

WSM, SEPTEMBER 22, 1946

Good Morning, Friends:

When President Truman dismissed Henry A. Wallace from his cabinet, he ended a controversy within his Cabinet on foreign policy but at the same time he may have <sup>alienated</sup> ~~made~~ <sup>you</sup> for himself ~~an opponent~~ <sup>a powerful element of the dem. Party.</sup> ~~for the democratic presidential nomination in 1948.~~ Henry Wallace is just about the political idol of that part of the democratic party which has been termed left wing. This element of the party is quite strong in the industrial states of the East as well as in California and the state of Washington. A steadfast liberal, Henry Wallace has commanded intense loyalties from this group, as was exemplified in the last ditch fight made for him when Harry Truman defeated him for the vice presidential nomination at the Chicago convention. This group was not strong enough then to put over his nomination nor is it likely that they will be strong enough to secure his nomination over President Truman in 1948, <sup>when he should have</sup> <sup>Henry Wallace fades out of the national spotlight</sup> <sup>whether</sup> ~~Whether~~ his name goes before the convention at all will largely depend, ~~it seems at this distance,~~ upon the turn and development of events in our foreign <sup>relationships</sup> ~~affairs.~~

Secretary Wallace has become the personification of a get-along with Russia sentiment. If our relations with Russia take a turn for the worse and the present state of suspicion and distrust <sup>between the two peoples</sup> ~~is~~ fanned to anger and hate, then ~~any one who~~ <sup>of</sup> advocates a more tolerant, lenient or get along with Russia attitude, however you want to describe it, would be doomed



~~to political defeat~~ in national politics.

The personality of Henry Wallace, now private citizen Wallace, is one of the most unusual ever to come upon the American political scene. I am well acquainted with Mr. Wallace, have played handball with him ~~on~~ numerous <sup>times</sup> occasions, have met with him upon various occasions, but I would still be hesitant to say that I know him in the sense that knowing a person connotes an understanding of the person. Not even his worst detractors, however, would say that he is a man without capacity. On the contrary, he is generally recognized as being a man of unusual capacity -- <sup>+</sup> extra-ordinary courage. With his political philosophies, I have often found myself in disagreement ~~while~~ <sup>but</sup> upon other occasions I have found myself in <sup>full</sup> vigorous agreement. <sup>One thing certain about him, his position was definite, unequivocal, and, ~~was~~ usually extreme and therefore controversial.</sup> Many an American is elated over his removal from an official capacity <sup>in Govt</sup> but for many others it severs a tie they felt to the Truman Administration.

An early advocate of agriculture reforms, ~~President~~ <sup>became</sup> Roosevelt selected Henry Wallace ~~as~~ Secretary of Agriculture in <sup>Pres</sup> his first Cabinet. He came to this position from the headship of a farm journal and a successful experience in farming. He brought with him ideas and theories -- ideas and theories such as the ever normal granary, production control, soil conservation -- <sup>prog now deeply embedded in or national life,</sup> programs now being ardently supported by perhaps ~~many~~ millions of people who denounce Henry Wallace for his radical philosophies.



When Vice-President John Gardner had reached his maturity in politics or, to put it another way, had fallen in disfavor with the leaders of the party, Henry Wallace became Vice President. In this position he was more or less submerged and did not give to the country very much of a constructive nature; perhaps, no vice president can. In any event he was defeated for renomination as vice president by Harry Truman in a hot contest; but President Roosevelt soon thereafter reappointed him to the Cabinet as Secretary of Commerce. Thus it was that when <sup>Harry</sup> President Truman succeeded to the Presidency upon the tragic death of President Roosevelt, he had the personal choice of deciding whether to retain or let go the man whom he had defeated at the recent Chicago convention. At the ~~same~~ time, it was generally conceded among politicians in Washington that Wallace was the one man in the Cabinet whom President Truman could least afford to let go. He did not let him go but asked him to stay and until this unfortunate episode, there has been every show of personal friendship between the two men. A show of personal friendship however could not erase the fundamental differences in political concepts of the two men nor could it heal the wounds of disappointment and frustration.

One may question the rectitude of Secretary Wallace's open criticism of the nation's foreign policy, <sup>while in the cabinet</sup> and particularly so since foreign policy is the primary responsibility of the



President of the United States to whom he owed allegiance and loyalty and to whom he owed something more -- gratitude for the privilege President Truman had afforded him of continued service in the President's Cabinet. This placed upon him an obligation which would not have been his under different circumstances; but even so, there is no compelling reason why it should have forced this man of vision and capacity, controversial though he may have been, from public life. *Involuntarily as they are, such men often prove useful.* Just why President Truman should have ever given his approval to the delivery of the speech is something ~~which~~ I do not understand. If Mr. Wallace had made the speech without consultation with the President, then he should have been *dismissed* ~~fired~~ summarily, but if in good faith he submitted a copy to the President for his approval or disapproval, and received approval then it would seem that he had every moral right to make the speech. Of course, as President Truman said in his press statement, at the time he asked Secretary Wallace to resign, there is a fundamental difference of opinion between the two men on foreign policy -- I may go further and say there is a fundamental difference of opinion on many other matters.

This episode may start a debate on foreign policy the like of which we have not had since the pre-war debates on lend-lease, aid to Britain, the lifting of the embargo and other controversial points between what was then called the isolationists and the interventionists.



Otherwise in Washington, the  
Pres is off ~~on~~ for a weekend  
on the Pto in his yacht after  
making it plain that the  
Wage Sta Board, which  
came in for so much criticism  
during the M strike, would  
not be abolished.

And the price decontrol  
board again refused to  
sanction price ceilings on  
dairy products.