

overthrow of the government by violence," and entrusting the enforcement of the resolution to the custodians of public buildings. The bill is an aftermath of Earl Browder's appearance at the Institute of Public Affairs last summer at the University of Virginia. Although there were some seventy other speakers, including two past commanders of the American Legion and several spokesmen for Nazi Germany, Virginia's professional patriots promptly went into hysterics at the idea of Browder's appearing. (We should note that this was before the Russo-German pact and before Browder's passport troubles with the government.) Friends of civil liberties in Virginia have denounced the proposed measure and hope that Governor Price will veto it. It is so loosely worded that it could be used as a means of persecuting all sorts of people—including Thomas Jefferson himself, if he were still in politics.

Indian Echo

Sir Michael O'Dwyer, sitting on a platform in London, was murdered by a Sikh in the audience, who at the same time wounded other prominent Englishmen. This echo of 1919 in India has contemporary significance. Twenty-one years ago British troops shot point-blank into a protest meeting of Sikhs at Amritsar, killing and wounding hundreds. It was an act of calculated terrorism to keep the Punjab in subjection, at a time when India was demanding self-government. Sir Michael O'Dwyer, then Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, sanctioned it. Now the Indian National Congress once more has voted a civil-disobedience campaign for Indian freedom. The spirit of Gandhi and non-violence still rules it; it disavows the murder, and asks for nothing more than dominion status now. But a rising opposition calls for stronger measures and complete independence. Will the British Raj again use repression and terrorism? Will it, by repeating old mistakes, make the assassination a symbol of revolt, for millions to follow? What then will become of Britain's professed devotion to peace, freedom and democracy?

Full Many a Flower

We hear that the flower shows this spring are drawing a bigger attendance than ever before. In New York City the crowd was so dense that you couldn't get anywhere near the prize-winning displays; you couldn't even buy a packet of seeds without getting your toes trampled. But what impressed us more than the tulips as big as soup plates—more even than the thousands of amateur gardeners gazing at them—were the new chemicals being sold as an aid to floriculture. It used to be said that the fairest flowers grew from the foulest muck, but it isn't said any longer. The fairest flowers are now grown in sterile sand, to which has been added a highly dilute solution of

stimulated with hormones. Their sexual maturity is hastened by an injection of Vitamin B₁. Their death by pest or disease is retarded by special sprays containing sulphur, lime, nicotine, arsenic or copper sulphate. The laboratory has triumphed over the dunghill.

News Notes of a Week

The Finns were moving their household goods out of the territory ceded to Russia; only a few families chose to stay behind. . . . It was reported in Paris that seventeen Polish professors from Cracow University had died during the last three months in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp near Berlin. . . . Field Marshal Goering requested Germans to give army authorities "every article made of copper, bronze, brass, tin, lead and nickel that is not vitally needed by the citizens," but he didn't offer to ante up his medals.

Conferences between Mayor LaGuardia and high CIO officials left both sides hopeful that a satisfactory labor policy would be worked out for the 27,000 members of the Transport Workers' Union who will be affected when the city takes over the subways. . . . Mrs. You-know-who said she didn't think women would mind telling census-takers their age, but Senator Tobey of New Hampshire continued his "civil disobedience" campaign against the census, with Frank E. Cannett and others offering to sit down on it with him.

Congress Should Investigate

DOES CONGRESS KNOW that its number-one police force is a self-confessed lawbreaker? Years ago Congress made it a crime to tap wires and the Supreme Court forbade the practice. Yet Chief G-Man J. Edgar Hoover last week told the press that his men had been tapping wires. He said that their wire-tapping had been done in "an entirely legal manner," and that in using taps they had never acted "in violation of existing laws." By these disingenuous statements Hoover was either providing himself with an opening to say later that he had been ignorant of the law, or indicating that he believes he has the power to overrule Congress and the Supreme Court. Attorney General Jackson apparently does not agree. By Jackson's order, Hoover may no longer enjoy the option of obeying or disobeying Congress's ban on wire-tapping.

Mr. Jackson, however, perhaps acting on Mr. Hoover's advice, does recommend the legalization of wire-tapping in kidnaping, extortion and racketeering cases. "Dirty business" was the characterization Mr. Justice Holmes applied to such detective practices by government officials. He and Mr. Justice Brandeis, in dissenting opinions, rejected the argument of necessity, saying it is better that some criminals escape than that

eral would be objectionable for two additional reasons. The statutes he seeks to implement constitute an undesirable advance of the federal government into local criminal cases and should be curtailed, not furthered. One of the crimes he mentions, racketeering, has been construed and increasingly used to combat labor unions; the performance of the Department of Justice, through its Bureau of Investigation, against unions in the Palmer and Daugherty regimes is being started all over again by the same bureau.

Does Congress know that Hoover spends a good deal of money to glorify the FBI and himself? At one time he had thirty-six employees doing publicity work. He has used government money to hire men whose work was the making of speeches, not the detection of crime. This ballyhoo has put over on the American public a series of myths about the G-men. Hoover's crime statistics and his claims to great returns for the millions he spends have been assailed by reputable criminologists as unreliable. Detailed descriptions have been printed in reputable magazines of his bungling of important cases, including kidnaping cases. There is no question that Hoover's men have captured criminals and detected crimes, but does Congress know that the FBI's activities are being carried on far less satisfactorily than by other federal police agencies, at far greater cost and with far greater publicity? A study published by the Brookings Institution shows that the FBI stands near the bottom of the list of government law-enforcement agencies in efficiency.

Questioned by Attorney General Jackson about its doings in the Detroit recruiting cases, the FBI denied every one of Senator Norris' charges. The result was that the Attorney General was induced to issue a public statement exonerating subordinates who had been guilty of indecencies and illegalities. It was not until after production of more detailed evidence by Norris that the Attorney General ordered an investigation. Had the FBI not pictured itself in the role of Sir Galahad, the Attorney General would not have been exposed to embarrassment by his own subordinates.

Does Congress realize in what manner Hoover is meeting grave charges advanced by Senators and Representatives, editors and leading newspaper columnists, clergymen and others, against the conduct of the FBI? Can the leaders of Congress approve, for example, a letter written by this head of a government bureau to one of his Hearst newspaper outlets, published portions of which state that the charges being laid against him come from the Communist Party, the underworld and misinformed persons?

Hoover's defenders in the press have been suggesting that the pending inquiry into the Detroit case, instituted by the Attorney General, is partly the result of a request of Hoover himself, and that its purpose is to

public attention to this one case only. Their purpose is to obscure Senator Norris' complaints about Hoover's installation of a secret political spy system, about his improper relations with employers in investigating the non-criminal activities of their workers, about his reintroduction of card indexes of radicals and others, about his reestablishment of practices to which he resorted during the notorious Palmer-Daugherty administrations, about improper or illegal treatment of reputable citizens in other recent cases. The wire-tapping incident illustrates the necessity of further inquiry into current FBI practices, of which Congress and the Attorney General may not have knowledge. How long will Congress let Hoover run on before it calls for a full disclosure of all the FBI lawlessness now hidden from its eyes?

What, No Unemployment?

A TRULY REMARKABLE DISCOVERY was made recently by The New York Times's chief Washington correspondent, Arthur Krock, and by that versatile columnist, Dorothy Thompson. This is that the unemployment problem in the United States has ceased to exist, and that the news has been suppressed by the politicians in Washington who are anxious to continue to "squander relief money" on a nonexistent problem. Both of these writers tell us that all the talk about nine to twelve million unemployed is pure political fiction, and that if we count the unemployed on the WPA as employed, then the volume of unemployment today is no greater, and possibly even smaller, than in prosperous 1929.

Not only is the news in itself amazing, but even more amazing are the circumstances attending the discovery and publication of this news. In the first place this "secret good news" is imparted to the world just when the business recession has reached such alarming proportions as to induce even a conservative banker like Colonel Ayres of the Cleveland Trust Company to suggest "large scale pump-priming" as a way out. Thus it would appear that the secret has been well kept by everybody down the line—from the high officials of the government to the humble workers in the factories. In fact, the workers have so successfully made believe that they were unemployed and unable to buy the products of industry and agriculture (when in reality they were employed and prosperous) that they even fooled cagey business men and bankers.

In the second place it would appear that the discovery of the news is not original with Mr. Krock and Miss Thompson, but stems from a report prepared by Edmond E. Lincoln, economist for the duPont interests. Mr. Krock in his articles quoted textually from