

GOOD EVENING EVERYBODY: -

O.P.A., that government agency now dead but resisting burial, lost its chief tonight. Paul Porter, who headed O.P.A. through its last stormy days, has resigned. Porter, it's reported, has accepted a fifty thousand dollar a year job in radio.

COAL

As for ~~XXXXXXX~~ John L. Lewis ~~is~~ is now ~~XX~~ on trial.

That is his
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

trial began
~~XXXXXXXX~~ after luncheon this afternoon - and followed the morning decisions handed down by Judge Goldsborough.

The federal judge administered a one-two punch **to** the Lewis defense, two blows. ^{TP} The lawyers for Lewis and the coal mine union had made a motion for a dismissal of the charges of contempt of court. The Judge said - No. He dismissed the motion for a dismissal.

Secondly, he ruled, though not in formal fashion, that the Norris-LaGuardia Act, forbidding the use of injunctions in labor disputes, did not apply to the government of the United States. Therefore, that Act of Congress did not invalidate the injunction against Lewis and the union - the injunction pronounced by Judge Goldsborough himself. So Lewis was put formally on trial.

His plea ~~was~~ - not guilty.

And now, the legal proceedings take up the

question of whether or not Lewis ~~should~~^{shall} be sentenced
to a fine, or to jail, or both.

COAL - JUDGE

The decision of the Judge, denying the application of the Norris-LaGuardia Act to the coal strike injunction, was one of those long legal opinions - full of technicalities of the law. But, it also included a dramatic turn - with a personal, human angle. ~~It has~~ been noted before that Judge Goldsborough had something to do with that same Norris-LaGuardia Act, when it was passed by Congress several years ago. The judge, at that time, was a member of Congress. So today, as a judge, he was interpreting a law with which ^{himself} he had dealt, as a congressman. ^{TP} This fact was emphasized today by Judge Goldsborough - he making the point that he knew, at first hand, what the Norris-LaGuardia Act was intended to mean - at the time it was passed. He expanded the personal angle to back up a contention that the act was never designed to apply to the government. Its purpose, said he, was to outlaw court injunctions in strikes

~~against private individuals or firms and not to outlaw injunctions in strikes against the government.~~

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, when it passed, was sponsored by the late Senator Norris in the upper House, and by Congressman LaGuardia in the lower House - that same fiery Fiorello ^{afterward} who made headlines as Mayor of New York and as head of Unrra. And today Judge Goldsborough began his opinion as follows: "It happens that the court was a member of Congress at the time the Norris-LaGuardia Act became law. Mr. LaGuardia and I were, legislatively, always very close. I think I am correct in saying I supported every measure he was interested in. So I am sure," the Judge continued, "that I am thoroughly familiar with the Norris-LaGuardia Act and its purposes, and the reasons for it."

In that way Judge Goldsborough went back to the days when ~~ixxxx~~ he was Congressman Goldsborough -

and played a prominent part in passing the Norris-LaGuardia Act. ^{TP} He then went on to review the history of court injunctions ~~and~~ labor matters, injunctions as a way of breaking strikes - a thing that labor has always bitterly opposed. The Norris-LaGuardia Act, he said, was intended to stop the abuse of court action against labor unions. ^{TP} ~~And in writing that law, the government was not specifically exempted. Why not? Judge~~

~~Goldsborough declared today that~~ ^{TP} The supporters of the Act had never meant it to stop government injunctions against unions, but they had left out all mention of the government, ^{because the} ~~after discussing the matter. One reason was, according to the judge today, that the~~

~~government was always exempted from things like that, - unless it was expressly stated to the contrary.~~ ^{TP} Judge

Goldsborough cited all kinds of law, ancient and modern, to show that it was implicit that a ^{statute} ~~law~~ like the

Norris-LaGuardia Act did not apply to the federal government.

All of which was in the dry technical language of the law, but it was brought to life by the dramatic turn, the personal, human angle. In this national crisis of the coal strike, the judge today ~~was~~ interpreting a law which he, as a congressman, had helped to pass. He was prominent in the matter then, and now that ^{same} law comes back to him -with headlines.

FOLLOW COAL-JUDGE

The latest news tonight tells of an increasing tie-up of industry - steel, in particular, closing down plants, ^{TP} and Republican Senator Knowland of California, newly elected, has called upon President Truman to undertake a drastic measure. He advises the President to make an appeal to the coal miners for return to work. And, if they refuse, ^{then} issue a call for volunteers to go into the mines, and dig coal.

STRIKE - LONDON

Across the ocean, London is facing a strike that would tie the British metropolis into a knot -- a subway strike. London traffic depends hugely on the Underground -- British for subway -- and to stop the trains xx that roll through the tubes would mean city-wide disorganization.

The Underground strike is threatened for December second -- and all because one single solitary worker refuses to join the Union. He's a tall, shy, mild sort of fellow -- William Clark, **B**ut he's strong~~ly~~ and stubborn enough to tie up the Underground, rather than change his mind. **R** His reasons for refusing to join a Union are religious. He's a member of the Plymouth Brethren, an austere sect founded a hundred years ago -- devout and determined believers. The authorities don't want to dismiss William Clark -- he's a capable and faithful employee. But the Union has issued notice -- unless he joins up or is discharged, there'll be a strike of the Underground.

England has other Union troubles, because of the Plymouth Brethren. In one borough department, three clerks face dismissal -- because they refuse to join Unions. What sort of religious scruples have they? They refer to the Bible. They point to a passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, a passage that reads: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." This they interpret ^{as} a prohibition against joining ~~Unions~~ *labor organizations*. ~~Just how they figure it is not too clear -- about being unequally yoked together with unbelievers.~~

On the other hand, many members of the Plymouth Brethren ^{do} belong to Unions. The doctrine of the sect is that each one shall interpret the Bible according to his own likes and his own ~~xx~~ conscience. So some interpret one way, and some another ^{in the matter of not being unequally yoked together with unbelievers}. During the war a number of the Brethren

were conscientious objectors -- interpreting the Bible as prohibiting them to take part in war. As against that,

one of Britain's distinguished soldiers in World War

~~Number~~ Two is a member of the Plymouth Brethren, ~~is~~

Lieut.

General Sir William Dobbie, who commanded at Malta

during the time of the savage Nazi air raids against that island.

Still another case is that of General Charles Orde Wingate, that fabulous jungle fighter, Wingate of Burma. He was of a family that adhered devoutly to the Plymouth Brethren. Wingate's air commander was a fabulous American, Colonel Philip Cochran -- Flip Corkin of the comic strip, Terry and the Pirates. In their campaign of wild adventure in Burma, Phil Cochran and Wingate were the closest of friends, -- *And* Cochran has told ~~me~~ ^{*me*} much about the signs of intensely religious upbringing in that legendary Englishman -- who, with his Plymouth Brethren origin, was ^{*both*} a zealot and a genius of war.

And now the Plymouth Brethren appear in London headlines -- in connection with the threat of a strike of the Underground.

Soviet Russia will not give up the veto in the control of atomic energy. This ~~was~~ ^{today} stated flatly before ^a ~~the~~ United Nations Committee at Lake Success, ~~and is~~ Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister Vishinsky declared that Soviet Russia would take no part in any program to outlaw atomic warfare, if the right of veto were denied.

Last night we heard how the Soviets had relented somewhat in their opposition to the principle of inspection. Previously, they had rejected all proposals that the United Nations should have the right to go into any country, and inspect - to make sure that, ^{nations} ~~judges~~ ~~disarmament were not being evaded; to be sure that nations~~ were keeping their promises on the subject of atomic weapons, ~~are~~ not making atomic bombs on the sly. Yesterday, the Soviets proposed - special commissions of investigation, the meaning of which was not entirely clear. But what good would anything like that be, if a

nation faced with investigation, could simply cast a veto - and thereby call off any attempt to examine what it might be doing about atomic bombs?

That point was pressed today by the British and Americans, and it brought forth an answer from the Soviets Vishinsky stating that Soviet Russia insists upon its veto, even in matters of atomic control.

In the midst of all this, an American jibe was uttered - a wry remark made by Senator Connally of Texas. The Senator was stating our side of the atomic veto question, when Vishinsky interrupted - complaining he did not know what was being said. *His ear phones* ~~He took off his ear phones.~~ These weren't working - the ear phones that were supposed to give to him a simultaneous translation into Russian of what was said in English. ~~The~~ *Technicians* were summoned, and they fixed the Vishinsky ear phones.

During the pause, Senator Connally chuckled:

"The Soviets have just got their wires crossed."

He paused for a moment, and then added
thoughtfully: "I hope they haven't got their fingers
crossed, too."

OPIUM

The United Nations call for a worldwide ban on opium smoking. ~~This was~~ ^{So} voted unanimously ^{today} by the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Nations in which opium smoking is legal, are asked to prohibit the manufacture, sale and use of the drug of dreams.

The resolution notes that Great Britain, France, Holland and Portugal have already enacted a prohibition of opium in their Far Eastern colonies. This was largely because of Lend-Lease pressure brought by the United States, war-time bargaining in which we granted Lend-Lease on condition that Britain, France and the Netherlands ~~enact~~ ^{forbid} opium in their oriental colonies as soon as the Japs were chased out.

One country that permits the sale of opium is India - which is now provisionally independent - under an interim government. British administrators out there have argued that the use of opium by the Indians is

not harmful - ^{since} they take it ^{merely} as self medication, and use it wisely.

Another country is - Iran. American and British notes have been sent to the ancient land of Persia, asking its government to put a ban on opium. Iran is particularly important in the matter, because that country has a flourishing business of exporting the drug. To date, the Iranian government has merely taken the matter under consideration.

In the pressing of today's resolution, the American delegation took the leading part, ~~because~~

^a worldwide ban on opium would make it easier for us to suppress the smuggling of narcotic drugs ^{— opium derivatives —} into this country.

ELLIOTT

In Moscow today, Elliott Roosevelt gave an answer to the story we had the other night - the account of ^R~~the~~ speech ~~that~~ the son of the late President Roosevelt made in Moscow. ^{TP} According to the magazine Newsweek, Elliott Roosevelt, at a reception given by a Soviet propaganda chief, defended Soviet Russia and attacked the United States. According to Newsweek, Elliott Roosevelt declared that the Soviets had always kept their word, while the United States and Great Britain had violated their pledges. He was also said to have declared that the United States had never, in a single instance, acted to further the cause of peace - and to have asserted that America was using the United Nations for selfish and imperialistic reasons. So what has Elliott Roosevelt to say to that?

In Moscow today, he declared that the Newsweek story was what he called - "a put-up job." Who put up

^{Why}
the job? [^] The American Embassy in Moscow, says Elliott
Roosevelt.

Had he said what he was reported to have said -
at the Soviet part -
[^] attacking this country? To this he replies that the
Newsweek story was incorrect because, in his words -
"it does not carry the story in full."

So what did he say? To that question he
replies: "I refuse to divulge the conversation of others
at a private party, just as I expect others to respect
my conversation."

As for his charge against the American Embassy
in Moscow, Elliott Roosevelt was told by newsmen today
- the newsmen - didn't
that they ~~didn't~~ [^] know of any put-up job. To this he
responded: "I know better. I've made a full investigation."
He intimates that American Embassy officials at the party
baited him and his wife with questions. And he adds:
"I also saw Embassy officials whispering questions to

ELLIOTT - 5
ask us, in the ears of women, who had no business participating in the conversation anyway." What? Ladies have no business participating in conversations? I wonder who told Elliott that!

Mrs. Elliott Roosevelt, the Actress Faye Emerson, added her denunciations - and these leave us in something of a haze - so far as understanding what went on at the Moscow party. "It's the first time we've been unfairly treated by the press boys," says Mrs. Faye Emerson Roosevelt. "That party and the baiting," she goes on, "were the most appalling example of bad taste I've ever seen. We were happy to have a chance to meet Americans again - and then to be laid out on the floor like that, it's disgusting."

She said the reason was because the newsmen in Moscow were jealous of the facilities the Soviets had given the Elliott Roosevelts - facilities for going

around and seeing things. This, of course, recalls the way foreign news representatives in Soviet Russian are kept, as if in a sort of isolation ward and not permitted to see anything. It was different with the Elliott Roosevelts. So, while Elliott ~~bx~~ blames the machinations of the American Embassy, the Missus blames the jealousy of the newsmen.

That must have been quite a party in Moscow!

And now Nelson, too wind up this party a few words from you.

Tonight, new outbreaks of trouble are expected in Palestine, because of a decision handed down by the British Supreme Court in Jerusalem today. The Supreme Court in the Holy City denied a writ of habeas corpus to prevent the deportation of four thousand illegal Zionist immigrants to Cyprus. The court ruled against arguments presented by Zionist lawyers, and upheld the British contention that the deportations were in the interest of public security.

During consideration of the case, the Zionist extremists warned that, if the habeas corpus were denied, ~~the response would be new~~ the response would be new strokes of violence. - And these are expected at any time.