

## A Step in the Right Direction

By Samuel Rosinger

I cannot commend too highly the action of the Board of Education in raising the salaries of our teachers. As a rule, salaries lag way behind the rise in the cost of living. In the past, the wages of toilers were usually increased only under the threat of strikes, or by the pressure of an aroused public opinion. The action of the Board of Education had no such compulsion behind it. It was dictated by humanitarian considerations and by the realization that, if any laborer is worthy of his hire, it is the teacher who handles not merchandise, but potential manhood and womanhood, and in order that he do full justice to his weighty task, he must be reasonably compensated and relieved of material care and worry. No enterprise brings richer dividends than the investment we make in our schools. An underpaid and overworked teacher cannot have the angelic patience which the mental training and character building of a child requires. Hence, the increase in the teachers' salaries will be repaid a hundredfold in the increased efficiency of their invaluable service.

The step of the Board of Education, however, has a wider significance than the welfare of our schools. Voluntary increase in wages is in line with the President's heroic effort to hasten our economic recovery. The greater the purchasing power of the vast army of employees, the quicker business and industry will snap out of the deep rut of stagnation. There can be no prosperity on starvation wages. And the sooner the leaders of commerce and industry will boost the wages of the workers, the quicker the government will be in a position to scrap its vast regulatory program and return the business of the country to the control of the natural law of supply and demand. There are deluded radicals who think that a general division of wealth, now held by a handful, would bring about the millennium. Such a scheme of economic recovery is illusory. But a distribution of wealth by means of high wages is bound to revert to the blessing of employer and employee, and is the soundest and most sensible method of bringing about prosperity.

It is such an effective help that the President needs in putting over the new deal and not the lip-service of high sounding praises. It is not making the Blue Eagle screech a strident "We do our part" that counts in this grave emergency. The hour demands sacrificial service, self denial, and a down-right sincerity that brooks no pretence or pretext, but demands a pure heart and clean hands. Democracy is sorely besieged in its last stronghold, the Constitution of the United States. May God imbue us with that spirit of deathless determination to preserve Democracy that moved our Fathers to shed their blood and risk their all for its establishment.

# ROTARYGRAMS

OF BEAUMONT



## WEEKLY BULLETIN

Membership Secretary, Phone 932

Vol. IX Beaumont, Tex., March 21, 1934 No. 37

### *Slants at the Meeting*

Olie Oleson says there is nothing dumber than a dumb Irishman except an educated Swede. We fall in neither of these racial classifications but we must be dumb, for we can't figure out why Randolph Reed vigorously protested Steine's being made a part of the program.

Of course, Steine was a bit confused on his rooms in Dallas. He couldn't figure out whether it was 14-20 or 14-2. But in the state of confusion he is still in we would suggest he must have had 14 to 20 . . . . Anyway he got his message across without having to resort to manuscript, except inadvertently.

The Pres. 'kinder' charged us with seeing the frivolous side of the Dallas trip and Steine was to reveal the worthwhile and dignified aspects of the jaunt. He stymied himself immediately he set-up his wife as an alibi and dignity left him just like love does a hungry stomach.

We can't imagine where John Gore got that speech he read. Besides he doesn't recognize our antipathy to the printed word, or like the Missouri mule just didn't give a d—. We regret, however, the tri-combination of reading, bad voice and rotten "mike" left us 'wised-up' just like a cornfield nigger would be after listening to a Harvard professor discourse on molecular force.

Even as good a narrator is Pres Doty is, he was in the act of resorting to notes after listening to Steinie trying to quote an excerpt from the Rotarygram and sitting through John's diatribe. Thanks to his equipoise, he finally got going in his usual stride and revealed some interesting details of the recent forum inaugurated by Genl. Johnson on the NRA.

We still think Randolph owes Steinie an apology.

Check.

## People, Not Diplomats Make Wars, Says Simonds

Woodrow Wilson's assumption that the problem of world peace is the problem of getting rid of war-making leaders was wrong, according to Frank H. Simonds.

"In a word," says the distinguished historian and journalist in the current *Rotarian Magazine*, "the problem is one of educating the peace-loving majorities to the fundamental truth that they are themselves responsible for the present danger of war because they fail to grasp the ultimate consequence of insisting upon what they conceive to be their rights.

"In America there has been a vast confusion between the idea of actually cooperating internationally and of merely sending American delegations abroad to express American ideas about world peace. The fundamental implication of any undertaking to act internationally, that which involves modification of national sovereignty and acceptance of foreign commitments, is not only rejected almost universally in the United States, but supplies a rallying cry for effective political campaigns.

"The majorities in France and Germany, with equal unanimity and passion seeking peace," he continues, "addressed each other in unceasing appeals, each calling upon the other to abandon its purposes in the name of peace, each identifying in the refusal of the other, a refusal which expressed the will of a whole people, a deliberate rejection of the only possible road to assured peace. 'In the name of peace, restore our national unity,' the German people clamored. 'In the name of peace, guarantee our security,' the French replied.

"As long as the French people desire peace and security, the German, peace and revision, the American, peace without involvement, and as all three send their representatives abroad to insist uncompromisingly upon these conceptions, the world must continue to move along that road the end of which is inescapably 'the next war.'

"To insure world peace," suggests Mr. Simonds, "you have first to establish national authority, because war is demonstrably the result of the collision between the irreconcilable policies of nations. To do that you have either to persuade all peoples to consent in advance to accept international judgment upon their disputes with other peoples, or to create an international force adequate to impose such a judgment upon recalcitrant peoples. But today no people will consent to sacrifice its rights in obedience to international decree and few would agree to contribute their men and money to enforce such a decree."—From *The Rotarian Magazine*.

## Is the Thirty-Hour Week Inevitable?

Invoking the thirty-hour week at the present time would bring a definite set-back to recovery, declares Robert L. Lund, prominent St. Louis manufacturer, in a symposium in the current *Rotarian Magazine*. To William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, however, with whom he argues the proposal, the thirty-hour week would not only help restore but help maintain a permanent prosperity.

Assailing the popular belief that business can afford to establish the thirty-hour week, Mr. Lund, who is past president of the National Association of Manufacturers, points out that in 1929 only a little more than one-half of the corporations in America earned a profit. The rest operated at a loss. And in 1931, the net operating loss exceeded three billion dollars.

But industry's opposition to the thirty-hour week, he adds, is founded upon six very practical considerations. Namely: it would lower living standards; it would tend to create unemployment; it would hurt, rather than improve, the workers' condition; it would retard recovery; it would be unconstitutional; and it would not solve the unemployment problem.

Mr. Green, however, disagrees throughout.

Blaming the rapid growth of labor-saving machines for much unemployment, he quotes General Hugh S. Johnson, National Recovery Administrator, as saying that even "if we were back at the 1928 or 1929 standards of prosperity, there would be 4,000,000 out of work, with no way to take up the slack without a six-hour day."

Industry of its own accord, Mr. Green says, will not take care of its men in slack times, nor those thrown out of jobs by technological improvements.

"That is why," he concludes, "we have unemployment today. We have been shortening work-hours at about the same rate for the last half century, and we have suddenly begun to shorten work-time by using machines at a rate six times as fast. This is why we must shorten work-hours drastically now to make a readjustment. We cannot have dial telephones, teletypes, automatic looms, giant steel presses, acres of machinery run by a handful of men and still have jobs for all unless work-hours are shorter than they ever have been in history."—From *The Rotarian Magazine*.