THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

W. C. DOWD, Publisher · J. E. DOWD, Editor · HARRY S. ASHMORE, Associate Editor

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1946

There Is Talk Of Peace Again

THERE is talk of peace again, good talk, sound talk, sincere talk. And it comes from responsible men: President Truman, Secretary Byrnes, Secretary Bevin, Generalissimo Stalin, Commissar Molotov. All of these make the same point—differences of opinion between East and West, grave as they are, do not in themselves constitute a real threat of war; it is time, therefore, to silence the hysterical factions on both sides of the Iron Curtain who speak of war as inevitable.

And President Truman, opening the new session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, underscores once more a significant point: The task of UN is not to make the peace, but to preserve it once the major powers have made final settlement of World War II. This serves as a warning not to expect too much from the fledgling international organization settling into its new home at Lake Success, and also as a reminder of the failure of the Paris Conference.

But there seems to us to be a new note of hope in all this. We detect no sound of a door being slammed against the future. Rather there seems to be renewed realization of the value of the cause to which all these men—American, British and Russian—are dedicated, each in his own fashion. War in an atomic age, as President Truman said, is unthinkable, and perhaps he coined a slogan: "Civilization as we know it cannot survive."

Perhaps the weariness of the long road from San Francisco to London to New York to Paris to New York is passing now. Perhaps the negotiators are regaining their vision, looking beyond Trieste and Sofia and Palestine, past all the wearing little problems that have grown in importance until they seem to obscure the final objective: An equitable arrangement under which two competitive systems of government can co-operate in peace as they did in war.

There is still a danger that weariness and frustration will prompt one side or the other to abandon the objective, to sink back into sullen isolation. But for the moment at least the danger has abated; implicit in all these recent speeches is a new determination to attack that central problem, to try, somehow, to translate words of good will into deeds.

Perhaps Lake Success has a prophetic name.

'One Of The Greatest Men . . . .'

FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT was surrounded by the high winds of controversy throughout his tenure in the White House. Although most Americans agreed neither with those who looked upon him with blind hatred nor with those who offered him uncritical adulation, they were affected nevertheless by the constant clashing of these extreme views. Now that the compelling personality of the man has been removed by death, most of us, with a sigh of relief, have consigned the late President to the historians for final evaluation; only gravediggers like Pegler and the professional commoners of the Democratic high command seek to make capital of the complex Roosevelt legend.

But there is new and illuminating evidence of the stature Franklin Roosevelt attained in the eyes of those who judged him as a citizen of the world. The great Tory, Winston Churchill, who wrangled with him frequently over the conduct of the war, applies the test of "the favorable influence exerted upon mankind" and rates the late President above Washington and Lincoln.

This could be the voice of gratitude, of course. An Englishman, remembering the shadow of destruction that fell across his country might well lavish praise intended for the American people as a whole upon the man who served as their symbol. In the first breathing spell after their salvation, men are inclined to be uncritical of their saviors.

We are more impressed with an estimate of Franklin Roosevelt that crops up, almost irrelevantly, in Robert Van Gelder's *Writers and Writing*. In 1941, before the United States had entered the war against the Axis, a young Austrian journalist, Hans Habe, arrived in this country after fighting with the French Army, being captured, escaping from a German prison camp and making the tortuous underground journey to Lisbon. In October of that year, when Mr. Van Gelder interviewed him for *The New York Times*, Habe said:

"It is not only that I owe to the President my life; it is not only that he is the best English teacher in the world—I know his speeches so well; they have meant so much to me. As you ask what I think of him, I can tell you, though perhaps as a foreigner I have no right to say. I think him the greatest man in the world today and one of the greatest men that ever lived. I have thought that for many years—yes. Most people in Europe—well, I did not hear one word of criticism of Roosevelt, ever, until the day our ship entered New York harbor. Believe me, we in Europe who hate Nazism see in your President the great hope of the world . . ."

That regard for Franklin Roosevelt, and through him for the American people, was our most effective weapon in the war against the Axis. It could now be the most effective instrument for the building of a peaceful world—perhaps the only really effective instrument. The tragedy of our time is not that we have lost a leader, but that somehow we have also lost the collective greatness of spirit he represented to the world.

The Vindication Of Chester Bowles

THE bellows of Senator Thomas remind *The Atlanta Journal* of the very recent history of the cotton market. Last March Chester Bowles, on his last legs as stabilization director but still fighting gamely, took note of the rampant speculation in cotton futures and tried his level best to do something about it.

The price of cotton, said Mr. Bowles, was being driven up all out of reason by gamblers who had taken over the markets, and the only result could be eventual collapse. He therefore requested the cotton exchanges to raise their margin requirements to $40 or more. Exchange officials promptly refused.

Mr. Bowles then announced that the OPA would issue an order of its own increasing margin requirements. Whereupon the same Senator Thomas who is now crying for the Government to take action against the bears, announced that such an order would be a call to battle for the Farm bloc, and that he personally would see that OPA was done to death by June 30. At the same time Senator Burnet Maybank of South Carolina, an old cotton broker, sent word to Mr. Bowles that the best service he could render his country would be to tender his resignation.

Senators Thomas, Maybank and the others who joined them to defend the cotton speculators in the name of the cotton farmers, won a clear victory. Chester Bowles was forced out of the Government. OPA was emasculated. Gambling on the cotton exchanges was allowed to continue unchecked. Chester Bowles had his inning last week, after a fashion, when the collapse of the cotton market proved the soundness of his views.

But, edifying though the discomfiture of Senators Thomas and Maybank may be, their worst enemies can derive no pleasure from the spectacle. There remains the tragic certainty that no one in a position to do anything about it recognizes even now the moral pointed out by *The Journal*: "The rise of the price of a basic commodity, when due largely to manipulation by gamblers, is bound to be in the long run a misfortune to a country's economy."

Another Voice

Of More Than Local Import

THERE are two phases, although they tend to merge, of the situation which has come to light in Charlotte, following its widely publicized divorce mill and lottery cases, which ought to be investigated in the public interest.

The first of these primarily concerns Charlotte itself as it involves the relationship between the city solicitor and the City Police Department. A lack of co-operation is indicated if not expressly charged in the solicitor's action in asking outside agencies, the State Highway Patrol and the State Bureau of Investigation, to aid him in breaking up the numbers racket and then pointing out that he had been unable to get convictions until these agencies were brought in. This situation should have the attention of Charlotte citizenry and officials to the end that any disagreement misunderstanding, friction or inharmony which exists may be eliminated and the cause of law and order served accordingly.

But the issue does not end at Charlotte's city limits. There have first of all been charges that SBI Chief Walter F. Anderson removed an agent from the divorce mill investigation and ordered him to work on the lottery case instead as a result of feeling between the SBI head and his successor as Charlotte's chief of police. While Mr. Anderson has denied the charge, it is well enough for higher authority at Raleigh to look into the allegation, since it was made by the executive secretary of the N. C. State Bar, and to make sure that personal pique, jealousy or animosity is not entering into law enforcement assignments in North Carolina.

Of broader state import are the circumstances under which a highway patrolman left his patroling, as vital as that assignment is in these days of mounting traffic casualties, to join SBI agents in their Mecklenburg County numbers raid. What was wrong that the SBI could not get Charlotte or Mecklenburg County officers, city police, county police or sheriff's deputies, to render this assistance but instead had to bring in State officers from an undermanned and overworked highway patrol? The reflection is not only upon local officers but upon the policy which governs the patrol and lessens the duty which it performs on the highways. The least that should be expected is clearance with somebody at Raleigh before patrolmen are pulled off their highway assignment, than which none is now more important, and sent or taken on jobs which general law enforcement officers ought to do.—*Greensboro Daily News.*

The Iceman Cometh

People's Platform

In Defense Of Fascism

CHARLOTTE

TENTATIVELY comparing the ghastly ordeal of revenge at Nuernberg with alleged liquidations by the Nazis, one H. L. Golden has written to cast unfavorable reflection upon certain columnists who have had the courage to denounce the Nuernberg lynchings, by referring to them as "mentally aborted".

The use of the frequently employed, but little-understood word, Fascist, is an old trick of the elements infected with "Red-itis". In the Moscow dictionary, a Fascist is anyone who disagrees with Communism.

Golden is ignorant that Fascism is a generic and comprehensive concept which refers to and describes that variable ensemble of physical and psychic elements which generate the cultural homogeneity and group self consciousness and solidarity forming the foundations of a nation, the Anglo-Saxon equivalent of which is "nationalism". And is conventionally used to designate the modern political system or order, based as it is upon the unit of the national state. And consequently carries no more stigmatation or import of dishonor than the identification of popular political parties or the word American. In fact, citizens scrupulously loyal defenders of Constitutional Americanism, are beginning to feel complimented when they are called Fascists. For as such the individual is clearly and whole-heartedly American—first, last and always—and decidedly untarnished by the alien "follosophy" of Communistic internationalism.

"The first objective of my heart is my country", said Jefferson. "In that is embarked my family, my fortune, and my own existence. I have not one farthing of interest, nor one fiber of attachment out of it". And it is authoritatively acknowledged that "many members of the Federal Convention were nationalists at heart". And "ever since the end of the eighteenth century, Nationalism has been the most important single factor moulding the public mind and determining history"; there appears no apparent reason to deny or dissent from American nationalistic Fascism.

Distortion of the word Fascism had its inception in Moscow under the stimula of George Demetroff, and since 1935 has been employed to distract the attention of the gullible up and away from the nefarious and subversive activities of the alien-minded internationalists. For Fascism, or national consciousness, is indubitably Communism's greatest enemy—an indomitable obstacle in the path of internationalism, and its proposal to shackle and enslave free peoples, destroy free enterprise, independence of political action, free speech, free press and the sacred rights of individualism. Therefore, heed not the seductive sirens of alien-minded internationalists, or the catcalls of the Cardinals of Communism.

In construing a lot of sentimental double-talk about cadavers "stacked like cord-wood", Golden places himself on the side of those who maintain company with the barbaric principle of "an eye for eye and tooth for tooth" morality. But Golden would do well to ponder the eloquent words of Ingersoll, who said: "The world has been filled with prisons and dungeons . . . with hangmen and headsmen—and yet these frightful means and instrumentalities and crimes have accomplished little for the preservation of property or life".

Which is to say, despite the exhaustive efforts of man to establish the gallows-tree as an expedient for the protection of virtue and well-being of states, the ratio of crimes and criminals has consistently increased. For every execution tends to harden the public heart; tends to lessen the sacredness of human life. As criminal statistics support the truth of this statement, we await the development of the future of this statement, we await the developments of the future that will inevitably spring forth as a result of the thoughtless spectable of Nuernberg.

—A. W. BLACK.

(NOTE: Mr. Golden asked: "Do we discern a wave of sympathy for the Fascists executed at Nuernberg"? Mr. Black provides an affirmative answer—not only sympathy for the gangsters who were hanged but for the system that produced them and the unspeakable horrors he writes off as "sentimental doubletalk". We reprint his letter here as a reminder of how much difference twelve months can make.—Eds., THE NEWS).

More Light

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

PETE McKNIGHT'S articles explaining the city boulevard project provide the citizens with facts that they do not seem to have any other way of finding. Although I am in business in Charlotte, I live outside and I do not have any direct interest in the controversy, but it seemed to me that the civic promoters of the improvement were about to be overruled by public sentiment until The News put the facts where everybody could read. The promoters of zoning, also, may lose their project to the opposition unless they spread their argument out where the people can see it.

The people are afraid of anything that they do not understand. Government agencies should give them more light. If there's no money to pay for publicity, it is fortunate that the newspapers find the facts of such news value as to make it profitable to let the people know all about what they are expected to vote for, and about what they are expected to support their city, county and state agencies in doing.

—SIGNATURE WITHHELD.

Medical Care

SOUTHERN PINES

Editors, THE NEWS:

I WAS tremendously impressed by the articles on the Better Health campaign. I have read some of Burke Davis' things before and liked them. You are lucky to have such a good man on the staff.

The campaign to improve the health of this State is close to my heart. I have long been working for maternity health in this county. I think we organized, here, the first citizen's committee to work with our county health office along those lines. We sent a nurse to train in New York and paid her salary for a while after she came back. We still pay part of her expenses.

I am planning to go all out, in my paper.

—KATHERINE BOYD,
Editor & Publisher,
The Southern Pines Pilot

Marquis Childs

Nuernberg Oversights

WASHINGTON

QUITE aside from questions of policy and procedure, I am at a loss to understand the result of the Nuernberg trials except on the theory, which I would deplore, that the court wanted to give an impression of judiciousness and so varied the sentences for the same or equivalent crimes.

To me the most shocking result of Nuernberg was not the sentences of "hanging" against Herman Goering and others but the acquittal of Hjalmar Schacht. To my mind this is precisely as if Al Capone had been placed on trial with other members of his gang charged with participation in the same crimes and his accomplices were found guilty while he was acquitted.

MOST GUILTY OF LOT

Schacht was the evil genius who contrived the finances by which Hitler and his gang were able to operate. To my way of thinking, his was the greater measure of guilt and yet he was allowed to go scot free while others were sentenced to be hanged or to prison for crimes which they could not have committed if it had not been for him. I will be greatly mistaken if the tender consideration shown to Schacht will not be more greatly misunderstood and, therefore, resented, as time goes by. With the greatest criminal of the lot dismissed with the kind smiles of the court, what deterrent will restrain some future Schacht, when he undertakes to breathe the breath of life into the diabolical schemes of another Hitler?

And after Schacht, it seems to me that Franz von Papen stood next in the order of his blood-guiltiness. It was von Papen who persuaded von Hindenberg to make Hitler Chancellor of the Reich. It was von Papen, who, during the First World War, plotted right here in America for the undoing of America. Hitler knew his von Papen. He appreciated his lack of honor, his total unscrupulousness and his willingness to put himself into the hands of his blood-letting leader as a ruthless instrument to throw the Chancellories of Europe into confusion. As in the case of Schacht, it gets down to the question whether greater moral guilt is to be condoned while a lesser degree of physical guilt is to meet with death upon the gallows.

I raise no question with respect to Rudolf Hess. It is fair to suppose that he was given life because he was thought to be insane. Julius Streicher was found guilty on only one count. He was sentenced to hang. On the other hand, Carl Doenits got off with ten years' imprisonment although he was found guilty on two counts. This should also be contrasted with Baldur von Schirach who was sentenced to a term of twenty years on a finding of guilty on one count. And as against Doenits with his ten years for being guilty on two counts, there is to be noted that Ernest Kaltenbrunner, also guilty on two counts, was sentenced to hang.

OTHER CONTRASTS

Hans Frank is in the same category. Fritz Sauckel was decreed to be hanged because he was guilty on two counts. Martin Bormann who was tried in absentia was held to merit death by hanging because of his guilt on two counts, while Konstantin von Neurath, although found guilty on all four counts, got off with a mere fifteen years. Another contrast: Arthur Seyss-Inquart, while determined to be guilty on three counts, was sentenced to be hanged while von Neurath, guilty on all four counts, was given the comparatively light sentence of 15 years.

To the degree that there were wide and apparently inexplicable variations are people likely to suspect that considerations entered into the judgment of the court that should not have been there. This apparent discrimination will not only make for a questioning of the court's judgment, it will constitute a basis for the belief that, in some instances at least, martyrs were being created instead of criminals being punished. Certainly to let Hjalmar Schacht go free while at the same time hanging von Ribbentrop will satisfy no one's sense of justice, while to write "Franz von Papen the Innocent" under the life-size portrait of that gentleman will evoke nothing but a cynical smile.

DROP THE TRAPPINGS

In view of what I regard as a miscarriage of justice with respect to Schacht and von Papen, I join with Mr. Justice Jackson in demanding that other blood-guilty Germans, particularly financiers and industrialists, without whom these shocking crimes could not have been committed, be speedily brought to justice. And, in such an event, I should hope that the stage trappings that robbed Nuernberg of its proper dread effect will be dispensed with.

Samuel Grafton

Belly-Level Campaign

NEW YORK

A PHILOSOPHER (or a moralist) might, I think, be a little worried about the nature of a good many of the campaign arguments being used today. Almost every election speech is an appeal to passion, and perhaps has to be, but some passions are higher than others. During the recent meat panic, for example, the shouter Republicans made a straight appeal to the belly, and to human impatience, which is not a virtue, and certainly it is fair to say that their urgings were addressed to the lower, rather than the higher, centers of human motivation and conduct. These orators were not fighting for food for the people which is a creditable enterprise, but only for a particular kind of food; they were shouting to the voter to make that chicken back and bring meat.

CHALLENGE IGNORED

But what might most bother a philosopher (or a moralist) is that nobody on the Democratic side took up the issue so raised, in strictly moral terms. It could have been done, in a speech to the public, somewhat like this: "All right, you may be without meat for two or three months. What of it? Is that too dreadful a deprivation to ask of you? In defense of a great cause of maintaining national stability? Do you expect to get stability for nothing? Will you sell it out for a hamburger?"

But the Democrats were afraid to ask the public to make a sacrifice; they accepted the belly-level, established by the opposition, as the right level, and they caved in. Nobody asked anybody to behave with grace, or to give up anything.

There is here a strange, self-pampering something, almost unique in the troubled world today. It started a year ago, when we dropped rationing about ten minutes after the war ended. Ever since the last gun was fired our politicians have lived in terror, lest they, any American who had to do without anything, would immediately go into a mad dervish whirl, and come at us screaming. Why should they? What right has anyone to resent a shortage? Shortages and dislocations are part of the price to be paid for winning a war.

LIFE IN BUTCHER SHOP

But the Administration has acted as if the economic consequences of the war were a kind of scandal, to be hushed up; while the opposition has treated our impatience as a political gold mine, and has worked on it, to make impatience more impatient. Our press has been filled with pictures of juicy cuts of meat being served in Canada (which has never dropped rationing) and the implication is that for the last month we have all been living, emotionally, in a butcher shop, amid the blood and slobber, either licking beefsteak or drooling over sides of beef; and perhaps it is time to get out into the air again, and add a higher value or two to the list of things by which we live.

To go back to my philosopher (or moralist): he might say that while the individualism which the Republicans stress so in their oratory is sound enough, there are perhaps other sides to individualism than an impatience for beef, than the short temper and the short view.

In fact, baby anger against fell circumstance is one of the poorest of all ways in which to express the dignity of the individual: there is something spoiled and unpleasant about that; the individual never really amounts to anything until he learns to think and feel on the higher levels.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Nazi Propaganda Took In Many Americans

WASHINGTON

THE amazing thing about Nazi propaganda before Pearl Harbor was the Nazis' ability to suck in certain highplaced and supposedly intelligent Americans even after Hitler had invaded Poland, overrun France and spread out over most of Europe. The Reader's Digest, largest circulating magazine in the world, was one of them.

The report on Nazi activities in the USA, prepared by John Rogge of the Justice Department after weeks of interviewing top Germans, shows that one editor of The Reader's Digest, Paul Palmer, was in consultation with Hans Thomsen, Hitler's personal Ambassador in Washington; also with Manfred Zapp, head of the official Nazi propaganda agency, Trans-Ocean News Service.

The Rogge report, which many high politicos tried desperately to suppress, also tells how DeWitt Wallace, owner and editor of The Reader's Digest, hired Lawrence Dennis, now under indictment for sedition, to do some smear pieces against Henry Wallace, then Vice-President of the United States.

Apparently, DeWitt Wallace knew how "hot" Dennis was, because he warned him to cut out his fascistic news letter. Also, the $4,300 which The Reader's Digest paid Dennis was not paid direct, but through a front man, Pendleton Dudley, a New York public relations agent.

Dennis also said that he also had collaborated with The Reader's Digest on an article by Senator Byrd of Virginia. This, according to the Rogge report, was in late 1941, shortly before Pearl Harbor.

"The Reader's Digest not only employed Palmer and Dennis," Rogge reported to his superiors in the Justice Department, "but also George T. Eggleton of Scribner's Commentator, the magazine which the Nazis subsidized."

Palmer was employed as an editor of The Reader's Digest from 1939 to 1945, and when Hans Thomsen, former Nazi Ambassador in Washington, was questioned about him by Rogge, Thomsen gave the following report:

"I met Paul Palmer several times in Washington and lunched with him. He made a great impression on me and seemed to be a special admirer of Germany and wanted to engage in some sort of activity because he had some money and wanted to bring about certain relations. I don't know whether he himself was a writer, but I think he made an attempt at it."

It was in the Summer of 1941, when Lawrence Dennis's activities already were looked upon with public suspicion, that The Reader's Digest surreptitiously hired him. Here is Dennis's own story of that employment, as told in the Rogge report:

"Last June, 1941, I did some work for Paul Palmer of The Reader's Digest. I did one thing for them and I got $1,500 in 1941. I had lunch with Wallace. He is the editor of The Reader's Digest. Wallace had lunch with me last Spring. I don't know, February or March—I don't remember exactly when—and he said he wanted me to line up a set of articles on this quart of milk a day for everybody in the world, and freedom from want and poverty and all that sort of thing, the pros and cons, and he said he would have to be very careful not to let it be known that he was using me in any way.

"He said, 'You will have to stop your letter before it gets you in jail. They are not going to tolerate that kind of free speech now.'

"Well, in June, Palmer came to me and said that Wallace wanted to make me a proposition and he would give me $1,500 for the piece of work I did for him, and he would give me a monthly stipend for a while if I would shut the letter down, so he gave me $1,500 last June and put on at $400 a month, which goes through this month (February, 1942) and in order to keep the thing very confidential he had it done through a public relations counsel."

Testimony which Rogge secured from former German diplomats in Nuernberg showed that Dennis was also working through George Sylvester Viereck, nephew of the Kaiser, and chief Hitler propaganda agent in the United States (he's now serving a six-year jail sentence). Viereck had instructions from the Germany Embassy in Washington to pay Dennis $20,000.

Thus the views which Dennis put out through The Reader's Digest and other channels appeared to be valuable to the Nazis.

Received And Noted

RALEIGH, N. C.

Honorable Drew Pearson,
Dear Sir:

Your column in the Saturday, October 19th issue of The Raleigh News & Observer misrepresents me. Your statement reads: "Not content with quick removal of most price controls, Calvin Zimmerman, a North Carolina Republican, wants the Government to refund all fines paid to OPA violators. He even wants the Government to pay a penalty for fining them." There is not a semblance of truth in your statement about me. It is false and defamatory. You put me on record as advocating a silly, ridiculous and unthinkable program before thousands of your readers throughout the country. Your misrepresentation of me has caused me great personal embarrassment, and is most damaging to my reputation as an individual and it also holds me up in ridicule as a leader in the cause for which I am fighting—the rights of the common people. I resent this, and urgently request you to quote me correctly.

The statement I made concerning OPA violators was as follows:

"I predict that at least 31 of the New Deal Congressmen will be defeated on November 5th, and that we Republicans will organize the next Congress when it convenes next January. I plan to join with a group of good American citizens in urging the prompt repeal of the OPA and to refund to all victims of treble damages the amounts they have paid less a reasonable penalty. We will urge the refund on the ground that tax violators by the thousands have settled with the Government by paying from 5 per cent to 25 per cent penalty, and that OPA violators not be required to pay any more penalty than tax violators."

Since you misquoted me I can and will accept nothing less than a full quote of what I did say concerning OPA violators.

Unless you correct this misquote of me within five days I shall bring suit to recover damages. You have injured me personally and the great cause which I represent.

Yours sincerely,
(signed) CALVIN ZIMMERMAN,
North Carolina Field Director of Finance,
Republican National Committee.