

# THE ALAMANCE GLEANER

Vol. LXVII

GRAHAM, N. C., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1941

No. 1

## WEEKLY NEWS ANALYSIS

By Edward C. Wayne

### 'No Quarrel With America,' Says Hitler, But 'Aid to Britain' Ships Will Be Sunk; New Japanese Envoy En Route to U. S.; Congress Continues Lease-Lend Debate

EDITOR'S NOTE—When opinions are expressed in these columns, they are those of the news analyst and not necessarily of this newspaper. (Released by Western Newspaper Union.)



FORT DIX, N. J.—Taking advantage of a snowfall along the eastern seaboard, members of the 44th Division's ski patrol glide down a hill in their first maneuvers in this huge army encampment. Warfare knows no seasons, so Uncle Sam must prepare to fight under any condition. The patrol pictured here was organized by Lieut. Eric Wilkner, formerly of Lapland, Sweden, but now of New York's 113th infantry.

#### EIGHT YEARS:

##### Of Hitler

On the eighth anniversary of his assumption of power, Adolf Hitler told his people and the world that U. S. aid for Great Britain "will be torpedoed" and that "Europe will defend itself" in case "those people" (meaning Americans) enter the war.

A cheering crowd of 20,000 gathered at the Berlin Sports palace for the speech heard the German dictator tell of Nazi plans to defeat England in the coming months. He said that Germany had "armed and armed" and that anyone seeking to destroy that nation would get a rude awakening. He told also of Germany's preparation of military surprises that will be used in the coming battles. He said that enemy hopes for revolts in Italy because of Italian setbacks were in vain. The British were challenged to invade the continent.

Hitler declared that 1941 "will be the historical year of a great new order in Europe." He said also that Germany has never been against American interests.

#### BRITAIN'S NEED:

##### Congress Considers

There was a growing feeling in congress that unless the President's measure to permit him to lend or lease material supplies to Britain was passed soon, the Germans would arrive before American arms. Administration leaders made concessions to opponents of the bill in order to obtain greater speed. They agreed to set a time limit on the President's powers, they were willing that a clause should be contained in the bill to prohibit convey by U. S. naval ships, and they were agreeable to an amendment which would require the President to report every three months to congress.

Further they would not go and efforts to make the proposal ineffectual by further amendment met firm resistance. Meanwhile supply and military experts held conferences with the new British ambassador, Viscount Halifax, whose arrival in America was unprecedented. He came on the H.M.S. King George V, a new battleship just recently launched and which was not yet known to be in commission. He was met at Annapolis by President Roosevelt.

#### MISSION:

##### Failure Expected

Kichisaburo Nomura, admiral of Japan, is a graduate of the United States naval academy. During the World war he was Japanese naval attaché in Washington and a close friend of the then assistant secretary of the navy, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Now Admiral Nomura, admittedly a pro-American among Japanese, is en route to Washington as the new ambassador from Tokyo. He said, he said, on what promised to be "a mission of failure." Younger men, offered the job, turned it down. They said it would be sure to end their political careers.

But Admiral Nomura is a man of courage. He lost an eye when a bomb was thrown and killed several other politicians. He received a glass eye from the empress herself. Before he left Tokyo he had a duplicate made, in case anything

should happen to his artificial eye.

It is not his eye, however, which is most likely to fail him. Back home Foreign Minister Yosuke Matsuoka, also educated in an American college through the kindness of American charity, did not wait for the admiral's arrival in Washington. Matsuoka declared to the diet that he considered U. S. policy "outrageous," in that it objected to Japanese control of the western Pacific. He said that the fate of world civilization depends wholly upon America's attitude and refused to accept the theory of U. S. Secretary of State Cordell Hull that the invasion of Manchuria by Japan was the first step in destruction of world peace.

#### HISTORIC CITY:

##### History Repeats

The town of Derna, now in Italian Libya, has an historic place in American history, for it was at this village where ended one of the most courageous exploits of the American army.

The year was 1805 and the United States was at war with Tripoli, after refusing to pay tribute to that nation in order that American ships would not be molested by pirates on the open sea. "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute," had thundered Charles C. Pinckney a few years before and the slogan was repeated now.

William Eaton, a captain in the American army who had been attached to Near Eastern countries, found himself in Alexandria, Egypt. There he recruited a motley crowd of about 40 Americans, several hundred Greeks and as many Arabs. On March 8, he started across the burning desert toward Derna, a city of 10,000.

The campaign experienced untold hardships, was almost without food or water, several times faced revolt in its own ranks. But by cool bravery Eaton dragged his army 600 miles across the sands and attacked Derna. On April 27 the city fell to the American army. The war ended soon afterward and Eaton returned home to be forgotten.

As March approached this year another army which started in Alexandria stood before Derna, now a city of 65,000. British troops with modern mechanized columns, lines of communications and trains of water, had put to rout an Italian force several times larger, engaged them in battle at Sidi Barrani, at Bardia, at Tobruk, and appeared to be masters of the desert. More than 100,000 prisoners had fallen before them.

#### Shock in Italy

In Rome there was no confirmation of the rumor that Marshal Rodolfo Graziani had been relieved of his Libyan command. But the Graziani rumor was not the most startling. There were stories of uprisings in Turin and Milan, of troops joining in the demonstration against Mussolini, of anti-Fascist speeches in the market place and of obscene words written on posters containing Mussolini's picture.

All this was denied, but more persisted. They said Germans had taken over the Italian censorship of postal, telephone and telegraph services. That three Italian generals had been shot, that thousands had been arrested by secret police, that revolt was halted only when German troops took over.

## Stowaway



LOS ANGELES, CALIF.—Embarrassed naval officers have threatened disciplinary action against any sailor who might have helped Shirley Dale, 23, pictured above, aboard the U. S. destroyer Long, two hours before it sailed for Honolulu. She was discovered and put ashore.

#### DEBTS:

##### U. S. Needs Money

Congress is ready to consider plans to increase the national debt limit and raise additional funds to finance defense efforts already authorized. The present debt limit, set by congress, is \$45,000,000,000. Chairman Doughton, of the house ways and means committee, introduced legislation to raise this limit to \$65,000,000,000.

At the same time a plan was submitted for selling 25-cent defense stamps to the general public. The plan parallels the War Savings stamps of 1917.

Meanwhile the committee of federal finances of the United States Chamber of Commerce sounded a warning. It recommended a federal agency to "co-ordinate the debt program with the general fiscal plan." They also suggested congress establish the debt limit at a sum only necessary to cover the necessary borrowing immediately in sight. "Financially," the report said, "the government is in a wilderness."

#### DRAFT:

##### Harsh Words

In England the government has had the power since the early days of the war to draft manpower and capital for defense. Virtually the same powers were voted to President Roosevelt under the selective service act. In neither country has there been much of a crackdown on industry, the force of the law being sufficient to compel co-operation of recalcitrant plants.

But now England is talking of drafting labor to man its factories and in Washington there has been threat to use the power on one or two industries. Most vocal of these instances was at a meeting of the Lumber and timber products defense committee when Leon Henderson, defense commissioner in charge of price control, warned that prices must be cut sharply and production speeded.

Henderson said there had been some improvement. He said prices in December dropped to \$35.01 per 1,000 board feet but would have to come down to \$25, or the government would take over. "I've had all the arguments, excuses and explanations I want and a whole lot more than I need," he said and stalked from the meeting.

#### In the Army

Winthrop Rockefeller, grandson of the late John D. Rockefeller, got up one morning at 5 a. m. and reported at the New York recruiting office at 6 for transportation to Fort Dix, N. J. He'll never get rich, he's in the army now—as a private.

On the other hand, Ernest Eisle, 22, of Pontiac, Mich., who fought to evade the draft, is dead. When federal officers called with a warrant for evasion, a gun fight resulted. Two officers were stabbed and young Eisle fatally shot.

With the approach of spring the draft will be speeded. The objective is 300,000 men in camp under the selective service law before June 1. Between now and then the monthly drafts will reach about 100,000 men.

#### MISCELLANY:

The sword which George Washington gave to the Marquis De Lafayette will be returned to America. Marshal Petain of France handed it to Admiral Leahy, American ambassador, for delivery to President Roosevelt.

## Speaking of SPORTS

By ROBERT McSHANE

Released by Western Newspaper Union

RIVAL baseball managers in the National league, indulging in a bit of wishful thinking, point out that the world champion Cincinnati Reds may fall in 1941 because big Paul Derringer can't be expected to go on forever.

The fact remains, however, that Derringer has quite a few games left in his firing arm, and that he is only one member of the highgrade pitching staff that Deacon Bill McKechnie has ready for the new season.

Those same rival managers, hoping against hope can't overlook Bucky Walters, Junior Thompson, Whitey Moore and one or two others who have been good enough to win two pennants in a row. Walters, too, is no youngster. But he will win his share of ball games in 1941.

The way things stack up right now the Reds get a slight nod in the pennantward direction. They have a good infield and a good outfield, and they still have speed. From their list of challengers you can eliminate the Bees, the Phillies and the Giants. Strongest opposition will come from the Dodgers, the Cardinals, the Pirates and the Cubs.

#### The Competition

Of the latter four, the Cardinals and the Dodgers look to be the stronger. The Card's position, late next September, will depend largely on what the mound staff can do. They were in and out most of last summer, a difficult team to figure. The big four of the pitching staff includes Bill McGee; Lon Warneke, Clyde Shoun and Morton Cooper. Between them they won 55 and lost 43 last year. McGee won 16 and lost 10, Warneke had a 15 and 10 record, Shoun won 13 and lost 11, and Cooper won 11 while losing 12.

That record means that the veterans will have to show considerable improvement and get much-needed help from the youngsters if the Cardinals are to make an important bid for the 1941 flag. But with Johnny Mize and the right punch, they can't be ruled out.

The main pennant war should rest with the Reds and the Dodgers. During the next season Ducky Medwick will be on hand from the opening pitch. Completely recovered from the effects of a bean ball, he won't have any odd noises buzzing in his head. Medwick has plenty of baseball left in his system.

Leo Durocher is far from the least valuable of the Dodger assets. A smart, hard working scrapper, Leo is one of the outstanding leaders of the game. He hates so much to lose that at times his over-aggression is a fault.

The Pirates started off in poor fashion last spring, but ended up at a stronger than normal clip. Manager Frankie Frisch is another hustling manager, and his 1941 squad will be greatly improved over last year's edition. Frisch has strengthened several weak spots, but above all, he has brought a new spirit to the Pirates—something the team has needed for too long a time.

#### A Job for Wilson

The Cubs are going to take a lot of rebuilding. Manager Jimmy Wilson is fully capable of doing the job, but at the present time lacks the much-needed material. And when that material isn't available, even the Wrigley moneybags aren't of much help.

Neither the Phillies nor the Bees have a chance. Their problem isn't the same as the Cubs'. Even if the right players could be secured, they haven't the money to spend for the rebuilding job.

It doesn't seem quite right to class the Giants with the Bees and the Phillies, but they are just as hard to rate among the first division teams with the present lineup.

So far as the two leaders are concerned there isn't an overwhelming choice. Larry MacPhail is making every effort to bring Brooklyn a winner and if the Reds show any signs of slipping, the Dodgers will be at their throats.

No one team dominates the field, but there are enough good teams to dog the footsteps of Bill McKechnie and his Reds. All of which should make the 1941 pennant race an exciting one.

## Washington Digest

### 'Revised' Farm Program Begins to Take Shape

Greater Curtailment of Surplus Crops Seen; Administration's Stand Against Convoys Has Significant Angle.

By BAUKHAGE

National Farm and Home Hour Commentator.

WNU Service, 1395 National Press Bldg., Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON.—A new and revolutionary farm program for America is in the works. If it is carried out according to the wishes of the administration, it will mean the first step in an effort to change the whole pattern of farming in this country as we have accepted it for the last century.

When this column is in print the new bill may be made public. At this writing even its outline has not been announced. But a careful review of discussions in highly influential government circles justifies three predictions:

(1) That the new bill will revolutionize New Deal farm policy and will have for its goal a—

(2) Vastly greater curtailment of production of surplus products, and—

(3) Complete change in type of some of the crops now raised by farmers.

What is behind the change in policy is this: the last die-hard who believed that any American farm program should take for granted a return to "normal" world trade, have thrown up the sponge. There is at long last a majority agreement in the department of agriculture that American farming must follow a new pattern—one that calls for no subsidy for lost export markets of the past, no attempt to nurse along surpluses on the assumption that the same foreign markets on which we once counted would be again available.

#### Original Purpose.

Roughly, the original purpose of the agricultural adjustment legislation was to secure reduction of certain crops and with the payments provide a livelihood for thousands of farmers who had lost their markets. Later conservation was emphasized; but the theory behind the subsidies was also to permit the farmer who formerly depended on the foreign market to keep his plant going, to keep him "tooled"—to keep, for example, a wheat farmer a wheat farmer against the day when the foreign market was restored.

By 1933 when the Triple A was started foreign markets had pretty well melted but the pattern of American farming itself was the same, generally speaking, as it had been for a hundred years. The Triple A policy was planned to preserve that pattern and fill the empty corners in the mould by artificial means. When I say the pattern was preserved, I mean that all the Triple A wanted to do was to cut down production to the point where demand and supply approximately balanced. "The policy of the congress as stated in the Agricultural Adjustment act was to restore to American farm products, as rapidly as practicable, the same purchasing power in terms of things farmers buy that those products had in the five-year period (1909-1914) immediately preceding the World war."

So if you were told to plow under your cotton this year, this did not mean go out of the business of raising cotton for good. You were supposed to get payments so you could stay alive until it paid to raise more cotton again.

#### Now a New Pattern.

But now a new pattern has been drawn. It is based on the belief that the major foreign markets are gone for good—or at least for so long that they cannot be reckoned on any longer. Some farmers will just have to face the fact that they must make permanent shifts in their crops.

Here is the key phrase of the new policy in a sentence taken from the annual report of the department of agriculture recently published:

"Growing unneeded crops is sheer waste of labor, of capital, of soil, even if temporarily the products can go into storage under government loans."

This change in agricultural adjustment policy was not heralded in advance. But little by little hints have been dropped as to what is coming. Secretary Wickard sounded a muted warning that the definite trend in foreign trade was downward in his recent speech at Purdue university. His Supplementary Cotton plan followed as a step in the direction of reducing the cotton surpluses, shifting acreage to food

crops. In the annual report of the department of agriculture are further hints, as to the "adjustments" which are to be faced by the producers of foodstuffs, tobacco and the other things which formerly made up our farm export trade.

#### Still a Possibility.

Of course, the administration does not say, "there will never again be any foreign market whatever for farm products." But the new policy refuses to take for granted that such outlets will ever return to what we have always insisted on calling "normal."

This viewpoint represents a struggle between those who fought to the end with hope as their chief support. The last light went out when the Hull reciprocal trade program collapsed in the face of war. Now agreement has been reached that the old plan must be scrapped and that America must build a new market for the farmer based on the theory that in war or peace the trend is strongly away from a possible profitable export trade.

It might be said here, however, that the producers of meats and fruits and vegetables are going to benefit by the immediate situation—at least temporarily when the contents of the newly filled pay envelopes of the defense industries will be exchanged for these products in home consumption.

But a wide disparity of prices is due between these products and cotton, wheat, corn and tobacco. The latter staples are among those which the administration believes must be curtailed under the new plan.

#### Are We 'In' or 'Out' Of the Current War?

There is a popular response around Washington which you frequently hear in answer to the question, "do you think we'll get into the war?" It is another question: "Aren't we already in?"

That remark was started somewhat facetiously but now you will hear it stated seriously, if unofficially, in the affirmative by some officials. And if you judge by the old standards when a country was either a belligerent or a neutral we are "in." Because we are not neutral and Secretary Hull himself has said so—he said that the law of self-preservation and not neutrality now governs the nation.

We have taken many steps which could be offered to prove that Mr. Hull is legally correct. But all the old rules are off. Undeclared war is the popular stunt these days. It is the way the totalitarians do it and we are being forced to take over a lot of these measures in order to fight fire with fire. The job will be to scrap them all when the trouble is over.

But in the real sense we are not at war. No Americans under the American flag are shooting anybody under any other flag. And that is something. And a high official of the United States government has made it clear that that was what the President had in mind when he said that he had never considered using American warships to convoy supplies through the war zone to Great Britain. It has been predicted frequently that convoys would be our next step. Well, this official explained that the reason the administration was against the use of convoys was because "when a convoy gets into the war zone there is likely to be shooting and shooting comes awfully close to war."

Statement's Significance.

It seemed to me significant that this statement was made on the same day that former Ambassador Joseph Kennedy, testifying before the foreign affairs committee on the lease-lend bill, said almost the same thing in other words. It almost looked as if the two spokesmen had gotten together beforehand.

That was the same day, as some of you may remember, that I had said earlier on the Farm and Home Hour that I could find no indication in Washington that any steps were being taken to get us into the war. My observation was a coincidence. Perhaps the conjunction of the other remarks was, too.

To the men who were in France in the last war, we will still be at peace as long as we are not shooting anybody.



GENERAL HUGH S. JOHNSON Says:

Washington, D. C.

#### 'TRANSFER' OF U. S. NAVY

The President says that any suggestion that, under the "lease-lend" bill he might transfer part of our navy to another nation is a "cow-jumped-over-the-moon" idea—meaning, we may suppose, Mother Goose nonsense or a palpable impossibility. "Hi-diddle-diddle, the cat and the fiddle, the cow jumped over the moon." He also says that he never even considered using the navy to convoy American shipments to Britain.

A great deal of confusion is creeping into this debate. There is nothing in the "lease-lend" bill about conveying ships. Providing they are not violating the neutrality act and the President's own proclamations thereunder, by entering proclaimed war zones, or otherwise, American ships can still sail the sea. If there is danger of illegal interference with them by another nation while they are in pursuit of their lawful business, the President doesn't need any additional authority to protect them with naval convoys. Therefore the convoy argument is not properly in the debate on the "lease-lend" bill.

But this "cow-over-the-moon" business is something else again. There is no authentic record of any cow jumping over any moon, but there is a very recent and rather startling record of a President transferring a very substantial part of our navy, to wit, 50 destroyers, to a belligerent nation. It was done without any specific authority. There is also a considerable record of diddling public opinion just before election or during the debate on hotly contested legislation by promises that were quickly forgotten—for example, the 1932 promise not to violate the gold covensants in our bonds and money. That was the highest diddle-diddle in all our economic history. But there was no remedy. All that happened was that "the little dog laughed to see such sport and the dish ran away with the spoon."

If there is no intention to transfer any part of our sorely needed armament, why is it necessary to grant unlimited authority to do so? With a little paraphrasing and transposition, which does no violence to its intent, the 1776 bill authorizes the President "to sell, transfer, lease, lend or otherwise dispose of . . . any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel or boat . . . any component material . . . any other commodity or article for defense."

#### WAR POWERS

There is a lot of argument in favor of the "lease-lend" war dictatorship bill based by the so-called constitutional "war-powers" of the President.

Abraham Lincoln, as President, without any previous congressional delegation at all, and under the war powers of the President, simply set aside all the constitutional guarantees and compromises that made this union possible and emancipated the slaves.

This is dangerous doctrine. If there is, in our form of government, any hidden power in the President in his own discretion, without any actual war, simply to set the Constitution aside, and do as he pleases with the peace, prosperity, property and destiny of the United States, we are in a fix.

What are the "war powers" of the President under our Constitution? In actual war and in the area of combat on enemy territory they are, and they must be—as the powers of a commanding general in such territory—completely dictatorial and practically supreme. But that kind of dictatorship does not flow from his office as the President of the United States. It flows from his specific constitutional office as commander-in-chief of our army and navy.

It was under this military power and under no civil office that President Lincoln emancipated the slaves. He did so only as an act of war, only in enemy territory in actual rebellion and his act was later confirmed by congress.

He did so, and said that he did so, not in his capacity as President—but in the execution of his office of commander-in-chief. This is particularly emphasized by the fact that when, under such fierce factional dogmatic urging as is now lashing Mr. Roosevelt, to force this great powerful, peaceful country into war, Lincoln attempted to Hitlerize the civil processes of the United States Constitution and send to concentration camps, or by a star chamber process, whoever opposed his war policies, authority to do so was denied by the Supreme court.