



Beyond A Famous Victory

IT WAS, as everybody knows now, a famous victory, and the executive is talking about it. The little man they said couldn't win not only won handily but carried a Democratic Congress in with him.

In the process, Harry Truman went far toward convincing his countrymen that he was a bigger man than he had given him credit for. Even Southerners, offended by his civil rights program, could not help admiring his courage in reiterating his stand before a Harlemed audience just prior to the election. Calistated risk or not, he spoke his piece.

Had he been defeated, he would have gone down gloriously, with all guns firing; and they were already saying about him that he would make our most popular ex-President. Victorious, his battle has just begun.

Look, first, at his Cabinet. It would take a Quiz Kid even to rattle off the names of the collection of hand-me-downs and personal friends who head the executive branch of the Government. General Marshall and Forrestal alone are considered to be top-notchers, and both have been reported preparing to retire. Without a first rate Secretary of State especially, President Truman would find himself in water over his head.

The economic condition of the country, while business was never better, is a source of apprehension. Profits and wages are high and everyone who really wants a job will get it before wages have gone up so far and stayed up so long. If they come down in a hurry, profits will disappear, and along with them fancy wages and the surfeit of jobs. Therefore, the Government will be siphoning off an increasing portion of the national income for its running expenses and to carry out the additional benefits to which the next Congress most likely will commit it.

As to the military, the next administration that it has organized labor solidly behind it. A more useful support would be that of industry, for industry is

easier than organized labor to manage, and industry's natural desire is to produce the goods and make the profits that are the stuff of prosperity.

But organized labor's bent is to demand more for producing less, and to the world it holds the trump card, when nothing at all is produced. For a reference, see "Railway Strike, 1948," when President Truman proposed to put striking railway workers into the Army.

In Congress itself the President may find that he has a Roundhead on his hands. It is easy to visualize the hero's reputation which will get from the Joint Session which he met next January to bear his State of the Union message. But if this message contains the same old recommendations for the same old things—price control, civil rights, housing aids—it is likely to produce the same old dreary round of frustration by the President's own nominal team mates.

On the brighter side, there should be several notable areas of cordiality between the President and his Congress, and they will be especially gained for the country at large. Trade agreements with friendly nations, the cornerstone of any conceivable American foreign policy other than complete isolation, will come rapidly back into practice. The continuation of the Marshall Plan on an adequate scale is assured. There will be no interruption in the continuity of firm negotiations with Russia, as there probably would have been in either case, and there will be no wholesale change in the faces that confront Molotov, Vishinsky and their subalterns. And Stalin, if he reads the election return, will have discovered just how little the U. S. thinks of him, and how much of the President who initiated the Truman Doctrine.

It's a man-killng year, the Presidency, and for the next four years it looks dead-end. But it is a year for both the best leadership and generous co-operation. It is our hope, but not our expectation, that we shall enjoy them.

Forthright Policy Greatly Needed
U. N. Success Depends On U. S.

BY SIMON WELLES
 Former Under Secretary of State

THE celebration of the United Nations' anniversary coincided with the submission to the world organization of the gravest issues it has faced. The fear and uncertainty that engulfed the Paris Assembly have not unnaturally impeded confidence. They have prevented any popular appreciation of the value of the United Nations—of what it has done, and of what it is doing.

No man anyone believes that if it were not for the United Nations, the world would be a more peaceful place. It is heartening to find tonic realism in the address of the Assembly's president, Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, the Australian Minister of External Affairs.

No member state has done more to strengthen the United Nations than Australia. Time and again our representatives have fought shy and sought refuge for the Charter's basic principles. Time and again Dr. Evatt or Col. Hodgson has rallied the standard-bearers of the world as a means of easing the road of self-interest or expediency.

Many Americans seem to find a peculiar satisfaction in alleging that the United Nations is a "top." They might well remark, as Dr. Evatt said, that in the last three years the United Nations has not only saved the independence of such countries as Iran, but has stopped, or drastically limited, Soviet, Russian, Indian and Kashmir. The Soviet study its "record in relieving economic and social disaster and working toward the raising of living standards throughout the world" as a means of easing political tensions.

It is a pity they cannot be compelled to respond to Dr. Evatt's challenge: "We should try to imagine what might happen if the United Nations had not existed. If there had been no organization to bring the great and small powers together regularly, and with the specific purpose of working out solutions to international problems, according to the principles of a universally accepted Charter of Peace."

What have unfortunately been making the headlines in the past months are chiefly the "incidents" in Berlin, the "shikari" trades and the 37th Soviet vote. Little attention has been paid to the effective work of the Security Council in the past year. Little heed has been given to the fact that the true significance of such recent developments as the Russian withdrawal from the United Nations and the fact that Moscow has been compelled to recognize the power of the Assembly as the agency of world public opinion; and all too little emphasis has been laid upon the most important development of all, the growing realization during the first post-war years of the realization of their responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

There is no need to quarrel with the major premise in the speeches delivered in Paris last week. The United Nations is the "incubator" of the world. The United States has unquestionably been primarily responsible for the frustration of the United Nations and for its failure to promote world recovery. The Charter was drafted with full knowledge that the co-operation of the United States was essential to the success of the United Nations. The Kremlin has impeded such co-operation.

But is the somewhat unctuous self-righteousness of the American press and public, who have addressed wholly justified? Has the United States actually based its policy on the United Nations, as it professes to do?

Her other members of the United Nations are not likely to forget, even if we do, that the Truman

DeWitt MacKenzie
Totalitarian Fight?

NEW YORK

IN discussing the Chinese Communist Party's great military victory in Manchuria, I have said that this also was a triumph for Russia and that it vastly strengthens the hand of Moscow in the world revolution for the spring of '49.

In this connection I brooded as brooded the claim that the Chinese Reds are just humble agrarians without any Soviet affiliation. I return to the subject of Russia and the cause of its great importance to the nations which are battling Communism, and because we have had a fresh development which gives undeniably proof of the fallacy of the agrarian tale.

Mao Tse-Tung, chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, has submitted a report of the Red successes in China for the bulletin of the Cominform (Communist International Bureau) which has headed the Communist Party of the United States. The Cominform is generally accepted by observers to be the successor to the Comintern, the Staff for World Revolution, which was "abolished" by Moscow in 1943 because of hostility of the Western powers to it.

Mao Tse-Tung reports to the Cominform which is the voice of the world Communist movement (which presumably was written for the fall of Mauden, capital of Manchuria, and the Red army's 60,000 square miles of territory, or about 24.5 per cent of China. He also claims that 18,000,000 of the Red army's 60,000 square miles of territory, or some 38 per cent of China's population, have been mobilized for the GREAT THERAPY.

Whether his figures are accurate, the fact remains clear, however, is that the United States Communist threaten to overrun all China, thus presenting Russia with a fait accompli. The Nationalist Government in China, Chiang Kai-Shek is pretty well out of the picture—politically, economically and

Where's Elmo? And George?

DR. GEORGE GALLUP isn't feeling well today. Elmo Roper, who took one sampling month ago of the Dewey-Truman sentiment, announcing that Dewey would win in a walk and that he himself, Roper, was going to devote his time thereafter to harder questions, is downright po'ty. The Chicago-Tribune should be, but for the sake of the country, and others, made a colossal error, right out where everybody could see it. They even fooled each other.

It is, perhaps, as well that they were caught in their poll town. The poll came to occupy the same relation to

national elections as the thermometer does to the hospital patient, these contests were beginning to lose the suspense that makes them so fun to come in at the end of a mystery picture.

Whether or not the polls have earned a repute in previous performances sufficient to ride out the Truman fiasco is purely a matter of commercial judgment. Dr. Gallup et al. do not take their samples and weigh their judgments for the fun of it. Polls are a sponsored, not a sustaining program. You have to pay for them, and a great many people are not having any at the moment.

Quote, Unquote

Many people think they got along better with cheerless white apples "things" — Grenada County (Wisc.) Weekly.

Sangamon (Miss.) paper goes to rather big. But we believe the one Paul Graham brought in to the office yesterday is the biggest one we've seen that weighed one pound. Dr. George Fritz, a state physician at Anna and formerly of this community, picked it up in Calhoun County near Cambridge, along the Mississippi—Mattoon (Ill.) Journal-Gazette.

A dollar will buy so little nowadays that lots of people are becoming disgusted and are saving them instead of spending them. —Tifton (Ga.) Gazette.

Shatterproof windshields were certainly an improvement. Now if they would just give rubber telephone booths and intercepting bugs rattling —Fernandis (Fla.) News-Leader.

Place in the paper says competent baby sitters are crying need. A good competent mama might fill the bill. —Gulfport (Ga.) Free Press.

Scientists think atomic energy may be used to combat the Florida red tide. Please, gentlemen — it isn't that bad. —Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Free.

It is an amazing thing how the Republican and Democratic political makers can find different words to express the same idea. —Little Rock Arkansas Gazette.

The world has never been the same since the circus got so big that it high-tails all the small towns. —Bismarck (N.D.) Gazette.

The time to propose is when the lady is feeling good but has had trouble with the boss and hates her job. —Richmond (Va.) News-Leader.

Four professors are going to the Bronx Zoo to study why a gorilla beats his chest. Easy! It feels so good when he does. —Sheffers (Tenn.) Banner.

Alexander George
Five-Term Reign

BY ALEXANDER GEORGE
 WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON—The Democratic Party's five-term reign of Roosevelt began on Jan. 20, will be rounded out by the inauguration of Truman on Jan. 20, and will be a half month of White House occupancy, its longest stay since the inauguration of Roosevelt in 1933, and starting its fifth term. Prior to the Roosevelt-Truman transition, the longest stay at the Presidency by a Democrat was Franklin D. Roosevelt's two terms from 1933 to 1945.

The Republicans set the modern record in a democracy, with their four GOP Presidents in succession from 1869 to 1893. They were Grover Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, Arthur, and the GOP tied that mark in the McKinley-Teddy Roosevelt transition.

Back in the early days of the nation Jefferson Republican-Democrats were what Henry Clay called "24 consecutive years Jefferson, Madison and Monroe each served eight years as President."

Precedent-making Franklin D. Roosevelt gave the Democrats a record long stay at the White House, and went on to set a new record for himself. This record may stand up to recently 31 states had ratified the 22nd Amendment, which would limit a President to two full terms. The ratification of 36 states is needed to make an amendment effective.

In 1937, the craft of New Deal Democrats was at its peak. The Democrats had a record majority in Congress, and the House of Representatives was 377 Republicans and 104 Democrats.

The Democrats had a record majority of 46 of the 46 states was a record.

President Roosevelt set another record by appointing over 100 justices of the Supreme Court after the United States. The entire membership of the Supreme Court was appointed by President Roosevelt. President Truman nominated only two justices, Justice Vinson and Justice Burton.

The depression, the Roosevelt policies, the New Deal, the war, and the recent Democratic era were the most turbulent in our political

A Principle Pays Off

POLITICS, at best, is a funny business, and a few hours can turn a long shot into a sure thing.

Such was the good fortune which suddenly came the way of Charlotte's Joe Barkley in last week's Truman victory. Before Tuesday, he was but one of a handful of Southerners who stuck by the man from Missouri and worked for his reelection, despite prospects of defeat, and the criticism that would be heaped upon him after Tuesday, he automatically became one of the big figures in the resurging Democratic Party, a man who is going to throw a lot of weight around in the months to come.

Joe Blythe stuck to Truman because he believes in party loyalty. His brand, whether you like it or not, is the old-fashioned kind, like that of Alben Barkley, which places the welfare of the party above consideration for individuals therein. There were things about the Truman Administration he didn't like, notably the civil rights issue. But when the national Convention nominated the Pres-

ident over Southern objections, Blythe didn't hesitate. He pitched right into one of the toughest assignments of the campaign—the job of raising money for what seemed to be a losing campaign. That the Democrats in the South were to lose Truman tours, and by enough newspaper space and radio time to take the word to additional millions, is a testimony to his own efficiency.

But more than that, he gave Truman and Chairman McGrath the benefit of his native political acumen and good sense. At the same time he set about convincing his Southern friends that party difference could best be worked out within the party, and coaxing them back into the fold.

Substantially because of Joe Blythe's work and influence, the Dixiecrat movement fizzled and Truman came into the home stretch, with enough Southern support to put him across. And though with that job done Blythe may be satisfied now, we've an idea that a high place in the next administration would be his if he wanted it.

Heaps of Fun, Little Damage

THROUGHOUT the hours of last Saturday evening, weird little spoons of assorted sizes and shapes, paper bags in hand, walked up front steps, rang doorbells, and tinkled in solemn, and sometimes squeaky, voices. "Trick or Treat," they called, and the householder to dig into the larger of goodies and hand out candies, candles, gum and whatnots to the eerie little visitors. In return for such generosity was the implicit pledge that no damage would be done to the householder's holdings by the nocturnal marauders.

By and large, the pint-sized spoons lived up to their pledges, and Halloween, 1948, went down in the records as the quietest, sanest Halloween in many a year.

For this blessed turn of events, a good many people and organizations in Charlotte deserve words of credit. From the special mayor's committee, which sought to place the emphasis on "rather than vandalism, down through the Parks & Recreation Commission, which sent out hundreds of party booklets, the Police Department, which provided more than 2000 supervising officers and 5000 Sanitationists, which cleared away tempting piles of leaves, to the churches, schools, and private homes,

where the several-hundred parties were given, it was a record of fine co-operation toward a common objective.

The result: only one false fire alarm; a very small number of misdemeanors in city code Monday morning; a minimum of damage to residential and business property; and no car trips from some Halloweeners of recent years.

The little spoons had a wonderful time. Some of them, perhaps, partook too much of the goodies they received on all sides, but they suffered no permanent ill effects from the party. They were ready, come next Halloween, to knock at your door and make their solemn proposition: "Trick or Treat."

If you're smart, you'll know which end of that bargain to take.

Sign of the week on the back of a big trailer-truck:
 Left — Pasing side.
 Right — Suckside. — *Thomaston (Ga.) Times.*

You, with the ballot and the blunt pencil. You're the only indispensable American. — *Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch.*

Substitute For Minority For Drew Pearson

NOTE—Political expert Drew Pearson's "Merry-Go-Round" for today was based on the assumption that Governor Dewey would be President-elect Dewey as this edition went to press. For obvious reasons, the editorial was called upon to pinch-hit for the Washington pundit-Editors. The News.

By JAMES MARLOW

AN old American tradition still holds true, and yesterday's elections prove it again. It is this:
 "It's America that elects its President."

Our Government is elected by only a minority of the people able to vote—although it's elected by a majority of those actually voting.

Why?
 Because so many people of voting age don't take part in the elections. All this has happened again and again in American history.

The total count from Tuesday's vote was not yet completed as this was written, so the figures here will be approximate.

But even if they're off by a couple of million, the point still will be the same. The total number of people in the United States is 150,000,000. That's the vote totalled 50,000,000. (That's a fair guess.) And say the winner got 26,000,000 votes to 24,000,000 for the loser. But say that 26,000,000 is a majority of the 50,000,000 votes cast in the election.

IT IS A fact. It's a clear majority of 52 per cent—of the total number of people in this country who are of voting age. That winning 26,000,000 still is only a small part of the total number of people in this country who are of voting age. This will show how:

The Census Bureau figures that this year there are about 94,641,000 people 21 years or older—and therefore old enough to vote—in this country.

(Some of these 94,641,000 are aliens and mentally deficient people who can't vote. But for the sake of illustration, let the 94,641,000 figure stand.)

Remember, only about 50,000,000 of those 94,641,000 voted.

That's a total of 26,000,000 votes is a minority—28 per cent—of the total number of people of voting age, although it's a 52 per cent majority of the votes actually cast.

Therefore, a minority of people of voting age were able to set up a government of their choosing for the majority of voting-age people.

A FEW examples will show there's nothing new about this:

When Warren G. Harding was elected President in 1920, only 37,179,795 votes were cast out of an estimated 94,641,000. That's 39.3 per cent of the total number of people of voting age. That was a 60 per cent majority for Harding. But—

Minority For People Elect Our Leaders

That 16,152,200 votes he got was only 28 per cent of the total number of people of voting age: 54,411,832.

Take the first election of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932, when there were an estimated 75,000,000 people of voting age in this country. Roosevelt got 38,276,563 of those 75,000,000. That was only 51 per cent of the total number of people of voting age.

Just one more example:

When Roosevelt won in 1944 there were an estimated 89,000,000 people of voting age in this country. Roosevelt got 47,976,563 of those 89,000,000. That was 54 per cent of the total number of people of voting age.

Well, what happens to those people who don't vote? Why don't they vote?

Some are indifferent and forget that the fullest expression of democracy is a vote by all the people. Some, for the most part, are Southern Negroes who are blocked from voting.

Others are Southern white men who don't vote because in the normally Democratic South—the Republican Party is the party of the "other side."

So since the Democratic candidate is a chinch to win in the South, they might vote to beat a Republican candidate who would be a vote.