

Pegler Gives To Henry Wallace His Unconditional Release With Many Regrets

Scribe Says Revelation Of Letters To Roerich Cut Wallace's Popular Vote

By Westbrook Pegler
(Copyright, 1948, By King Features Syndicate, Inc.)

I am sorry to let him go, for he was very useful to me for more than a year, but I am giving Henry Wallace his unconditional release and I doubt that you will hear much more about him. The authorship of the babbling letters to Nick Roerich has been established and I hope I may say without immodesty that the revelation of the scribe's tangled conduct cut down his popular vote from a potential of six million, the figure which Jim Farley mentioned last spring, to about a million votes. Some tea-leaf readers then thought Henry would get eight million votes, but all this was goose-bone prophecy. Speculation and prediction will continue, however, and the election will find experts and pollsters at it again as though nothing had ever happened. Does a baseball seer retire, because the team he picks in April winds up last?

I would point out, too, that not only we professionals of punditry and the more modest lines of journalism, the strident oracles of radio and the book-makers, were wrong. Barney Baruch, the, in a generous manner of speaking, elder statesman must have felt sure that Governor Dewey was practically in or he never would have slammed the White House door forever in his own face by calling President Truman a "rude, uncouth, ignorant man." True, he thought the better of it after sleep, but his scared statement that he had not authorized quotation of his remarks was neither truthful nor extenuating. Dan Tobin, the doddering king of the teamsters, and his regent, Dave Beck of Seattle, were equally at loss and missed the bandwagon. John L. Lewis had been at war with Truman for years so this was only another proof that his authority ends when the miner votes.

This brings us to the fact that the miscalled labor vote still flouts the orders of the union bosses and the alarms of candidates. There is a theory afloat that a "labor vote" elected Mr. Truman in response to his unblinking recitation of all the formulated union claptrap about the Taft-Hartley Act. But "labor," in that evil sense of an honest word, is concentrated in centers of population which Governor Dewey carried with eclat or lost too narrowly as to disprove the idea that "labor" lickered him. This fact only muddles the confusion again. It is futile to accept explanations which are false on sight.

I find two homely parallels in this situation of old times on the sport side. When Tunney fought Dempsey, the first time most of those who made a professional practice of picking winners for a few cents a copy, the standard price of papers before Truman inflation, were convinced that bluejaw couldn't lose. The few who picked Tunney, like those who professed to be confident of Mr. Truman's victory were personal friends or dependents of one degree or another. Their wisdom, therefore, was divided by their loyalty and self interest.

And in the same vein, we have in Mr. Truman a buck Cinderella, a fellow who, as it were, had to tape his own hands, carry his own bucket and swing his own towel. Like Jimmy Braddock, a fighter of very similar characteristics, improbable rejected, and forlorn Mr. Truman won by himself. And he won despite the men who owed him help but denied him of ere cock-crew. He seems a bitter fellow for his closing remarks were fierce warnings of revenge to be taken if he won as now he has. If that be so surely he owes more hurtful and degrading punishment to William O'Dwyer, of New York, to Jimmy Roosevelt, to Jake Arvey of Chicago, Senator Pepper of Florida, Henry Wallace, Tobin and Beck of the teamsters, Johnson of the railroad engineers and Harold Ickes than to men who never took his food or fee but met him frankly as political enemies.

All these and Brauch, as professed democrats in debt to the White House, turned Truman downed at Philadelphia. It was for a fact, a sore humiliation that a man of pride and masculine ethics could not forget. Naturally, Republicans and dissenting essayists would fight him, but these were his own people and they didn't fight but sneered. If he is a conventional American he must still respect the state's rights democrats who fought him on issues as declared opponents. He never has believed in so-called social program himself.

O'Dwyer, Hague and Curley, not only quit him: They insulted him. Jimmy Roosevelt, a party parasite who fattened at the trough and gave nothing, publicly belittled him in Los Angeles. Eleanor and Leon Henderson, a marvel of levitation who stayed up for several years without visible means of support, organized a thing called the Americans for democratic action which yelled for Eisenhower or Douglas. The old girl came through with a letter at the last minute after Truman had barnstormed the country on his own, but it had the sound of a plea for her \$12,000 job in the United Nations, her last means of public attention. She had to write it. Truman might tolerate her, but Dewey certainly wouldn't. So what had she to lose?

They haven't the finest character, these professional bleeding hearts. After all his scurrilous abuse of Robert R. McCormick, John Boettiger, Anna's husband, poor weight, called on McCormick last winter and came away with dust on his knees. He wanted a job with the iron tory, who was remarkably decent, all things considered, but sent him away. After all his abuse of Truman, Ickes came in toward the end for obvious motives. Turned columnist after he quit the cabinet lest he be fired by Truman, he soon lost his Washington client, the star, by a brutal attack on the facts of a known situation.

This cost the old miser money a tragic, turn, and his vanity withered, for now he had no soapbox in his own town. It is strange that Truman received him, for he swings no vote but his own.

AFTER-ELECTION THOUGHT



Tucker Classes Truman's Election As A Body Blow To Joe Stalin And Upholding Of U. S. Foreign Policy

By Ray Tucker

WASHINGTON, Nov. 10—President Truman's election in his own right is a body blow to Stalin, despite the Missouri's sneaking liking for "Uncle Joe" and despite campaign charges that the Administration had harbored Communists who crept into key offices during the Russo-American wartime alliance.

The Soviet propaganda agents here and abroad were prepared to interpret a Dewey victory, albeit wrongly, as a repudiation of the Truman-Marshall doctrine and program. Although political enemies have accused the White House of wavering in the conduct of foreign affairs, especially with respect to Russia, China and Palestine, the Kremlin cannot and does not forget that, breaking from the Roosevelt policy, Mr. Truman and Secretary Marshall authored and implemented the program for rehabilitating anti-Communist countries in the Mediterranean and Western European areas, for rearming the United States and for encircling Russia with a ring of armed foes from Scandinavia to Korea.

Even Trumanites admit that the President handled foreign problems with his eye on the November 2 political returns. They note, too, that he is not the first Chief Executive to realize that many millions of voting Americans have economic and blood ties, mystic but compelling, with their kin and friends across the seas. Now that he owes possession of the White House to nobody but himself, Mr. Truman is expected to take even greater command of the handling of foreign affairs. In doing so, he will probably get rid of Secretary Marshall and Under Secretary of State Lovett. Although an excellent soldier, Mr. Marshall is no great shakes as a diplomat. Both he and Mr. Lovett embarrassed the President at critical moments during the campaign.

It is also doubtful whether the so-called bipartisan foreign policy will survive the Republican debacle. It was built and represented as a bipartisan affair only because Republicans controlled the House and the Senate, with Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan and Representative Charles A. Eaton of New Jersey heading the Senate and House committees which deal with these issues. Now, those committees are chaired by such loyal, unquestioning Democrats as Tom Connally of Texas and Sol Bloom of New York.

Despite his political handling of foreign matters during the last few months, Mr. Truman's instincts and impulses are good, honest and democratic. When he ousts a few "brass hats" and hidebound diplomats in the State Department and abroad, he will probably pursue these general policies: (1) Strong support inside and

outside the United Nations for a larger Palestine than the Bernadotte plan, which won Secretary Marshall's immediate approval, provides.

(2) Possible reviving of the abortive idea of sending a personal emissary such as Chief Justice Vinson for a last-minute showdown with Stalin.

Should this attempt fail to wheedle or force Russia into a change of heart, as it probably would, Mr. Truman would have greater justification for asking huge appropriations for rearmament and a military lend-lease measure to aid anti-Communist nations abroad.

(3) Greater assistance, both financial and military, to China. Fail to recognize that Moscow's penetration of this vast and heavily populated land may be more dangerous than the Kremlin's poke into Central Europe, and the Balkans, is blamed on Mr. Marshall's personal dislike of Chiang Kai-shek.

(4) The use of American might and prestige in regional difficulties which the United Nations seems unable to compose because of Russia's power of veto. In such instances, however, President Truman will make clear that he is supporting majority UN opinion rather than bypassing the international organization.

Despite the Democratic landslide which washed out so many Republican members and brought back to Washington many Democrats who were drowned by the GOP's 1946 "wave of the future" in Congressional contests,

the voters showed extraordinary and encouraging judgment in voting for members of the House. They picked, chose and voted with uncommon common sense.

Here are a few outstanding members who were reelected without regard for the presidential voting, meaning that there were many thousands of split ballots:

Christian A. Herter and George Bates of Massachusetts, both Republicans. Gordon Canfield, although his election is still in doubt, and Harry L. Towse of New Jersey, both Republicans. Andrew Somers of New York, a Democrat. Dan Flood, Sam McConnell and John C. Kunkel of Pennsylvania, Mr. Flood being the only Democrat. Jim Patterson, Republican, of Connecticut, a distinct corner on Capitol Hill. Also Representative John D. Lodge of the Nutmeg State.

Others deserving and receiving reelection were:

John M. Vorys of Ohio, a GOP brilliant. Albert J. Engel and Roy O. Woodruff of Michigan. Dick Welch and Jack Anderson of California. Mike Monroney of Oklahoma. And, of course, despite their philosophical enmity, Speaker Joe Martin of Massachusetts and future Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas.

This does not complete the list of worthy members who were reelected. But it is sufficient to suggest that the American people are far smarter than Stalin thinks.

They vote with their heads, not with their hips!

MARLOW

Government Aid To Education Is Big Problem New Congress Will Tackle

By James Marlow

Washington, Nov. 10—(AP)—Government aid to education is one of the problems the new Congress has to tackle in 1949.

Such aid would mean giving federal money to the states to help them educate grammar and high school children.

The new Congress may approve, although the idea has been battling around a long time without getting anywhere.

This year, with the Republicans in control, it passed the Senate, backed by Senator Taft of Ohio. But the House Republicans let it die.

President Truman has plugged hard for it. You can expect him to plug harder next year with his Democrat running Congress.

For 30 years bills to give such help have been offered in Congress in growing numbers. Why?

On the grounds that some states are so much poorer than others that they can't afford money for a fair education for their children.

One of the main points in the argument against giving such help is this: sooner or later it would give the federal government power to dictate the nation's educational system.

There's another question: Besides helping the public grammar and high schools, should any of the federal money go to private or religious schools in the states?

There's been strong support for doing that, and strong opposition to it. All the arguments, and there are many have gone on a long time.

The Taft bill, passed by the Senate, tried to reach a compromise on some of them. It may be the model for what Congress does in 1949.

For example: the Taft bill doesn't bar private or religious schools outright from receiving any of the federal money. But—

They couldn't receive a cent unless, under the law of an individual state receiving the money, such schools were receiving state help already.

As for government control, under the Taft bill the government could not tell the states what to teach in their schools.

The government would merely act as a kind of bookkeeper to see that the money was distributed by a financial formula.

Under the bill the states would receive \$300,000,000, at least at the start, to help them give their children a better education.

DAILY BIBLE QUOTATION

"One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and throughout all, and in us all. (Eph. 4, 6)

This month's Daily Bible Quotations are suggested by Father Peter M. Denges, Pastor of St. John's Catholic Church in Roanoke Rapids.

American Education Should Be Stressed Fifty-Two Weeks Not One Special Week

This week has for one reason or another been set aside for American Education Week, and in so doing it joins one of the other "weeks" the American people are so prone to observe.

There is only one drawback with setting aside one week of the year to emphasize education on a national scale and that is that it leaves 51 weeks in the year which are NOT devoted to education.

Every week in every year should, in our opinion, be devoted to keeping American education in the public eye because it is a matter of prime importance to us all. There are often many statistics quoted on the most important things produced in America, however youth is frequently not included in the list.

Actually there are no more important citizens in any community than the children. These children deserve nothing less than the best their parents and their community can offer them, therefore it seems a shame to devote only one week of the year to trying to rouse the interest of the general public in education.

Our own community is, perhaps, fortunate in having a school system which in many ways is superior to that of our neighbors. Yet it is not difficult for even the untrained eye to see there is much still needed to give our children the very best in educational standards.

When we realize that most of the daylight hours of children between the ages of six and sixteen is spent in the school, it becomes increasingly evident that the schools should be emphasized at all times. Along with the home and the church, the schools of our nation are the biggest influences on the nation's future because it is in the schools that young minds are being trained to grasp the fundamentals of living useful lives together in a society which is constantly changing. Unless the children of today are taught the importance of living together in peace, we cannot hope for the future to bring anything better than international misunderstanding.

The schools for years have been increasing their influence on our nation by training young minds. It is important that those young minds be given the benefit of the best teaching, the best facilities and the best training possible.

That cannot happen unless all of us make it our own job of furthering the cause of education in every way possible—not only during this American Education Week but all the time.

Observers Say Communists' Present Purpose Is To Bankrupt The U. S. A.

The purpose of present Communist strategy, in relation to the United States, according to some observers, is an effort to lure the United States into excessive expenditures in the hope that eventual bankruptcy will stop our interest in foreign affairs.

These is no doubt but that the United States is spending immense sums of money. The national defense establishment is expected to require from fifteen to seventeen billion dollars next year. In addition, the Economic Cooperation Administration will need from three to five billion and there is also talk of a peace-time Lend-Lease program to cost between one and three billion dollars.

Certainly, if the United States attempts to finance the world in a campaign against Communism, it will have to spend immense sums of money. This means that there is little chance of tax reduction in this country. Something of a counter-offensive against the policy of the nation will develop, not from the Communists in this country but from the capitalists who will not relish the payment of the taxes necessary to support the program.

Daily and Sunday Herald

Roanoke Rapids, N. C., Wednesday, November 10, 1948
PUBLISHED every afternoon (except Saturday) and Sunday morning by the Herald Printing Co., Inc., in Roanoke Rapids, N. C., the capital of a Five County Empire with a population of 160,000 and a buying power of 60 million dollars.

MILTON I. WICK, President and Editor
GUY M. LEEDY, Publisher and General Manager
WILLIAM A. McCLUNG, Managing Editor
WILLIAM L. DAVEY, City Editor
DON HALL, Advertising Manager
MIRL CROSBY, Circulation Manager
EDWARD O. ELMORE, Commercial Manager
MORRIS S. LANCASTER, Mechanical Superintendent

SUBSCRIPTION RATES
CARRIER DELIVERY, Payable to carrier—30¢ a week. No monthly or other rate is made (We are not responsible for advance payments made to carriers)

MAIL RATES, Payable in Advance
Carolina and Virginia All Other States
1 year \$9.50 1 year \$11.00
9 months 7.75 9 months 9.00
6 months 6.00 6 months 7.00
3 months 3.50 3 months 4.00
1 month \$1.00 1 month \$1.25

Entered as Second Class matter, April 3rd, 1914, at the Post Office of Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina, under Act of March 3rd, 1879.

National Advertising Representative
Fred Kimball, Inc.—67 W. 44th St., New York City; 369 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.; 131 W. Lafayette St., Detroit, Mich.; 1213 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.