

THOMAS L. ROBINSON

J. E. DOWD

WILLIAM M. REDDICK

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1947

Echoes From Yalta Haunt Us Yet

Even an amateur reader-between-the-lines can glance at the current revelations of James P. Byrnes and trace most of the world's troubles of the moment back to Yalta, a pin-point in history which looms ever-larger as crisis and failure. It was there, Mr. Byrnes admits, that the Big Three began, to the world's knowledge, to plot a program which was unfortunately destined for bickering and misunderstanding. It was there that the squabble over the United Nations vote became clear. It was there that Stalin's casual attitude toward the whole United Nations idea was revealed.

There are surely other sides to the long complex and epic story of the attempt at building a new world for peace while the great war still raged around the globe, but the documented version offered by Mr. Byrnes is his best and most accurate. It falls so well into the pattern of things as we see them now that it becomes a vast tragedy, involving the lives of the millions who died in war, and the billions who must live after in a world still threatened by war. The strands first woven at Yalta stretch through our day and trail ahead of us far into the future.

It is worthy of recall from the Byrnes story that Stalin went to Yalta with a yen for settling the peace and ironing out differ-

ences long before the war was over. Almost every word he spoke was toward that end. He had no motive in seeking a close friendship with border nations, he at least spoke out for writing down the rules before the game began. It was Churchill who wanted to wait it out. His reason for wanting are clear enough. He wanted to play the old League of Nations game, to wait until the assembly was at hand to vote when British command was a majority. That was back of Churchill's hesitancy which later became bulldog stubbornness; that was behind the argument over the vote. Failure to reach an agreement on specific matters at Yalta (in addition to the breakdown of those reportedly made) and failure to agree on the veto haunts us yet.

These Yalta failures hovered over us at San Francisco, and at every session of the United Nations since. They propelled Gromyko and Vishinsky. They nettled the British Foreign Office when it huffily denied the Byrnes report. The selfishness of the British and Russian positions at Yalta (and, we have no doubt, some of our own) marked the beginning of today's squabble, and so began to threaten what might mean the end of the United Nations. They mean that we have scarcely begun to make a peace, that the major parties did not enter the new world in a spirit of co-operation, but one of compromise and sheer expediency.

A New Day In The Grass Roots

When the touring House Agriculture Committee pulled into Rocky Mount last week to hear testimony from Tar Heel farmers, it was really getting down to grass roots. For hours on end farmers, housewives, and school children, white and Negroes, sang praises of the Federal farm program. They thought the soil conservation program had already saved America, and it should be expanded. They hoped price support subsidies would be kept high; they had saved the tobacco farmer. Everything was peaches and cream.

The committee will certainly hear the same kind of testimony everywhere it goes throughout the country, with little variation. They will hear tobacco subsidies praised here, cotton there, peanuts, small grain, fruits and so on. And everywhere, of course, they will hear hosannas for the Federal program which has begun to save the nation's dangerously wasted soil.

It marked a vast change in American agriculture and a change in our thinking about government and rural economy. In the early days of the New Deal many a suspicious farmer reached for his shotgun when agents approached him with the new-fangled schemes to conserve soil and conservation of soil. They derided new methods of contour planting and plowing,

of rotation and diversification. They resisted, thousands of them, all efforts to lure them with new methods. They had to learn the hard way, as most of us do.

Even after the first days had passed, and farmers had followed the conservation patterns were becoming more prosperous, agents still had to beg many farmers to join the movement. A good deal of the resistance that followed in the years since the result of envy. A man would look at his neighbor's fields becoming greener, his livestock fatter, and his income bigger, and he would begin to wonder what might mean the end of the United Nations. They mean that we have scarcely begun to make a peace, that the major parties did not enter the new world in a spirit of co-operation, but one of compromise and sheer expediency.

And so, in the Rocky Mount, as everywhere else the farmers gather to testify, for the program they once resisted as radical, and an enemy of their pocketbooks, is now a common way of doing business, is going to be lauded highly. Perhaps we'd better remember—farmers and all the rest of us—that it took the new-fangled schemes for some time before they got to the point, and that future resistance to change may be just as costly.

The CIO Sees A New Light

These are curious times in the realm of labor and labor relations, a time when the CIO, most militant of union groups, can answer die threats to its security with the bland suggestion that we drop the scheme of Government intervention in industrial strife and start all over. This surprising government emphasis on the need for less interest to news services and newspapers than the fact that Philip Murray wants to put profilers in jail, or that he called John L. Lewis a "labor racketeer and man." But as a proffered measure of salvation for the CIO in the face of the Taft-Hartley Act it presages a new era in labor relations.

In the years when the CIO had powerful friends at court, and a good many Americans regarded the Administration as a kind of labor government, Murray and his associates were castigated as reactionary slave-drivers in routine fashion—and that went out from Washington almost as often as from union headquarters. The chorus decried, to be sure, as Labor began to earn its spurs and packed enough power to fight on something like even terms. But the attitude didn't change, not even during the war period.

From The Asheville Citizen

Betting On Babies

Like most states, North Carolina has gained in population since 1940. Like a few of them, however, this state may have a smaller proportion of the total population in 1950 than it had in 1940 when the last decennial census was taken. This is being predicted with some abandon that North Carolina may lose one of its two House members after the 1950 census.

This possibility does not disturb The Citizen overmuch, and for two reasons: (1) We got along swimmingly with eleven Representatives until now, and there was a time not so long ago when we had more in Congress; (2) the prediction may not come true anyhow.

After Roosevelt, and after the Great Truman Transfiguration, the national program to set in. Not only in Congress, but in one state Legislature after another. The program is to be carried out by the Labor's march. The Taft-Hartley Act was only a symbol of the new barriers being laid all over America. When that happened, and when it was more possible to go to Washington for help, the CIO apparently saw the much-maligned employers of the land as the lesser (or perhaps weaker) party. John L. Lewis and Philip Murray, after falling pick his way through the maze of Taft-Hartley Act, throws himself upon employers.

But we don't know it will work out, but it is vital that it does. A new wave of industrial troubles at the moment would be almost as serious as war-time strikes, so far as the world economy is concerned. If it can be done, it can be done, and there will be the new day dawn. The average American must be weary of the spectacle of labor and management dragging their affairs before government at every turn—often while all of us suffer the consequences. If it can be done man to man, on terms that suit Mr. Murray and do not endanger the status of free labor, then let it be done.

Minutes of 1942 Meeting

THIS column, however, has been able to obtain one sensational national document giving the minutes of the meeting of the National Jewish Conference on the extermination of European Jews. The meeting was held Jan. 20, 1942. And while history has now shown what happened since then, the minutes of the term call for a study of the mass extermination and the detailed way in which they worked it out.

What a world! In the time you're old enough to enjoy the classics, you can't read their fine print. —Richmond Jones, New Leader

People's Platform



more important. Mr. Mayor's youth centers and ping pong and tennis is a civic and cultural center for their aiders? Which is more important, character and good citizenship or the dollar value of convention business? I believe that if we build the former, the latter will follow, but first needs must be met first.

I agree that our present Auditorium is a disgrace to our city, but I disagree that a new one will necessarily bring new business or industry to Charlotte. New business is more interested in tax rates, shopping facilities and profits than it is in concerns about their children. To bypass our primary needs at this time, in favor of building a shiny new auditorium would be like putting fresh paint on the state capitol, and sticking it back in the bakery window.

Now I mentioned our need of expanding our city-county school system. I have already approved a \$6,000,000 bond issue for that purpose. But I learn from City Hall that the money has been set aside, and I am not sure it will be spent, relatively. And why, Mr. Mayor? Only the most urgent expenses and being made at this time because of the high costs of construction! The most compelling argument against this Auditorium bond issue is simply that it costs too much. The much more important work of expanding our school system, certainly costs are also too high for building an Auditorium which is not our first need.

I have mentioned Youth Centers as a greater need than an auditorium. We had one. Today we have none. That is a more appalling shame than that our present Auditorium. We deplore our crime rate and our juvenile delinquency. Will a new auditorium make better citizens of our youngsters? And I know, don't we, Mr. Mayor, that teen-age gangster driving cars, under the influence of liquor sometimes, racing around town because there is nothing better for them to do, no place where they can wholesomely work off energy. Which is

Drew Pearson's: How Nazis Planned To Kill Off Jews

ONE of the most important treasures of war information in existence are Nazi files seized by the U. S. Army after it entered Germany. The Nazis were medical keepers of conferences with Hitler to actions by deputy fuhrers, was faithfully recorded and filed away in neat columns. These papers, which throw significant light on how we can avoid a similar fate, are now being made available to the public. The Nazi soldiers gave their blood to capture them, and Royall has tried to persuade the State Department to open them to the public.

How ever, Wall Street Banker Bob Lovett, Acting Secretary of State, refused. And following his usual business policy, these revealing papers were kept secret.

Open Letter To Mayor Baxter

CHARLOTTE, Oct. 18.—The text of an open letter which I addressed to Herbert H. Baxter, mayor, under date of Oct. 16.

For many reasons, I am very much opposed to the proposed bond for a new Auditorium. First, it is not of primary importance among Charlotte's needs. We need expansion of the school system, not just more parking meters; increased parking facilities; and we need also to keep in mind the bonds already authorized, and the increase they will make in our tax load, in addition to what has been called "only 1/2¢ per \$100 of valuation."

I say that our present Auditorium is a disgrace to our city, but I disagree that a new one will necessarily bring new business or industry to Charlotte. New business is more interested in tax rates, shopping facilities and profits than it is in concerns about their children. To bypass our primary needs at this time, in favor of building a shiny new auditorium would be like putting fresh paint on the state capitol, and sticking it back in the bakery window.

Now I mentioned our need of expanding our city-county school system. I have already approved a \$6,000,000 bond issue for that purpose. But I learn from City Hall that the money has been set aside, and I am not sure it will be spent, relatively. And why, Mr. Mayor? Only the most urgent expenses and being made at this time because of the high costs of construction! The most compelling argument against this Auditorium bond issue is simply that it costs too much. The much more important work of expanding our school system, certainly costs are also too high for building an Auditorium which is not our first need.

Distillery Workers Must Eat

BURLINGTON, Oct. 18.—(AP)—You had an intelligent editorial page (the reason I buy your paper) but—how can you print such stupid reasoning as appears in your editorial, "We're All For Conservation, But . . ." And I AM NOT a "union man."

When you say distillery workers should stop work for 60 days, did you check to see if the planners in Washington made arrangements with all the renters, grocery stores, etc., to carry these thousands of workers for 60 days on their backs? "Don't cry my son, Daddy will buy you something to eat in 60 days."

London Eye-Opener

ANY one who travels across Europe these days has to be struck by the fact, comes to at least one conclusion: The idea of political and economic cooperation between American dollars and American commodities. But the influence must be directed toward Europe.

Here in the home of the mother of all nations and the center of parliamentary socialism, that becomes even more obvious. Millions of Britons have grown up to believe that socialism will bring greater rewards and satisfactions than capitalism ever could. The millions of Britons believe their fellow citizens have a right to choose socialism if they are in a LONDON.

Shortly before he left for home, Congressman Christian Herter, chairman of the important House Committee surveying Europe's reaction to the proposed European Conservative Party—Lord Woolton, Anthony Eden and R. A. Butler—later the British Conservative party's official program, so far-reaching in its scope and its stability in America so-called conservatives in America out of their wits.

Herter asked all three things—the same question. What would be the effect on the Conservative party if a provision written into the Marshall plan providing further nationalization? They all gave the same reply—it would be a disaster. The Conservative party would not support the plan if it contained such a provision, even though the Conservatives here at home are violently opposed to any move toward nationalization. Such a provision would be taken as a barrier to the sovereign rights of Great Britain.

The word of Woolton, chairman of the party, and Eden, former British Secretary of State, are the most influential Conservatives, and their challenge to the Government becomes clear that any attempt to write in a provision forbidding nationalization would mean a withdrawal of support from the Government and an attempt to defeat co-operation between Europe and America.

Both in Britain and the United States, the activity of Britain's plight is being observed. It is deliberately obscured, it happened in the past. The Government is powerless at the very moment of our greatest British economic crisis of our time.

The cause of this crisis are complex and varied. They extend back to the time when Britain was at the peak of her economic and military power. The Government's policy of Victoria's long reign. During that time of power and prosperity, Britain built up a vast empire of investments in various parts of the world, and particularly in America. Two world wars and especially the second world war, however, have reduced the overseas investments, and have had a huge drain on our Commonwealth nations was added.

Stewart Alsop

THE British rarely telegraphs its policies. There is no really reliable source of forecasting the next turning in the serious road of Soviet foreign policy, since the American press is not permitted to get hold of pieces of the puzzle with most of the jigsaw missing. Yet it is these missing pieces that the planners in the Kremlin are preparing a Sunday punch, to be served to the American Ministers' conference next month.

The speculation—and it is still only speculation—is that something like this. The ministers will meet in the Kremlin next month. The old familiar deadlock will develop, with Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov trying to get the United States to get the United States out of the Korean peninsula. The old familiar deadlock will develop, with Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov trying to get the United States to get the United States out of the Korean peninsula.

There are reports that precisely the same sort of preparations are now in progress in the Soviet zone of Germany. The Russians are in control of the Soviet-occupied "Socialist" Unity Party. It is not wholly unchallenged. The unreliable deal-wood has been ruthlessly cut out. The new Russian-erected German Army, whose core is the German survivors of the Red Army, now has 100,000 men, and probably far more. In East Prussia, and its leaders, Marshal Friedrich von Paulus and his staff, are being moved to East Prussia, are in Germany, at the call of the Soviet commanders.

The German "Red" men is not a great Army. Yet in case of the outbreak of a new war, it would be a great Army, even so small an army would become the only power of the West. Working closely with the Communist leadership, this power could be expected shortly to be in a position to effect the Soviet domination of all Germany.

It is the fact that these countries, together with Russia were included in Nazi tabulations, would indicate that Hitler planned to take all the countries of Europe and exterminate all Jews. At the time of this conference, Jan. 20, 1942, Pearl Harbor had just exploded the American fleet, the Jews were being driven out of Europe, and the German Army was taking Stalingrad.)

In the Jewish population figures given for the various countries, it is interesting to note that the Jewish faith are included, as the stipulations for defining Jews along racial lines still are in part sticking to the old attitude and viewpoint with certain difficulties in the various countries, especially in Poland, where the Jews are being driven out of Romania, for example, for the Jew to acquire for money the right documents to give him official proof of a foreign nationality.

The "Problem" in Russia This is the problem of the Jews in the USSR. It is known in the European part of Russia there are perhaps five million Jews. In Asiatic Russia hardly one.

'Final Solution' Of Jews

MEANWHILE, in view of the dangers of an emigration from the war and in view of the possibilities in the East, the Reichsfuhrer-SS and the Chief of the Security Police had forbidden the emigrating of the Jews.

The emigration program has now been replaced by the evacuation of the Jews to the East a further solution possibility. In accordance with previous authorization by the Reichsfuhrer-SS.

'Final Solution' Of Jews

MEANWHILE, in view of the dangers of an emigration from the war and in view of the possibilities in the East, the Reichsfuhrer-SS and the Chief of the Security Police had forbidden the emigrating of the Jews.

The emigration program has now been replaced by the evacuation of the Jews to the East a further solution possibility. In accordance with previous authorization by the Reichsfuhrer-SS.