and Negroes that accompany them are only food to feed the flames. So, Mr. Legionnaire, don't be taken in. Don't worry about the mill owner's wife and children, worry about your own."

Brother Little, continuing, says the business of the American Newspaper Guild is to get things for the membership on next pay day. That's right, we agree with him heartily. But, Brother Little, you are making the Guild's job too easy, you are not giving it enough work to do. That bread and butter policy, long the sole political tactic of American Labor (and one which it is, happily, beginning to desert), makes for a poor housewife. It fails to take into consideration the rainy day. It fails to think of that pay day a year, five years, twenty years from now. It fails to build for the future.

Working for the future, as well as

On what kind of public matters should the Guild express itself? Should it take a narrow or a broad bailiwick? This has been a moot question ever since the ANG was formed.

Your opinion is invited. An open discussion of the subject will make for better understanding of the Guild.

Today, is what this Guild wants to do, must do. This Guild must say: I don't care who my father or my grandfather voted for, I will vote for the man who advocates the principles that will accomplish most for us. As for the teachers' oaths, I know that they will not add to my pay or lessen my hours next week. But, by Heaven and Hell, if I don't now lend the force of my contribution to public opinion against them, then in two years or five years or twenty-five years I may not be permitted to have my say regarding my own wage and my own hours and my own thoughts, and damn it (to be prophetic like Brother Little) that will affect me most considerably.

To Sum up, Brother Little, the Guild's business is any business which makes for the betterment and security, present or future, of its membership.

WYAN PARKER
JULIUS H. KLYMAN.

To Set Up Office
WASHINGTON, D. C. — The Washington Newspaper Guild at its regular July meeting agreed to set up an office in the Kellogg Building, and to employ a part-time clerk to handle routine work.

The table of receipts at headquarters for the Minneapolis strike in the Aug. 1 issue of the Guild Reporter recorded the sum of \$44 as being received from the Minneapolis Typographical Union, No. 20. It should have said from the St. Paul Typographical Union, No. 20.

Papers Gave Anti-Labor Board Ruling 1428 Inches; Favorable Ruling Got 167

(Continued from Page 1)
1 paper carried its own story, 1428 inches.

Total: 128 papers carried 1,428 inches.

Handling of Associated Press

6 papers carried the story dispatched from New York by the Associated Press, a total of 38 inches.

3 papers carried United Press stories, a total of 23 inches.

1 paper carried an International News Service story, a total of 2 inches.

5 papers carried their own story, a total of 48 inches.

6 papers ran editorials, a total of 59 inches.

Total: 177 papers carried 187 inches.

Handling of Headlines

In both these Circuit Court decisions the main issue was whether the Board under the Constitution has jurisdiction over labor relations in the steel industry on the one hand, and in a newspaper service on the other, tend to affect interstate commerce. The issue was a narrow one, and the Courts in deciding it expressed no opinion whether the jurisdiction in any other type of enterprise except those directly before the Courts. It is apparent, then, that a copy desk writer who declares that the National Labor Relations Act is void, merely on the basis of a Circuit Court decision in regard to that particular enterprise, is taking upon himself the function of the Supreme Court of the United States. This function, however, was assumed by most of the headline writers in the Jones and Laughlin story. A few samples follow:

"Wagner Labor Relations Act Held Void in Appellate Court."

"New Deal Labor Act Ruled Invalid by Appellate Court."

"Circuit Court Ruling Annuls U. S. Labor Law."

"Labor Law Killed in Federal Court."

"Labor Relations Law Is Invalid."

"Labor Relations Act Thrown Out by Federal Court."

"Wagner Board Is Held Powerless."

"Court Nullifies Powers of Labor Board" (banner head).

"Circuit Court Holds Wagner Act Invalid."

"Labor Board's Authority Held Illegal by Court."

"New Deal Labor Act Unconstitutional" (banner head).

"Labor Relations Act Ruled Out."

"Wagner Bill Ruled Illegal."

"Labor Act Is Held Invalid."

"Labor Relations Body Ruled Out."

"Court Strips Power of National Body in Labor Squabble."

"Circuit Court Finds Wagner Act Void."

"Ruling Wagner Bill Invalid."

"Appellate Court Quashes Labor Relations Act."

The above sample headlines are calculated to create a public im-

pression that the National Labor Relations Board has been held without any authority to deal with labor disputes affecting interstate commerce. The fact that this decision is subject to review by the Supreme Court is rarely mentioned.

The 17 papers which gave any space whatsoever to the decision in the Associated Press case are few enough to examine their headlines in detail. They are:

"Labor Relations Act Is Upheld by Court."

"Orders Reporter Restored to Job."

"Still a 'Local Matter' (editorial).

"There Ought To Be a Law" (editorial).

"Court of Appeals Upholds National Labor Board Act."

"Appeals Court Upholds NLRB in Press Test."

"Board Is Upheld in A. P. Labor Suit."

"Labor Relations Board Upheld in Watson Case."

"A. P. May Appeal Labor Decision."

"Court Rules Against A. P."

"Court Upholds A. P. Man's Case."

"Guild Again Victorious in A. P. Labor Case."

"Labor Board Decisions" (editorial).

"Court Upholds Labor Board."

"Labor Relations Board Is Upheld."

"On the Statute Books" (editorial).

"A. P. Lose Appeal in Watson Case."

St. Louis, Mo.

Editor of the Guild Reporter:
Since Herbert Little, of Washington, has raised the question, since ANG Vice President Julius H. Klyman told me the other day that he intended to "answer" Little in the Barometer, here are my views on the scope of the American Newspaper Guild.

Little is right—that is, he is right as far as he goes but he does not go far enough, either forward or backward. He points out that the Guild is an organization of limited objectives; he might have demonstrated as truly that the doctrinaire leadership has never recognized this fact, has ever refused to be bound by constitutional limitation or common sense, has taken the whole world for its field and the long-heralded social revolution as its goal, and that as a result the Guild and every member of it, on one resolution or another, stands branded a crackpot.

One of the unassuming minority, I do not yearn to wave a flag at some fiery barricade. I trust I have a decent amount of respect for myself and a willingness to "accept the equal rights of others. I am eager for a program that even promises to be sound to carry us all to a finer and a better day, but I have not entrusted my judgment and conscience to the Guild, its national officers or its Convention in any blank check sense.

Social Revolution on Grand Scale

The Guild states its purpose in its Constitution. The language offers no difficulties. Any one, except possibly the leadership, can read it and get a very fair idea of what the Guild was organized to do and how it meant to do it. I find no wording that makes the Guild an agency of social revolution on the grand scale, nothing that would lead any one to believe the Guild was a political organization.

nothing authorizing the leadership or the Convention even to consider farmer-laborism, militarism or fascism, amendment of the United States Constitution, the Virgin Birth or the tariff on peanuts.

I have heard it argued, unimpressively, that the resolutions in favor of Farmer-Labor political action and for an amendment to the United States Constitution were "organic" to the purposes of the Guild, that the Guild as the Guild will be up to the necessity of political action, and that the Guild economic objectives can not be attained without a constitutional amendment to give the Federal Government powers broad enough to repeal the law of gravity and change the baby's dials.

Is it really necessary to point out these are mare's nests? Points of inevitable difference and conflict within the Guild? Only remotely related, if at all, to the stated purposes of the Guild?

Believes in Guild Ideas But

The theory is, I suppose, that the Guild is dedicated to a broad program of general human welfare. That is not the job the members gave the Guild to do for them, it is the scope of activity to which they subscribed when they became members. I for one recent and most earnestly denounce and deplore these extra-legal, irrelevant and impertinent resolutions—call them "recommendations" if you like—which have branded every member of the Guild as one or another kind of nut.

For instance: Vice President Klyman and I agree on some points and disagree on others. We agree most often on what to do about immediate practical problems of the Guild and newspaper work. We begin to disagree when we travel afield from here. Now I am willing for Klyman to speak for me within the limits of what the Guild Constitution says the purposes of the Guild are, but neither I nor the membership nor the Constitution gives him or any one else any authority to speak further. The Guild has no such authority; neither have the national officers.

Flatly, the leadership and the New York Convention have put themselves in the position of a target, of one who receives a good check for, say, \$10 and criminally raises it to \$1,000. Were the offense single I might not be saying anything about it, but the offense of the Guild leadership is defiant, flagrant and too often repeated.

I believe in the Guild idea. Even affiliation with the American Federation of Labor (which I thought and still think was unnecessary and unwise; and who, in light of A. F. of L. developments, can prove me wrong?) could not shake me. I believe in it so much that I still believe there is a chance that the sober, sane majority of the membership will some day unseat the irresponsible and unresponsive plain politicians who, hell-bent, are going to keep on trying to put over their own ideas whether we like them or not.

HAROLD TREUMER MEEK.
(St. Louis Post Dispatch)

Boston Unit Asks Parley

BOSTON—Members of the Boston Transcript Unit voted unanimously at a meeting held July 23 to begin negotiations for collective bargaining with publishers. It named the following negotiating committee: Robert J. Wait, secretary-treasurer, Massachusetts Branch, American Federation of Labor; Edward Allen, president, Boston branch, ANG; John J. Barry, Boston Globe, and Richard O. Boyer, Boston Herald, members of the Boston Guild executive committee; and Philip W. Wrenn Jr., chairman, Transcript unit.

GROUP MEDICINE PLANS GROW AMONG UNIONS

Second article of a series on the possibilities of Guild medical care projects.

By JEAN LYON,
Chairman, New York Guild Committee on Medical Care

START talking group medicine in any Guild crowd and the first question asked of you is, "What do other unions do?"

Sick benefits have been the answer of most unions so far to the medical care question. Such benefits, however, provide only set weekly payments, to members who are disabled, and do not cover the costs of the doctor and the hospital. In this series we are discussing only plans for the payment of doctor and hospital bills—although the payment of sick benefits is important, and merits study by the Guild later.

An impressive number of group medical care projects—not all under union auspices—are now operating, and they are of sizes sufficiently varied to enable every Guild to find some formula suited to its conditions, for operation either by itself or in cooperation with other groups.

Recently there has been a conspicuous trend toward the idea of group payment for medical care in unions. At one center we were told that we were the third union seeking information on medical care plans through a newspaper. Unions are looking now, it was said, for more complete medical care and some means of distributing the costs so that a heavy blow will not fall on any one member at any time.

Union Health Center Cited

The biggest medical care project of which we know, run by any single union, is the Union Health Center, at 275 Seventh Avenue, New York City, which is owned and operated by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. This center, although conducted by an exceptionally large union, is important to us as a possible pattern for Guild medical care. This is how it works.

The I. L. G. W. U. employs the doctors, rents the offices, and buys the equipment. Any member of the union with a paid-up union card may come to the clinic for general physical examinations, for such minor surgery as can be performed without sending the patient to bed, for special heart examinations, for x-ray injections, in fact for almost any ambulatory illness.

He pays a fee for each service, just as he would in a private doctor's office. But—and here's where the group function—the fee is very small. Seldom are the fees over \$5.00 for anything. And for most services they are \$1.00, \$2.00, and \$3.00.

The clinic also has a house-call service, which some of the I. L. G. W. U. locals can use, depending on their benefit rules. It does not give hospitalization (partly because of the New York State law on hospitalization, which is unusually strict), and does not provide for major operations.

45,000 Attended in 1935

The clinic gave some 45,000 examinations to union members during last year; in 1935, the first year of its existence, it gave only 1,254. It does not entirely pay for itself, according to Pauline Newman, educational director. The I. L. G. W. U. pays the deficit out of funds collected from dues.

The Center has the important advantage of being union owned and union operated. A medical director is in complete charge of the medical side of the work, but the union controls the finances. It is run primarily for the interests of the union and its members.

Other employee groups (though not necessarily union) have tried group medical plans from which Guildsmen can learn. One of the most interesting is the Standard Employers' Medical and Hospital Association in Baton Rouge, La. This group medical experiment is run by the employees of a single company—the Standard Oil Company of Louisiana. It has been described by C. Rufus Boren, of the Julius Rosenberg Fund, in a pamphlet called "Group Payment for Medical Care." Our description is taken from his.

Under Employer's Control

Here, again, the employer group owns the building and the equipment for a general clinic, and employs the doctors, who are in complete charge of the medical part of the work. There were 2,500 employees in the association, which was formed for medical care in 1924. To raise the money for the building and the equipment, each member was required to buy a \$20 share of stock. He was allowed to pay for his share in monthly installments of \$2.50.

This arrangement made it possible for the group to be incorporated, to buy its building, and to get new and excellent equipment. To cover running expenses each

More Care is Now Sought, as Well as a Means Of Easing Sudden Blows on Individuals



EXPERT CARE AND EQUIPMENT AT UNION HEALTH CENTER
A Lung Examination in X-Ray Room of I. L. G. W. U. Clinic

member pays \$3 a month, which covers almost complete medical care for himself and his family. It provides hospitalization and nursing care up to \$250 in any one year, without extra charge. The Board of Directors (which is elected from the members) reserves the right to levy three special assessments of \$3 each during any one calendar year, if the costs of the services make it necessary, but, according to Dr. Boren, this right has been exercised only once.

Seven physicians and specialists are employed on a full time basis, to give the medical care. The medical director is paid a salary of \$4,000 a year. And the other doctors receive from \$6,000 up. Hospitaliza-

tion is arranged for in local hospitals, and paid for by the group.

Dues Deducted from Pay
This association had, of course, a large group membership to begin with, which made the relatively elaborate set-up possible. It also is able to collect its dues through payroll deductions, which insures regular payments.

There are other group medical arrangements which are set up by doctors themselves. And Guilds in cities where these group plans exist, might wish to consider joining them. One of the most famous of such bodies is the Ross-Loos Group Medical Service in Los Angeles. It was started in 1928, when 2,008 employees of the Los

Angeles Department of Water and Power approached Dr. Donald W. Ross and Dr. H. Clifford Loos, asking for a medical service.

It was arranged that Dr. Ross and Dr. Loos would give complete medical care to the employees and their families for \$3 a month. A small extra charge was to be made for house calls (to keep members from abusing this service), and the patient was to pay for his own supplies. Also, the \$3 included hospitalization only for the wage earner himself. Hospitalization for the members of his family was paid for separately.

Other groups of employees, including a large teachers' association, have joined the clinic now, so that it handles, according to the Survey Graphic of June, 1935, about 40,000 people.

Only organized groups of employees have been allowed to join. The groups make their own collections of the fees, which eliminates collection costs and the risk of bad bills from the expenses of the doctors. The arrangement seems to have been satisfactory both to the patients and to the doctors. The only control that the groups have over the clinic, as far as we can discover, is through their membership, which they can, of course, withdraw if they are not satisfied. The groups sign contracts with the doctors for the service, and there the group responsibility ends.

Similar to Philadelphia Plan
It is a plan similar to the Ross-Loos Group Medical Service which our own Philadelphia Guild has joined. Philadelphia was the first Guild to offer a medical care plan to its members.

The Guild found that Dr. Dudley W. Saul, a man of high professional standing, was interested in furthering group medicine, and of willing to make a start with the Philadelphia Guild on the basis of 500 interested members. Guild members were to pay \$2 a month each, for complete medical care with three months' hospitalization. Small extra charges were to be made for members of families. Dr. Saul was to provide the office and the equipment, and to make arrangements with specialists and hospitals.

While Guild members have been satisfied with the service, the project has taken an unfavorable turn. The Guild's contract provided that no non-Guild newspaper men were to be admitted to the service. Dr. Saul knew that with only the Guild patients he would probably go into the hole, but he counted on bringing other groups to join the service also. However, he at length felt that he had to open his doors to individuals in order to increase his membership and pay his bills.

This change of policy on the part of Dr. Saul, it is felt, will eventually open the door to non-Guild members and sacrifice some of the important advantages of group activity.

Our one other pioneering Guild is St. Louis. The group medical service there, which is only five months old, seems to have succeeded so far because of the friendship of some Guild members with doctors in the community. Whether or not the St. Louis plan can be applied to other Guilds is problematical.

Payments Fixed on Salaries

The monthly payments are on a sliding scale adjusted to salaries. They range from \$3 to \$4.50 monthly, with an extra charge of 50 cents for families. The Guild handles practically all medical bills, providing 21 days' hospitalization a year (though this is limited to \$250 in any one year for any one family).

There are no doctors under contract to the Guild. Rather, the Guild pays each individual's doctors' bills, just as though there were no group organization at all. The mechanics are confidential. St. Louis is trying to avoid complications with the American Medical Association, and is staying well within the A. M. A. rulings on medical ethics. No doubt individuals of the Guild would like more information on St. Louis' plan can get it through Julius Klyman, ANG vice-president.

ANG vice-president.

St. Louis itself admits that contract medicine would be much better—would lower the cost, and make for less financial risk to the Guild. But the Guild felt that it could not form a group plan, contracting with the doctors for service, at this time. So the current plan, which about 70 members have joined, seems to be filling the need.

Just why the St. Louis Guild and other groups have had so much difficulty organizing group medical plans is another story, which will be told in the next article in this series. Guilds must know the hurdles, and how to take them.

THE FREE PRESS

Business Risks Off As Papers Fight Guild

When the New York World-Telegram inaugurated its Saturday "Metropolitan" edition, the Hearst papers in New York rejected its advertisement of the event, which they saw as a threat to the Hearst Journal's five-cent Saturday paper. Business is business. This little matter of competition, however, does not keep the Journal from lining up with Roy Howard, of Scripps-Howard, in a "united front" against the Guild, as is seen from the story about the Scripps-Howard statement reported in this issue.

Federal Judge Clark Is News-Sometimes

Pronouncements from the Federal bench of New Jersey have traditionally been recognized as news by local papers. Judge William Clark, of Newark, who once held the Eighteenth Amendment unconstitutional, is undoubtedly the best known of New Jersey jurists. Yet when, on July 30, Judge Clark made some sharp comments on the actions of State courts in Camden in the RCA strike and granted heavy cuts in the bill set for three men arrested in the strike, he suddenly appeared to lose his standing in the local press.

The court held the defendants' constitutional rights had been violated by the RCA strike and granted heavy cuts in the bill set for three men arrested in the strike, he suddenly appeared to lose his standing in the local press.

The court held the defendants' constitutional rights had been violated by the RCA strike and granted heavy cuts in the bill set for three men arrested in the strike, he suddenly appeared to lose his standing in the local press.

Three New York papers, the World-Telegram, Times, and Post (but, not the Herald Tribune), ran spreads on the hearing, the first named using the story immediately

The Guild Reporter

Copyright, 1936, by the American Newspaper Guild



"Resolved, that the editor of THE GUILD REPORTER be instructed to so edit THE GUILD REPORTER that it shall promote in every legitimate way the recommendations and mandates of the Third Annual Convention of the American Newspaper Guild, and that he confine the editorial policy of THE GUILD REPORTER to that specific program."—Resolution of the 1936 Convention.

Editor:
Clyde Beale
Assistant Editor:
Leon Svirsky, New York World-Telegram
Staff for This Issue:
John Sullivan, Sidney Penner, M. Iushewitz,
Selma Weisopf, Charles Calkins, Jean R.
Meyer, Guy Rollston, Ada Calkins.

International Officers —of the— American Newspaper Guild

President:
Heywood Brown, A.N.G. Headquarters,
1560 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Executive Secretary:
Jonathan Eddy, A.N.G. Headquarters,
1560 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Treasurer:
Don Stevens, A.N.G. Headquarters,
1560 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
National Vice-Presidents:
W. Eric Homan, 113 Eadlich Ave., Mt. Penn, Pa.
Garland Ashcraft, 44 East 211th St., Euclid, Ohio
Julius H. Klyman, 626 Forest Ct., Clayton, Mo.
Gunnar Mickelson, 2105 E. Kenwood Blvd.,
Milwaukee, Wis.
Betty Ballantine, 111 Ellis St., San Francisco, Cal.
Morris Watson, A.N.G. Headquarters,
1560 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Vol. III, No. 17

August 15, 1936

"Wanted: A Rival"

That has been the cry of the reactionary opposition to the Guild ever since we organized. On the old principle of "divide and rule," the more rabid spokesmen of the publishers have almost prayed that some splitting movement would develop which could be played off against the Guild.

Every so often a rival is discovered. Editor & Publisher, chief prophet of the idea, has just made its find again, and this time an actual sponsor appears. Variety, the screen and stage weekly, located a make-up man who said he was the spokesman. Said Variety:

"When asked how it would differ from the Newspaper Guild (he) declared:

"There will be no copyboys or elevator men in the membership. We will negotiate peacefully and discipline members when necessary. We are not looking for a fight."

According to Editor & Publisher's version:

Its charter, which may follow in general lines that of the British Institute of Journalists, would prohibit any "entangling alliances, political, economic, or otherwise," thereby guaranteeing the complete freedom of its members as individuals.

There might seem to be a great opportunity for such an organization. The publishers, eager to do anything to prevent the Guild from becoming strong, will dispense largesse in modest amounts; and undoubtedly the chief offices will be stepping stones to soft beds, meaning advancement for those able to stand on their fellow members' shoulders. The organization would, of course, keep working conditions poorer, since it would hamper the Guild, and since that would be the only reason for the publishers to support it.

But the new organization, we believe, came too late. The British Institute of Journalists, after which it is supposed to be patterned, is already aware of its own futility. After hindering for a generation—but by no means stopping—the National Union of Journalists, after which the Guild is modeled, its mem-

Newspaper Men as Citizens

The reply by the New York Guild to Roy Howard's statement on the reasons for his refusal of a contract with the Guild, published in this issue, needs little elaboration. But there is one point that, to keep our own minds clear, will bear further analysis. That is Mr. Howard's criticisms of the indorsement of independent political action by the last Convention.

Some members are asking: Why antagonize the publishers by getting involved in something that is none of our business?

This can be broken down into two questions. Let's take the first: Should we confine our activities to those that will be pleasing to the publishers? To put the question is almost to answer it. For Mr. Howard objects not only to our leaning toward independent political action but to our affiliation with the A. F. of L. The publishers hold that we should not be a union but a professional organization. From the very beginning they have stated one pretext or another for not approving the Guild. If we allow their wishes to determine whether we shall take a stand on independent political action, we have opened the way to outside dictation on the very nature and tactics of our organization. That would stultify the Guild. We must make our own decisions.

Now, is independent political action none of our business? Should we as a matter of principle, refrain from any participation in politics and as a matter of practical strategy avoid supporting a labor party? Let us dispose of the "regimentation" argument by pointing out the fact, overlooked by Mr. Howard, that there is no moral or legal obligation on any Guildsman to vote or write contrary to his beliefs, but, on the other hand, there is a definite duty on every loyal Guildsman to be unbiased and truthful in presentation of the news, in accordance with a fundamental purpose of the Guild.

We are aware that there is a school of thought in journalism, led by Mr. Howard, which asserts that newspapermen should be completely detached from active civic interests. This notion is quixotic, at best, and socially pernicious.

Its utter fantasy is seen when we remember that 85 per cent of the newspapers of the country, according to reliable estimates, are opposing President Roosevelt's re-election. The men who control what goes into the papers are regimented—by their interest in profits.

You cannot set up a double standard for newspapermen. If you make them political eunuchs, you must do the same

to publishers, to teachers and school officials, to ministers, actors, movie magistrates and their staffs, social workers, and a host of others. Every one of these groups is involved in creating public opinion. But it is absurd to bar members of all of them from leadership or influence in public affairs. The success of democracy depends upon their exercising their full rights as citizens.

In attempting to apply their united strength politically on a national scale for the advancement of their economic interests, newspaper editorial workers are but following a well-traveled road that has been traversed by labor organizations and publishers' organizations.

Surely Mr. Howard could not object to the American Newspaper Guild supporting legislation to protect collective bargaining. But it is not as simple as that. We must work for such objectives through political parties, for this is a government depending upon party, not individual responsibility. Indorsement of independent political action is only recognition of the facts concerning the two old parties. To whom are the Democratic and Republican parties responsible? To political machines, which in turn are controlled by the wealthy groups and individuals who subsidize them; who supply the "grease," as politicians say. Their responsibility to the public as a whole, and especially to labor, is so remote that after thirteen years the Child Labor Amendment has not yet been ratified, despite an obviously overwhelming public support for it. These conclusions are so well documented that no disinterested authority in America would deny them.

That is why the American Newspaper Guild in Convention assembled indorsed independent political action. An independent political party will not materialize out of thin air. It must be dreamed of, urged, promoted and encouraged by those groups vitally interested in its formation.

What have newspaper editorial workers to gain from the success of a labor party? The defeat of a threatening rise of fascism; protection of collective bargaining rights; wage and hour legislation; adequate social security benefits, better housing, consumer protection—in other words, those improvements in living standards that can be accomplished by a government responsible to and conducted for the vast majority of the people. That's very much our business; possibly one of these days Mr. Howard will admit we are right.

1. We want a large, militant labor movement—as the one real means of protecting our own welfare.

2. We entered the A. F. of L. as it is now constructed because we believed the local and state bodies offered the best means both for strengthening our immediate position and for working toward the long-time goal.

3. The unity of the labor movement is important to us, so long as the way is open for growth.

On the immediate issue of the suspension of the C. I. O. unions we believe, in all frankness, that no matter what the cause, a large bloc of the Federation's membership can not be deprived of a vote at the Tampa convention on an issue vital to all labor without infraction of democratic control. Industrial unionism, to which we are committed, seems an inevitable concomitant of present economic trends and the Executive Council must find ways of accommodating that fact or follow the path of the Knights of Labor.

Having arrived inside of the A. F. of L., we have the opportunity, and from the standpoint of enlightened self-interest the obligation to work calmly and methodically towards unity on a basis that will speed the development of progressive trade unionism.

Why Guild Needs the Unorganized

Non-Members Serve as an Actual Handicap

Non-Members:

If you are not familiar with the Guild you may be puzzled to know why other newspaper men and women in cities far from yours and to all appearances holding as good or better jobs should devote much of their spare time to trying to bring you and others like you to become members.

In other words, if they are offering a gift horse you want to know what kind of teeth it has.

The members already enrolled have an excellent reason for being interested in your welfare. They want better conditions, higher pay, reasonable security and you, the unorganized editorial workers, are the largest single factor in determining how much of these improvements they can obtain.

This is so for two reasons: First, because no small group of workers in an industry can lift themselves permanently much above the level for the industry in general. They may achieve a momentary gain but they will be in an exposed position and will sooner or later lose it.

Second, because their bargaining strength depends on the degree of completeness of their organization. This is particularly true when a showdown comes and the Guild is forced to strike. Then the unorganized editorial workers, being seriously in need of better jobs, in most cases, represent potential strikebreakers and help the publishers keep down the whole forward movement.

Moreover, Guild members are anxious to improve conditions as widely as possible so as to have more good berths available if the need arises. Most newspaper men and women change jobs fairly frequently. If Guild conditions are established widely there will be less risk of landing in bad jobs.

These aims of men and women already in the Guild coincide with the aims of those still outside because such is the nature of the trade union movement. The interests which the great body of employees have in common are the interests which it seeks to promote.

You are eligible if you earn all or most of your income by contributing to the editorial output of news publications.

You are needed in the Guild now to help strengthen it. JOIN NOW!

Fill out the blank below and mail it in. All information will be kept in confidence and will not be given out without your permission.

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER GUILD,

44 West 45th Street,

New York City.

Please send me an application blank and statement of membership requirements.

Name

Address

Paper..... Position.....

Father Coughlin

Is Father Coughlin determined to earn for himself a place as Public Menace No. 1 for reporters.

The Washington Guild's protest at the treatment of J. A. Reichman, of the United Press, by Father Coughlin's aides in a New York broadcasting studio in June, has already been published in the GUILD REPORTER. Father Coughlin became annoyed when the questions of reporters grew too penetrating and his aides seized Reichman and after a scuffle took his identification cards.

At Worcester, Mass., on July 31 Father Coughlin assailed the "controlled" press in such a way as to lead his listeners to move menacingly toward reporters seated at the press table. Police quickly surrounded the reporters and trouble was averted.

The papers undoubtedly are expecting the reporters to take the gloves off in covering Coughlin and Lemke and are giving them a leeway that would not be tolerated in stories about the older parties. Yet a man who is throwing language as Father Coughlin is ought to be able to take some punishment in return. Certainly peevishness is not an endearing trait.

Storm Over the A. F. of L.

As the newest international union in the A. F. of L., perhaps we should sit tight and mind our own p's and q's while the family troubles are being aired. Yet the confusion that descended on us at the very moment when we received our charter and the rapid development of the clash between the two A. F. of L. wings, show that we, in company with all other A. F. of L. bodies, are going to be drawn into the arena. What are the guiding factors for us?

bers have lately been trying to find ways of merging with the Union. Such a merger is only prevented by the publisher members of the Institute, who, because of the nature of the charter, are able to block it.

Moreover, the era of rotarianism, which such an institute would represent, is passing. Newspaper men, certainly, are not willing to perform the drudgery necessary to run an organization merely for handshaking and banqueting and extra privileges for the top few. And the publishers, by their exhibitions during and since the NRA, have disillusioned too many of the old romantics. The clock can't be turned back.