

Weekly News Review

Four-Power European Treaty May Avert General Warfare

By Joseph W. LaBine

Foreign

Until he spoke at Nuremberg a fortnight ago, Adolf Hitler had never given open, out-and-out promise of assistance to Czechoslovakia's Sudeten Germans. If his purpose was to brew trouble, it was not long in coming. By promising his exiled fellow Germans the right of "self determination," Der Fuehrer gave overnight rise to demands for a plebiscite, demands which were not long in bringing bloodshed.

Confident that frightened Prague would tolerate anything, the henchmen of little Fuehrer Konrad Henlein organized demonstrations that ended in riots which took six lives. By this time the Czech government was forced to show its hand. Tight martial law was clamped on five Sudeten towns, then on three more. While a jittery world held its breath, Fuehrer Henlein shot back an ultimatum that martial law be lifted in six hours or his party would "decline responsibility for all further developments."

In the next 24 hours Prague rejected the ultimatum, rushed troops



NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN
In a crisis, he took to the air.

to the frontier and won a brief series of skirmishes that took on the temporary aspect of a civil war.

Since further trouble would certainly bring Germany to the rescue, since France and Russia are bound by treaty to aid Czechoslovakia, since Great Britain must aid France, this overnight turn of events assumed international importance. In Berlin, the press cried out at "terrors of the Czech police." France maintained her high-pitched military machine and looked, as usual, to London.

Next afternoon came the most precedent-setting move yet made. A thoroughly frightened Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain announced he would take his first airplane ride, crossing the channel to Berchtesgaden for a conference with Adolf Hitler. Said he: "I am going to see the German chancellor because . . . discussions between him and me may have useful consequences."

Later the same day he landed at Munich, sped to Berchtesgaden, where Der Fuehrer was waiting. For three hours Britain's strong man talked to Germany's strong man, then Neville Chamberlain emerged to tell the world he was returning to London, would come back to see Hitler in a few days.

What happened at Berchtesgaden was mere conjecture. Best guesses said London and Paris seek a four-power pact with Germany and Italy, since Prime Minister Chamberlain's visit was suggested by French Premier Edouard Daladier. No one could figure how the source of this trouble, Czechoslovakia, fit into the picture, but it was clear Der Fuehrer would accept little short of outright autonomy for his Sudeten friends.

The Chamberlain flight brought little but gloom in Prague, where resistance stiffened and an angry cabinet ordered Konrad Henlein's arrest. But Fuehrer Henlein, who had just broadcast a proclamation demanding Sudeten union with Germany, was already fleeing to Munich. In the mood she was in, Czechoslovakia was ripe for loud broadcasts that came from Moscow that night, assailing Neville Chamberlain's "sellout" to Fascism, urging Prague to "fight to the last" against Germany.

White House

Like any other hospital visitor with time on his hands, Franklin Roosevelt waited impatiently at Rochester, Minn., watching Son James on the mend from his gastric ulcer operation. Finally he went riding on Minnesota's rain-soaked roads, found his car mired, stopped to chat 20 minutes with a farmer about crop prices. Outcome: The President promised he would try to raise them.

From his special train, which served as hotel, the President watched the outcome of his "purge" (See POLITICS), also watched nervous Europe (See FOREIGN). Finally, interview-hungry correspondents were told: "At this time, Minnesota is not a news source for events in Europe, Maryland and Maine."

Mr Roosevelt's worries about

Europe were obvious. To a nine-year-old visitor who found him studying Czechoslovakia's map, he advised: "Just now, more than ever, it is necessary to remember my geography lessons. So keep up your interest in geography."

That night the presidential special left for Washington where Secretary of State Cordell Hull waited to talk diplomacy, where Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau Jr. waited to discuss U. S. money and stock market action in the event of war.

Politics

Until August 11, the word "purge" had little application in American politics. On that date Franklin Roosevelt asked Georgians to defeat their Sen. Walter F. George because: "He is out of touch with the broad objectives of the party . . . On most questions we don't speak the same language."

Subsequently, "purge" went after South Carolina's Sen. Ellison D. Smith and Maryland's Sen. Millard E. Tydings. Both won anyway. Adding to the President's consternation was Maine's historically prophetic election in which all Republicans won, all Democrats lost. Only two days later, Georgians voted to give "purge" a final shellacking, to bury with vengeance the gravest political error Franklin Roosevelt has ever made.

Day before Georgia's election, Manager Edgar B. Dunlap of the George machine could confidently predict victory. Major reason was the President's speech, but Manager Dunlap himself was another reason. One-time Georgia chairman of the Birthdays balls, once an RFC attorney, he was fired from the latter job for political activity. Few Georgia Democrats carry more weight.

Against red-suspended ex-Gov. Eugene Talmadge, against New Dealer Lawrence S. Camp, against Townsend Planner William G. McRae, Manager Dunlap drove a campaign that won handsily. But while anti-New Deal Senator George was renominated, so was Gov. E. D. Rivers with his "Little New Deal" platform.

Among other results in a week filled with primaries:

In Michigan, Gov. Frank Murphy and ex-Gov. Frank Fitzgerald became Democrat, G. O. P. gubernatorial nominees, respectively.

In Utah, Dr. Franklin S. Harris, president of Brigham Young university, won Republican senatorial nomination, will face Democratic Sen. Elbert D. Thomas in November.

Business

No target of New Deal dislike has been U. S. small business, though a leading small town business man is often regarded by his fellow townsmen as the counterpart of big business. Last spring, Franklin Roosevelt called a meeting of little business men at Washington, was later shocked to see his conference turn into a near riot.

Not the outgrowth, rather a reaction from this meeting is the National Small Business Men's association, founded by a letter-writing letterhead manufacturer from Akron, Ohio, Dewitt M. Emery. Jokingly called "little in everything but stature," 6 1/2-foot President Emery solicited members by mail from business firms not employing more than 500 persons, not capitalized at more than \$1,000,000. Presumably too inarticulate for membership are the butcher, baker and



LITTLE MAN EMERY
How little is little business?

grocer who fit into Franklin Roosevelt's more logical definition of a small business man.

To Pittsburgh last week for their first convention went Dewitt Emery's little business men. Though Pittsburgh's C. W. Elton hopefully predicted 2,500 delegates, the first day found a scant 200 whose restraint held discussion to a minimum. Next day, with their number increased to 300, little business men talked more freely. Drawn up were resolutions which lashed fiercely at administration policies in relation to business.

Their demands: Free enterprise, less waste, removal of excess bureaus and employees, balanced budget, lower taxes, sound money.

Crime

Fortnight ago, before his rackets case against Tammany Leader James J. Hines was thrown out of court, New York District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey was a good bet to win Republican gubernatorial nomination. Cause of the mistrial was Tom Dewey's reference to Tammanyman Hines' alleged conspiracy in Manhattan's poultry racket, a reference which Justice Ferdinand Pecora thought constituted a breach of court etiquette.

Since Justice Pecora has a Tammany-Democrat background, it was easy for disgruntled prosecutors to mutter about political influence. Day after the mistrial decision, even the august New York Times pontificated that "Justice Pecora has made a profound mistake of judgment."

In its efforts to prove Politician Hines had participated in the late Arthur ("Dutch Schultz") Flegen-



JUSTICE FERDINAND PECORA
". . . made a profound mistake . . ."

heimer's policy racket, the state had spent \$50,000, presented four weeks of testimony, gone to great pains guarding precious witnesses.

But Justice Pecora's decision had hardly ceased echoing through the courtroom before Tom Dewey began planning his next move. Though the Republican nominating convention was but two weeks away, though Defense Attorney Lloyd P. Stryker had sarcastically suggested that a new trial be delayed until "after the political campaign," the state will probably rush through a new trial which would preclude the 36-year-old prosecutor's running for governor. Biggest job will be to avoid Justice Pecora's sitting on the case. For this, the state must either ask Gov. Herbert Lehman to designate another judge, or present the case back to a county grand jury for an indictment identical with the last.

Relief

As enacted, social security is insurance based on a man's lifetime earnings. But Depression and Recession have shown that some never earn enough to retire comfortably. For this reason, also because 1938 has brought an alarming rebirth of pension ideas (Townsendism had 100 supporters in the last congress) social security will probably be revised next winter in the face of such "short cuts to Utopia" as California's "\$30-every-Thursday" plan.

Changes Franklin Roosevelt reportedly wants: (1) Beginning of old age insurance payments in 1940 instead of 1942; (2) increasing minimum monthly old-age payments from \$10 to \$30, decreasing maximums from \$85 to \$60; (3) payments to widows and orphans of workers equal to those received by a man retiring at 65.

Already announced are plans to expand social security among 16,000,000 now excluded: Farm laborers, domestics, seamen, federal reserve bank employees, and possibly self-employed persons.

War

In theory the forlorn League of Nations applies sanctions against aggressor nations. Ineffective against Italy's Ethiopian campaign, the league has been even less capable of spanking Japan for her Chinese conquest. Fortnight ago, when the league began its current session, China resolved to demand action. From Hankow went hundreds of telegrams to league representatives.

But last week all hopes were dashed when a European crisis (See FOREIGN) developed into such proportions that China's complaint drifted to the background. Only hope remaining is that Great Britain will force the league's hand to protect her swiftly vanishing economic domination of the Far East. Meanwhile, Jap troops continued creeping up on Hankow, one-time Chinese capital which is their final objective, and which they will ultimately capture whatever the cost.

Miscellany

On Utah's Bonneville salt flats, Englishman John Cobb drove his button-shaped, 2,500 horsepower racing car 350.20 miles per hour, capturing the record held by a fellow countryman, Capt. George E. T. Eyston.

Bruckart's Washington Digest

Government Must Be Kept Liberal, Cry of President and Spokesmen

Roosevelt's Definition of Term Means He Has Cast Die For Realignment of Political Parties; Time May Prove Fallacy of Today's Liberal Doctrines.

By WILLIAM BRUCKART
WNU Service, National Press Bldg., Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON.—There is a great to-do being made these days about "liberalism." We are told in the press, through the radio, in personal conversations that "liberalism," liberal thinking, is vitally necessary; it is urgent that our government be kept liberal, and that our daily lives be moulded along liberal lines. President Roosevelt says so, and sought in a recent speech to define liberalism; his spokesmen repeat and emphasize what he has said; the vast army of ballyhoo artists on the government payroll is saying it after the manner of a stooge for a ventriloquist. A lot of Republicans, trying to ape the New Dealers, are saying it, too, and making just as much of a mess of the proposition as the less slick-tongued among the New Dealers.

Well, any way, at any cost, there must be liberalism. If we don't be liberal, we are warned, the devil will get us. The nation, its 130,000,000 inhabitants and all of their works will sink to the depth of perdition. It's a very sorry situation, indeed.

Recognizing the need, the urgent necessity for liberalism, Mr. Roosevelt undertook recently to define it. I quote his words from a recent speech in Maryland where he had gone to try to bring about the defeat of Sen. Millard Tydings in a race for the Democratic senatorial nomination:

"For example, Mr. A is a composite conservative. He admitted that in 1933, interest rates charged by private bankers to ordinary citizens who wanted to finance a farm were altogether too high; he admitted that there were sharp practices, excesses and abuses in issuing securities and buying and selling stocks and bonds; he admitted that the hours of work in his factory were too long; he admitted that old people, who became destitute through no fault of their own, were a problem; he admitted that national and international economics and speculation made farming and fishing extremely hazardous occupations; and he even admitted that the buying power of farmers and fishermen had not kept pace with the buying power of other kinds of workers."

"But conservative Mr. A not only declined to take any lead in solving these problems in co-operation with the government. He even found fault with and opposed, openly or secretly, almost every suggestion that was put forward by those who belonged to the liberal school of thought."

"Mr. B, I said, was a composite liberal. He not only admitted the needs and the problems like Mr. A, but he put his shoulder under the load; he gave active study and active support to working out methods, in co-operation with the government, for solving the problems and the filling of the needs. Mr. B did not claim that the remedies were perfect, but he knew that we had to start with something less than perfect in this imperfect world."

Would Force Realignment Of Politics of Country

Mr. Roosevelt's pronouncement on what constitutes a liberal followed very closely a statement he had issued in a meeting with the newspaper correspondents at the White House, saying that he had no objection to election of "liberal Republicans." Said he: "If there is a good liberal running on the Republican ticket, I would not have the slightest objection to his election. The good of the country rises above party."

The importance of these two declarations?

Mr. Roosevelt has cast the die for a new alignment of political parties. He has swept aside all previous bonds that held men and women within the Democratic party or the Republican party or the lesser political groups and has said, in effect, "Come with me into a new fusion of forces and action." Of course, no one who has studied Mr. Roosevelt's course since his political ears were first pinned back in defeat of his malodorous plan to add six justices of his own choosing to the United States Supreme court could have failed to recognize this eventuality. He was planning to force realignment in politics in this country for some months; but now the thing is out in the open, and the Democrats and Republicans, alike, know what confronts them if it is their desire to maintain the present political party setup.

What will happen is quite another question. Undoubtedly, the Democratic party will be the greater sufferer. It has to be so, because Mr. Roosevelt became titular head of the Democratic party by virtue of election to the presidency in 1932 and again in 1936 as the candidate of that party. So many of the former Democrats have become wedded to the New Deal either by conviction or as a result of having won office on New Deal coat tails that there is no turning back for them.

Thus, there is a split, with those who subscribe to the New Deal theory of liberalism on the one hand and the Democrats who adhere to the hundred-year-old principles of the Democratic party on the other. There will be some Republicans drawn into the new alignment, but they will be fewer than the wing formed from Democrats. The Republicans who will go over to any new alignment will be of the type of Harold Ickes, now secretary of the interior, Senator Norris of Nebraska (who once wore a Republican label) and others of the here-today-gone-tomorrow category.

And further, as to what will happen: my observation is that these so-called liberal movements don't last very long. They crack up on the very principles which are supposed to be their foundation stones. Always, there are too many "leaders." Every "liberal," who catalogues himself as such, shouts about it and produces plans for saving the world wherever anybody will listen, conceives himself to be a leader. Someway, the ideas and ideals of these liberal leaders always differ. Each invariably takes the position that his plans must be adopted unanimously or the world will go to pot.

Ideas Subject to Quick Change; Try Something Else

Then, too, their ideas are subject to such quick change that few of them are retained very long. They are cast aside for something else that has more glamor. A case in point is an incident of recent history. After New Dealer Senator Pope had been kicked for the Idaho Democratic nomination for senator by the youthful Worth Clark, there was talk among the New Dealers about having Senator Pope seek reelection independently; it was proposed and discussed with Mr. Roosevelt whether Senator Pope should embrace the faith of the LaFollette's progressive ticket in Idaho. It was found, however, that the LaFollette had a candidate for the senate on their ticket. To the suggestion that he withdraw and let Senator Pope be their candidate, the LaFollette spokesman said: no sir—enough Senator Pope isn't progressive enough for us—and Senator Pope had campaigned as a 100 per cent New Dealer.

One can walk around the halls of congress any day when the session is on and find hundred-per-centers arguing how far "reform" must be carried; what "liberalism" means. And, in downtown Washington, where the really important headmen of liberalism are to be found, they are constantly fuming and fretting at each other. Instances are on record where two rabid liberals actually have sought to get each other discredited in the eyes of the President because of their differences over what liberalism means.

The only thing about which they seem to agree is that anyone who insists on sanity in governmental thinking—anyone who takes heed of lessons of experiences and traditions of the past—must, of necessity be a Tory, a bloodsucker, a trampler of the poor, an obstructionist, a "republicrat," or some other animal in human form who is overcome with personal greed. On that point, the liberals that we see in the government these days present a united front.

Time May Prove Fallacy Of Today's Liberal Ideas

That is the story of the self-appointed liberals. To them has been given the right—in their own minds, at least—to guide the destinies of the nation. I assume that if they regard me at all they classify me as coming from across the railroad tracks, question my mental balance. But I shall continue to study their methods, commend what is good, criticize that which is obviously unsound. More important, I shall continue to cling to the doctrine of the ages that human nature is going to be changed by some Power that is considerably above the level of human intelligence; I shall hold to a conviction that real progress comes by that method and not from the crackpots who look upon the human race as a fresh litter of guinea-pigs.

But, anyway, we have liberalism defined at last by a man who is qualified to define it, and we find that it differs from what liberalism formerly meant. It was only a few generations ago that liberalism meant restricting, not increasing, the powers of government. Neither Mr. Roosevelt's definition nor his record in office coincides with the former understanding of the word. It seems to me likely, therefore, that we will go on for quite some years with this quarrel, and that may be—and this is just a hunch—time will prove the fallacy of some of the so-called liberal doctrines of this day.

© Western Newspaper Union.



WHO'S NEWS THIS WEEK

By LEMUEL F. PARTON

NEW YORK.—In 1918, the Bolsheviks were fixing to shoot Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, but he persuaded them to let him go to America so he could get a new wooden leg. He got it, also a beautiful wife, a \$5,000,000 airplane factory, and a lot of flying records, culminating in his new east-west transcontinental record of 10 hours and 3 minutes, from New York to Los Angeles.

Flying for Imperial Russia in the World War, he engaged in more than 100 dogfights with the Germans and dropped 13 of them. But one day they dropped him—into the Baltic. A forty-pound bomb, which he had failed to release, exploded as the ship struck the water, and blew it to bits.

Recovering consciousness later, he discovered that, witless as he was, he had been clinging to a pontoon. The water was red around him. Shifting his good leg over the pontoon, he made a tourniquet of his torn trouser leg. He swooned again, as a Russian destroyer picked him up. He crow-hopped the Chinese border on his wooden leg, as a stupid border guard refused to recognize his papers.

Washington received him hospitably, in April, 1918, and made him a consulting engineer for the army air service. He later experienced some rough going, but the only real crack-up in his career was encompassed in that drop into the Baltic. He was steadily on the uptake, designing planes, flying and bringing through his factory. In 1933, he designed and built an amphibian plane which made a record of 177.79 miles per hour. Trained in the Imperial Naval academy, he has contributed greatly to aviation engineering and design.

Several years ago, using an alarm clock and few electrical odds and ends, he made a waltzing plane, swaying rhythmically with band music from below. His waltzing days were over and he found this a satisfactory substitute.

SIMON LAKE, the inventor of the submarine, 72 years old, hopes some day to get an under-sea peek at the sunken continent of Atlantis.

Lake Out to Redeem the Submarine

In a mid-town hotel in New York, he is up to his knees in blueprints of submarine adaptations and gadgets which he hopes will be found useful by the deep sea boulevardier. His father is 91; his grandfather lived to the age of 96 and his sister is 102. Although his once red hair is white, he thinks he is just now getting his start in life.

His 25 basic patents alone made the submarine possible. Like many, possibly most, inventors, he could devise a scheme for almost anything except getting what was coming to him. So, in his genial, casual way, he is broke.

Reading Jules Verne, when he was 10 years old, led him to capsize a rowboat on the Toms river in New Jersey and test his staying powers in the submerged air chamber. In 1894, he made a wooden submarine 14 feet long, with a soda water tank supplying compressed air. It worked nicely. In 1894, he made the Argonaut, Jr., in which he cruised under the water for thousands of miles on Chesapeake bay.

Like the Wright brothers, he aroused little attention. He finally got Washington interested when he telephoned to the capitol from the bottom of the sea. His working submarine came through. Washington didn't seem to care much what he did, so he took his invention to foreign capitals. Czarist Russia made him some impressive offers but he decided they were a dissolute lot and, as a self-respecting American business man, he wouldn't have anything to do with them.

All in all, he became fed up with bureaucrats and red tape and governments in general and turned to deep sea treasure hunts. The submarines, of course, destroyed much more treasure than they ever dredged up. This troubles him. Vigorous and energetic, with a wrinkled, knobby weather-beaten face, genial and friendly, he plugs along alone in his hotel to redeem the submarine by making it a general cargo and passenger carrier.

© Consolidated News Features WNU Service.

The Letter Writers

The average Englishman writes 78 letters a year; an American writes 67; a New Zealander, 66; Swiss, 60; German, 56; Dane, 46; Austrian, 38; Dutchman, 34; Swede, 26; Frenchman, 26; Norwegian, 20; Italians, Spaniards and Portuguese write less than 20 letters a year.