

A11353311433  
549

HENRY AGARD WALLACE IN THE  
ELECTION OF 1948

Margaret J. Stevenson Miller

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree  
of Master of Liberal Arts

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, OHIO

August, 1956

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
BOWLING GREEN, OHIO

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
BOWLING GREEN, OHIO

378,771

B7t

no. 549

cop. 1

151455

11

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
II. WALLACE IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE . . . . .	7
Wallace under Roosevelt . . . . .	7
Wallace under Truman. . . . .	31
Resignation from the Cabinet. . . . .	34
III. WALLACE, <u>THE NEW REPUBLIC</u> EDITOR. . . . .	42
The critic of American foreign policy . . . . .	43
The European tour . . . . .	58
The transcontinental tour . . . . .	73
The Palestine tour. . . . .	83
IV. CANDIDATE OF THE PROGRESSIVE CITIZENS OF AMERICA . . . . .	89
December announcement . . . . .	99
Progressive Philadelphia Convention . . . . .	115
Communists and platform adoption. . . . .	125
Political comment . . . . .	136
V. CAMPAIGN OF 1948. . . . .	140
Dewey <u>vs.</u> Wallace . . . . .	140
Truman <u>vs.</u> Wallace. . . . .	150
Wallace against the major parties . . . . .	159
Political comment . . . . .	178

	111
CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. THE ELECTION RESULTS EXAMINED . . . . .	181
Truman victory. . . . .	185
Decisive factors. . . . .	193
Wallace, a defeated candidate . . . . .	202
Political comment . . . . .	209
VII. SUMMARY . . . . .	214
The liberalism of Wallace . . . . .	217
<u>Toward World Peace.</u> . . . .	223
Disavowal of former policy. . . . .	236
Contribution to American politics . . . . .	242
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	248
APPENDIX. . . . .	259

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Comparison of Pollster's Prediction in the Election of 1948. . . . .	183



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

No study of Henry Agard Wallace in the election of 1948 would be complete without taking cognizance of his contribution to American agriculture in his efforts to alleviate the plight of the American farmer. After the prosperous years of 1909-1914, sometimes called the golden era for the American farmer, agriculture in the 1920's was a sick industry. The farm income dropped seriously; furthermore, the farmers' share of the national income fell from 21.4 per cent in 1914 to 14.2 per cent in 1920.<sup>1</sup>

The farmers' dilemma was a result of many factors. Over-expansion and mechanization of farms led to chronic surpluses, intensified by the decline of the foreign and domestic market. The foreign market decreased seriously as the balance of gold drained to the United States because she became a creditor nation following World War I. Nations unable to get American dollars increased their own production and subsisted on less food supplies. Simultaneously, meat and wheat from Argentina, Canada, Australia, and Russia appeared to challenge American products in the world market,

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry C., and Anne Dewees Taylor, The Story of Agricultural Economics (Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State College Press, 1952), p. 508.

while cotton from Egypt and India appeared to threaten American cotton.<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile, in the domestic market, the demand for agricultural products declined as the American public ate less "bread and meat, wore lighter clothing, and women favored silk and rayon over wool and cotton."<sup>3</sup> The use of farm machinery forced the acreage of forage crops used for farm work horse food to be turned over to human food production also adding to the food surplus.<sup>4</sup> These factors accumulated farm surpluses attended by falling prices.

In this situation, farmers grew discontented with their lot. This was emphasized by the fact that men in other industries forged ahead as the farmer fell behind. The high tariff policy of the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover Administrations proved beneficial to business and labor, but worked against the interests of the farmer.<sup>5</sup> The high tariff prevented other nations from buying the farmers' produce or the American farmers from taking foreign goods in return; whereas, on the other hand, the farmers paid higher prices for

---

<sup>2</sup>John B. Hicks, The American Nation (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949), p. 540.

<sup>3</sup>Leland D. Baldwin, Recent American History (New York: American Book Company, 1954), p. 95.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Marshall Edward Dimock and Gladys Ogden Dimock, American Government in Action (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1951), p. 833.

manufactured goods, protected by the tariff from world competition.<sup>6</sup> The farmer was further burdened by high taxes and high cost of labor, machinery, and transportation. These increased the farmers' dissatisfaction as business seemed to prosper.

Because of their economic distress, the farm leaders began to evolve plans to ameliorate their position. Three alternatives appeared possible: (1) to sell a greater percentage of its total production in world trade; (2) "to attempt to get a better price, relative to other prices, on the domestic market;" or (3) to decrease production.<sup>7</sup> Important plans formulated for these purposes were: the McNary-Haugen Bill, the Export Debenture Plan, and the Domestic Allotment Plan.

The McNary-Haugen Bill, passed by Congress in February, 1927, created a Federal Farm Board. This act, favored by the Farm Bureau, proposed that the Farm Board remove the surplus from the domestic market and sell it abroad at world price.<sup>8</sup> The farmer would receive the world price plus the tariff in the domestic market and by means of an equalization

---

<sup>6</sup>Dimock and Dimock, American Government in Action, p. 833.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Carl T. Schmidt, American Farmers in the World Crisis (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941), p. 114.

fee, share a portion of the loss incurred in selling the surplus in the world market. The bill was vetoed by President Coolidge on "the ground that it incorporated a price-fixing principle and benefited special groups."<sup>9</sup>

Undaunted by the Presidential veto, the McNary-Haugenites passed a second bill in April and May of 1928. By this measure a Federal Farm Board would be created with a revolving fund of \$400,000,000, which would be available to agricultural co-operatives to enable them to market their staples more economically. The Board was authorized to loan funds to the co-operatives to enable them to remove surpluses from the American market at a protected price. If a loss occurred it would be paid by an equalization fee levied on the farmers who produced the crop. Again President Coolidge vetoed the bill on the grounds that "it sanctioned price fixing; was an improper delegation of the taxing power; would lead to overproduction and profiteering; and would antagonize overseas agricultural producers and thus invite retaliation."<sup>10</sup>

A second plan, advanced in 1926-1929 and favored by the Grange, was called the Export Debenture Plan. The Government would pay the bounties or debentures to the ex-

---

<sup>9</sup>Richard B. Morris, Encyclopedia of American History (New York: Harpers & Brothers, 1953), p. 334.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 336.

porters and accept them for payment of import duties. The "difference between the domestic and world price would be met from the customs receipts."<sup>11</sup> This plan passed the Senate, but was dropped because of opposition from President Hoover, who planned to veto it.<sup>12</sup>

While the farmers' attempts failed, the Hoover Administration offered the Agricultural Marketing Act in June, 1929. This act "established a Federal Farm Board . . . for promoting the marketing of farm commodities through agricultural co-operatives and stabilization corporations."<sup>13</sup> The Federal Farm Board was given a revolving fund of \$500,000,000 to be used in the "interest of the orderly purchasing, handling, and selling of surpluses" of farm products.<sup>14</sup> The efforts of the Farm Board to support the market through agreements with co-operatives and stabilizing corporations failed "partly because farmers were reluctant to reduce their acreage" and chaotic world conditions would have made almost any plan unworkable.<sup>15</sup>

A third plan devised by the farm interests and favored

---

<sup>11</sup>Morris, Encyclopedia of American History, p. 337.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

by the Farmers' Union was the Domestic Allotment Plan, which was introduced as the Hope-Nordeck Bill in 1932. This plan provided for the "allocation to each farmer of what was called a 'domestic allotment' or percentage of his total output that corresponded roughly to that used in the domestic market."<sup>16</sup> This plan was caught in the "lame-duck" session in 1932; consequently, it was lost in the change of administrations after the election of the Democratic candidate, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The failure of the farm interests to secure favorable legislation and the Farm Board to cope with the disastrous farm situation led farm leaders such as George Peek to turn from the Republican party. When Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Governor of New York, appeared as a Presidential candidate in 1932, they were willing to support his candidacy. Cognizant of the seriousness of the farm problem, Roosevelt assembled farm leaders and economists to assist the formulation of an acceptable farm program. Their ideas were used by Roosevelt in a campaign speech delivered September 14, 1932, at Topeka, Kansas. This address was notable in that it did much to capture the dissatisfied farm vote of the Midwestern farmers for the Democratic Party in the November election.

---

<sup>16</sup>G. W. Forster and Marc C. Laeger, Elements of Agricultural Economics (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 379.

## CHAPTER II

### WALLACE IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Among the leaders called to consult with Roosevelt on the farm program was the son of Henry Cantwell Wallace, Henry Agard Wallace. The father had been the Secretary of Agriculture in the Administrations of Harding and Coolidge. The son, the editor of Wallaces' Farmer, was an active agrarian leader. Wallace's ideas together with those of other farm leaders, had been used to produce the successful Topeka speech. Having been invited to speak at Cornell University, Wallace conferred in August, 1932, with Roosevelt at his Hyde Park home. As the result of these contacts and his obvious qualifications,<sup>1</sup> Wallace was asked to join Roosevelt's Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture.

Wallace under Roosevelt. The experiment in agriculture began with the request of President Roosevelt that Wallace summon fifty farm leaders to a conference to plan farm legislation. From information submitted in the meet-

---

<sup>1</sup>Wallace in addition to serving as editor of Wallaces' Farmer had been active in the farmers' attempt to secure favorable legislation, had developed successfully a hybrid seedcorn, and had served as statistician for Hoover's corn-hog commission in November, 1917. See Russell Lord, The Wallaces of Iowa (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947), pp. 142-152, 197-199.

ings of this group, the Administration drafted a bill, called the Agriculture Adjustment Act. This act, which was delayed in Congress for two months, passed Congress and was signed by the President on May 12, 1933. This bill was the most ambitious agricultural legislation in the history of the country; however, many of its major features were an outgrowth of earlier plans to aid agriculture.

As in the case of earlier but unsuccessful acts, the AAA was designed to restore the purchasing power of the agricultural producers. Richard B. Morris, editor of the Encyclopedia of American History, described the act as follows:

Its chief objects were the elimination of surplus crops of basic commodities through curtailed production and the establishment of parity prices for enumerated basic commodities. . . . The Act incorporated the subsidy principle: in return for voluntarily reducing acreage or crops, farmers were to be granted direct benefit or rental payments. The funds for such payments were to be derived from levies on the processors of specified farm products. The Act established the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA). In 1934 the list of enumerated commodities were extended by the Jones-Connally Farm Relief Act and the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act.<sup>2</sup>

The act gave the Secretary of Agriculture power to make marketing agreements with farmers' associations and middlemen in order to obtain business-like practices and higher farm prices. For the same purpose, the Secretary was given

---

<sup>2</sup>Morris, Encyclopedia of American History, p. 343.



broad powers "to loan money on the security of crops, purchase surplus commodities, and subsidize exports."<sup>3</sup>

To administer the law the act set up the Agricultural Adjustment Administration within the Department of Agriculture. George Peek was selected as the first Administrator. Jerome Frank, a New York judge, was selected as Consumers' Counsel, created to inform the consumers of the Triple A activities. For carrying out the operations in the field, local organizations of farmers and county agents were used. Almost all farm producers who participated in the program belonged to a local committee.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, the national hierarchy was concerned with advisory, planning, and administrative functions of the program for major agricultural projects.

Many factors combined to make the task of the Secretary not an easy one. Wallace was forced to set up a new program amid the conservative-liberal feud within his department and pressures from critical and often self-seeking

---

<sup>3</sup>Oscar Theodore Barck, Jr., and Nelson Manfred Blake, Since 1900 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952), p. 534.

<sup>4</sup>Carl T. Schmidt, formerly in the Department of Agriculture, has written: "Thus, the county committees--containing about 100,000 farmers in all the agricultural counties of the nation--have been called upon to help allocate quotas and allotments, explain details to farmers, obtain their acceptance of proposals, and check their compliance with the various crop programs." See Carl T. Schmidt, American Farmers in the World Crisis (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941), p. 201.

farm interests from without his department. Further difficulty arose from the fact that, as the program went into operation, seed had been planted under the old surplus-producing system.

A particularly serious situation existed in the cotton and hog markets. Under the AAA, Wallace induced "more than a million cotton growers to plow up from 25 to 50 per cent of their acreage in growing cotton."<sup>5</sup> "These farmers were recompensed with rental payments" of cash or with cotton which had been stored under the Federal Farm Board regime.<sup>6</sup>

In the hog market, a huge over-supply existed; Schmidt has written:

Similarly, in order to cut the potential supplies at once, some 6,000,000 pigs and brooding sows were slaughtered. This provided large amounts of pork for relief purposes, and gave corn-hog farmers about \$9,000,000 immediately.<sup>7</sup>

Criticism of the hog program led Wallace to remark, "To hear them talk," . . . "you'd think that pigs were raised for pets."<sup>8</sup> Stuart Chase, writing of the incident, said:

The program was devised . . . at a conference of corn and hog farmers from the midwestern states. The pig

---

<sup>5</sup>Schmidt, American Farmers in the World Crisis, p. 127-128.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 128.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 129.

<sup>8</sup>Henry A. Wallace, Democracy Reborn (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1944), p. 81.

killing had the approval of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, the Corn Belt Meat Producers, and the Central Cooperative Exchange.<sup>9</sup>

The inability to grant all farmers' demands, as well as serious drought conditions, led to further criticism of Wallace. Individualistic farmers,

. . . having tasted now the bread and honey of adjustment payments and a mild inflation, with a resulting marked rise in braced prices, sent delegation upon delegation to Washington demanding that the Department of Agriculture have done with mild tail-twitchings and other gentle gestures of guidance and assume absolute control.<sup>10</sup>

Russell Lord, editing Wallace's Democracy Reborn, related that a "delegation of Five Northwestern Governors came in to demand of Wallace 'cost of production' guarantees, backed by absolutely arbitrary mandates from Washington."<sup>11</sup>

While drought conditions in 1934-35 added to the Secretary's burden, it reduced the acreage more effectively than did the Triple A. Nevertheless, many farmers regarded the drought as a "judgment of God" because of the AAA's curtailment of the productive program.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Stuart Chase, Democracy under Pressure (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1945), p. 99.

<sup>10</sup>Wallace, Democracy Reborn, p. 51.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Russell Lord, The Wallaces of Iowa (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947), p. 378.

Wallace and the AAA program have been attacked because they aided the large farming interests and penalized the small general farmers, sharecroppers, tenant farmers and farm laborers. Efforts to obtain Wallace's aid to alleviate the situation seemed to fail and resulted in a purge of Jerome Frank and others in the Department of Agriculture who tried to help the plight of the misfortunate.<sup>13</sup> Norman Thomas, the perennial socialist candidate for President, tried to interest Wallace in the betterment of sharecroppers of the South on the basis of his firsthand investigation and failed.<sup>14</sup> Charges have been made that Wallace represented the farmer of the "four-hundred-acre-class" rather than the average farmer.<sup>15</sup>

Chief complaints against the AAA came from the consumers, who bore the burden of the increased prices, and the processors who paid the tax to implement the crop reduction program. The dissatisfaction led to the Supreme Court case United States v. Butler. By a decision of six to three, the tax was held to be unconstitutional. The Court found that the "tax plays an indispensable part in the plan of regula-

---

<sup>13</sup>Baldwin, Recent American History, pp. 243-244.

<sup>14</sup>Dwight MacDonald, Henry Wallace; The Man and the Myth (New York: The Vanguard Press, Inc., 1947), pp. 50-51.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

tion," that a tax "has never been thought to connote the expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another," and "it is a statutory plan to regulate and control agricultural production, a matter beyond the powers delegated to the federal government."<sup>16</sup> Moreover, the Court said:

The farmer, of course, may refuse to comply, but the price of such refusal is the loss of benefits. The amount offered is intended to be sufficient to exert pressure on him to agree to the proposed regulation. The power to confer or withhold unlimited benefits is the power to coerce or destroy. . . .<sup>17</sup>

The decision destroyed the production control efforts of the AAA; however, the marketing provisions, commodity loans and other features of the law remained in operation.

Since the decision was not wholly unexpected, Wallace quickly assembled a group of farm leaders to consider the new farm situation; from this meeting came the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936. This act,

. . . enabled the continued restriction of agricultural output, not by contracts with farmers for the control of crop production, but by benefit payments to growers who practiced soil conservation in cooperation with the government program.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Lawrence B. Evans, Cases on American Law (Chicago: Callaghan and Company, 1952), pp. 137, 138, 139.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 140.

<sup>18</sup>Morris, Encyclopedia of American History, p. 353.

Payments were made from the Government Treasury and went to tenants and sharecroppers as well as owners. This law failed to solve the problem of surplus crops, because most crops of 1937 were larger than in any previous year. Large surpluses accumulated in the face of economic recession.

To meet this problem, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was passed. This act utilized an idea that Wallace had read from "a thesis by a Chinese student at Columbia on 'The Economic Principles of Confucius.'"<sup>19</sup> So influenced, Wallace advocated that an ever-normal granary be inaugurated, by which in times of plenty, surplus farm products would be bought and stored to be sold in times of scarcity. The new act,

(1) empowered the Secretary of Agriculture to fix a marketing quota whenever it was determined that a surplus of any export farm commodity . . . threatened the price level; (2) authorized acreage allotments to each grower after two-thirds of the farmers had by referendum expressed their approval of the marketing quota; (3) incorporated the 'parity payment' principle and established the 'ever-normal granary' arrangement by the following means: the Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to make loans to farmers on their surplus crops at a level slightly below 'parity' (a price based on the Aug. 1909-July 1914 level of farm purchasing power).<sup>20</sup>

If surplus crops occurred, they were:

. . . to be stored under government auspices, and the

---

<sup>19</sup>MacDonald, Henry Wallace; The Man and the Myth, p. 61.

<sup>20</sup>Morris, Encyclopedia of History, pp. 357-58.

farmer was to repay the loan and market the surplus during crop failure years when the price was at 'parity' or above. Since such disposal of surpluses would prevent the market price from rising too high above 'parity,' this arrangement stabilized agricultural prices and stored surplus crops without loss to individual farmer income.<sup>21</sup>

Basil Rauch, a historian of the New Deal, pointed out that the,

. . . parity-price and ever-normal granary plan met with wide approval during the short period of trial before the Second World War, and, after the War created extreme need for abundant crops, the system continued to operate, but as a powerful instrument against inflation of farm and food prices, successful to the extent that Congress resisted demands of farmers to raise the parity price levels.<sup>22</sup>

Notwithstanding, the plan was attacked both because of large sums of government money tied up in stored surplus crops and the large storage space required. As a partial remedy, Wallace was able, in August, 1938, to announce a plan for subsidizing the export of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat at an expected loss of \$25,000,000. In 1939, Wallace was able to trade "600,000 bales of cotton for 90,000 tons of rubber-- enough to make 18,000,000 tires; and this rubber was added to the nation's stockpile."<sup>23</sup> The rubber thus stockpiled became a valuable asset in wartime.

---

<sup>21</sup>Morris, Encyclopedia of History, p. 358.

<sup>22</sup>Basil Rauch, The History of the New Deal 1933-1938 (New York: Creative Press, Inc., 1944), p. 304.

<sup>23</sup>Wallace, Democracy Reborn, p. 159.

The outbreak of war in 1939, with its increased demands for farm products, resolved the nation's surplus program for a temporary period. Wallace's insistence on an "ever-normal granary" proved valuable foresight and increased his political prestige.

The serious world situation in 1940 caused America to break a strongly entrenched precedent against a third term for a President. Wallace was among the first members of the Cabinet to advocate a third term for Roosevelt. Another member, Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, wrote:

The third term was an immediate consequence of Hitler's conquest of France and the specter of Britain alone standing between the conqueror and ourselves. Our dangerous position induced President Roosevelt to run for a third time.<sup>24</sup>

There has been much conjecture as to why Roosevelt insisted upon Wallace as his teammate in 1940. Hull has related that Roosevelt asked him to become the candidate for President in 1940 and suggested that Hull "could probably take Wallace or some person in the farm belt as Vice President and win."<sup>25</sup> Failing to secure Hull as the Presidential candidate, Roosevelt attempted to get him to run as Vice-President. When Hull refused again, Roosevelt remarked,

---

<sup>24</sup>Cordell Hull, The Memoirs of Cordell Hull (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948), I, p. 855.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 859.



"If you don't take it, I'll have to get Henry Wallace to run."<sup>26</sup>

In the July convention held in Chicago, President Roosevelt was easily a winning nominee; however, the suggestion of steam-roller tactics brought reaction against Wallace as candidate for the Vice-Presidential nomination, although he was selected on the first ballot. The reaction did prevent Wallace from making his acceptance address at the convention.

Various comments became available on the selection of Wallace. That Wallace was persona non grata to many of Roosevelt's immediate followers was indicated by Secretary Ickes of the Department of Interior, who wrote: "But, frankly, I do not think that a man who cannot run his own department is qualified to run the Government of the United States."<sup>27</sup> Mrs. Roosevelt commented on the Wallace selection: "He [Roosevelt] evidently felt at that time that Wallace could be trusted to carry out our policies on foreign affairs if by chance he, Wallace, found himself hurled into the presidency."<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Hull, The Memoirs of Cordell Hull, p. 861.

<sup>27</sup>Harold L. Ickes, The Lowering Clouds, 1939-1941, Volume III of The Secret Diary of Harold L. Ickes (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), p. 263.

<sup>28</sup>Eleanor Roosevelt, This I Remember (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1945), p. 216.

Edward J. Flynn, Democratic Committeeman of New York, gave his version of Roosevelt's choice:

He [Wallace] impressed me as being a loyal supporter of the President and of the things for which the President stood. He had been a good administrator of the Department of Agriculture and had brought to the President a certain strength among the farmers. This was important in 1940 because, by that time, the President was beginning to lose his popularity in the country districts.<sup>29</sup>

Russell Lord, biographer of the Wallaces, felt that the pressure for the choice of Wallace came from the desire to get a candidate who opposed appeasement:

But the main task the vice-presidential candidate faced in the Middle West during that campaign of 1940 [wrote Lord] was not to appease people who instinctively had disliked his farm program, even while they participated in it voluntarily and received its benefit payments with some pleasure. His main task was to oppose a push there spreading, with a throng of advocates increasingly active--a pro-German push for appeasing Hitler. The President understood that; and Wallace understood it well before the nominees had been determined and the 1940 campaign launched. With this much decided, the detailed approach in opening principal campaign speeches was left largely to Wallace, who made them.<sup>30</sup>

Robert Bendiner, columnist of the Nation, thought Roosevelt was "so clearly in demand that he was able to dictate terms, and the choice of Wallace was a sign that victory

---

<sup>29</sup>Edward J. Flynn, You're the Boss (New York: The Houghton Mifflin Company, 1945), p. 157.

<sup>30</sup>Lord, The Wallaces of Iowa, p. 475.

next November was to mean not just a triumph for the Democratic Party; it was to mean an extension of the New Deal."<sup>31</sup>

Wallace opened the 1940 campaign with his belated acceptance address, made at Des Moines, Iowa, in which he used the slogan, "Whether it knows it or not, the Republican Party is the party of appeasement," which he repeated throughout the campaign.<sup>32</sup> Wallace's tour covered the electorate west of the path of the Roosevelt tour.<sup>33</sup> "His westward trail followed that of Wendell Willkie from Indianapolis to Kansas City, then down to New Mexico, and up through California to the Northwest."<sup>34</sup> Wallace spoke to crowds of varying sizes; sometimes he spoke amid boos and hisses. Above all, his speaking tour was overshadowed by President Roosevelt's tour.

The election of 1940 continued the Roosevelt Administration; while Wallace, contrary to precedent played a surprisingly active role as Vice-President of the United States.

---

<sup>31</sup>Robert Bendiner, "It Had To Be Roosevelt," The Nation, XXXII (July 27, 1940), 67.

<sup>32</sup>Lord, The Wallaces of Iowa, p. 480.

<sup>33</sup>Because of the serious world condition, F. D. R. made speeches in cities not too far from Washington, such as: Philadelphia, New York City, New Haven, Meriden, Hartford, Worcester, Boston, Brooklyn, and Cleveland. See Robert E. Sherwood, Roosevelt and Hopkins (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), Chap. VI, pp. 169-201.

<sup>34</sup>Lord, op. cit., p. 482.

In December, 1940, Wallace represented President Roosevelt as Ambassador Extraordinary at the inauguration of the Mexican President-elect Gamacho. His addresses in Spanish augmented good feeling between the two countries. His presence at the ceremony seemed to give an American blessing to the president who was opposed to Hitler and willing to grant the United States naval and air bases in Mexican cities. Mexicans expressed their appreciation by using the cornstalk, a symbol of Wallace's success with hybrid corn, to decorate bridges and highways.

Against a background of tension in Europe, many Americans, including Wallace, had become alarmed with the business-as-usual-policy on the part of many of their fellow Americans. An example of this attitude might be found in Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and Administrator of the Federal Loan Agency. "Thoroughly imbued with the banker's point of view, Jones examined all projects as business investments and refused to be swayed by their social aspects."<sup>35</sup>

The "business-as-usual policy" led President Roosevelt to establish the Economic Defense Board, giving it the, . . . responsibility for the development and coordination of 'policies, plans, and programs designed to protect and strengthen the international economic

---

<sup>35</sup>Baldwin, Recent American History, p. 225.

relations of the United States in the interests of national defense.<sup>36</sup>

Henry Wallace was appointed chairman of the new board and continued in that capacity when the board expanded to become the Board of Economic Welfare. In the pursuance of his duties as Chairman of these boards, Wallace, in stockpiling scarce raw materials, aroused the opposition of Jesse Jones and Cordell Hull.

Hull objected to the powers given Wallace under an Executive Order of April 13, 1942, by which Wallace had been given "sweeping authority to deal directly with foreign Governments and to send representatives abroad for this purpose, thus virtually creating a second State Department."<sup>37</sup> Hull believed that it "was manifestly impossible to have representatives of various American agencies running about the world responsible only to their agencies in Washington many thousands of miles away."<sup>38</sup> At Hull's insistence that the new agencies be responsible to American ambassadors and ministers, led to a May 20th "Clarification and Interpretation" of the April 13th order. President Roosevelt made a statement to the press "that there was no question but that

---

<sup>36</sup>Elliott Roosevelt, F. D. R. and His Personal Letters 1928-1945 (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1950), IV, p. 1182.

<sup>37</sup>Hull, The Memoirs of Cordell Hull, II, p. 1154.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 1156.

the State Department was in charge of the foreign affairs of the United States."<sup>39</sup>

Wallace encountered with disastrous results another formidable opponent in Jesse Jones. The BEW had been created by executive order, but depended upon funds appropriated by Congress to carry on its program. Jones sought through his popularity with Congress to gain control of the BEW's expenditures. Senator McKellar, Tennessee, introduced such an amendment to the appropriation bill to provide funds for the BEW. Violating a Presidential edict of August 21, 1942, against governmental agencies airing their differences publicly, Wallace charged Jones with "timid, business-as-usual procedures" and downright failure to get his job done, with practising "hamstringing bureaucracy and backdoor complaining."<sup>40</sup>

The New Republic commented on the situation: -

Critical shortages of vital commodities could have been prevented if Jesse Jones had believed that this was to be a long war, if he had chosen to take his directions from the President and the President's agents, rather than from his own hunches about an early negotiated peace.<sup>41</sup>

In The New Republic, Wallace "blamed Jones for throwing

---

<sup>39</sup>Hull, The Memoirs of Cordell Hull, II, p. 1157.

<sup>40</sup>The New Republic, CIX (July 12, 1943), 43.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

obstacles in the way of our exercise of the powers given us to carry out our wartime assignments."<sup>42</sup>

In this category he cited quinine and quartz crystals, quinine to relieve our fever-stricken troops in the South Pacific and other theatres of this global war, quartz crystals to make possible radio installations in our airplanes, tanks and submarines. . . . A shortage of quinine due to Jesse Jones's unwillingness to risk \$125,000 and a shortage of quartz crystals due to Jones's reliance on the business-as-usual methods of a commission-merchant who supplied inferior crystals, useless for radio, are proving difficult to explain to our armed forces and their families and friends.<sup>43</sup>

Jones struck back, terming the criticism hysterical, charging "that the Vice-President's charge was filled 'with malice and misstatements.'"<sup>44</sup> Efforts of President Roosevelt to settle the matter privately failed; on July 16, 1943, he abolished the BEW, creating in its place the Office of Economic Warfare and placing it under the leadership of Leo T. Crowley, a personal friend of Jones. Jones relieved of his RFC duties under the Federal Loan Agency, chose to regard it as a personal triumph because of his friendship for Crowley, the new appointee.

Press comments on the affair seemed to foreshadow political events to come. The New Republic said:

---

<sup>42</sup>The New Republic, CIX (July 12, 1943), 43.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., pp. 43-44.

<sup>44</sup>The New York Times, July 18, 1943.

In the background is the ugly fact that the conservatives, who have long and steadily been gaining power in Washington, have formed a cabal to prevent the renomination of Mr. Wallace if the President runs for a fourth term.<sup>45</sup>

The New York Times commented as follows:

Perhaps the most important result of the President's action will be its effect on the political career of the Vice-President. Mr. Wallace stands in high favor with the progressives and New Dealers in the Administration. He has been spoken of as candidate for re-election if the President runs for a fourth term in 1944, a candidate for the Presidency if Mr. Roosevelt withdraws. The President's slap, many thought, gave his sponsors' hopes a blow from which recovery will be very difficult.<sup>46</sup>

Wallace's only comment was: "In wartime no one should question the over-all wisdom of the Commander in Chief."<sup>47</sup>

In his controversy with Jones, Wallace fell in Presidential favor. Robert Sherwood, a co-worker and biographer of Roosevelt, wrote: "Those who were around the White House at the time of this disagreeable incident felt there was now no chance that Roosevelt would support Wallace at the Democratic Convention in 1944."<sup>48</sup> Many Southern leaders were pro-Jones and anti-Wallace. Samuel Rosenman, a friend and advisor of Roosevelt, wrote:

---

<sup>45</sup>The New Republic, CIX (July 26, 1943), 94.

<sup>46</sup>The New York Times, July 18, 1943.

<sup>47</sup>Lord, The Wallaces of Iowa, p. 513.

<sup>48</sup>Robert E. Sherwood, Roosevelt and Hopkins (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), p. 741.



Many of his progressive and well meaning speeches about improving the standards of living in backward areas of the world have been so unfortunately phrased that they were distorted by the isolationist press into a statement of readiness to embark on crack-brained and unrealistic projects of worldwide charity handouts.<sup>49</sup>

The Democratic National Chairman, Robert Hannegan, brought in reports that conservatives in all parts of the country would refuse to support Wallace. As a result, the "President became convinced that in order to nominate Wallace as Vice-President for a second term he would have to go through the same 'knock-down and drag-out fight' that he did in 1940," wrote Rosenman.<sup>50</sup> This the President did not want to do.<sup>51</sup>

As the political outlook for the Vice-President darkened, Roosevelt sent Wallace on a mission to Asia. The Kuomintang-Communist struggle for China was proving embarrassing to the Allied friendship with Russia. Roosevelt, desiring to find a solution for the difficulty, requested Wallace to go in the spring of 1944 to China with the hope of "consolidating the Chinese war effort against Japan."<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup>Samuel I. Rosenman, Working with Roosevelt (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), pp. 438-39.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 439.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid.

<sup>52</sup>United States State Department, United States Relations with China (Washington: The Government Printing Office, 1949), p. 55.

Wallace chose to enter China via Siberia and Outer Mongolia, where he was entertained by the Russians. A study of Russian language enabled Wallace to speak to them in their native tongue and bring them the message that "the wartime coalition would grow and strengthen in a concerted program for world peace," and "if the United States and the U.S.S.R. demand the enforcement of peace, no nation in the world today will seriously dare to challenge them."<sup>53</sup> This statement, conveyed to Stalin by the American Ambassador Harriman, appeared in Pravda on June, 28, 1944.<sup>54</sup> The message seemed significant of the great admiration Wallace developed for Russian culture and methods while in Eastern Asia.

Continuing his mission to China, Wallace held conversations with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the President of the Nationalist Chinese Government. The Wallace party brought the message to Chiang that,

Stalin had agreed with Ambassador Harriman in Moscow that support of the Generalissimo was desirable during the prosecution of the war and expressed keen interest in a settlement between the Kuomintang and the Communists. . . .<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup>Henry A. Wallace and Andrew J. Steiger, Soviet Asia Mission (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock Publishers, 1946), pp. 150-51.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 149.

<sup>55</sup>U. S. State Department, United States Relations with China, p. 56.

On June 22, 1944, Chiang accused the Communists of desiring the "breakdown of Chinese resistance against Japan" to enhance their own position.<sup>56</sup> Criticizing the idea they were nothing more than agrarian democrats, he charged "that they were more communistic than the Russians."<sup>57</sup> Chiang indicated at the same time that he was willing to settle with the Communists providing they agreed "to support the Government;" on the other hand, if the United States refused the Communists' support, he felt that they would be more co-operative.<sup>58</sup>

Chiang had refused permission to American military observer missions to visit the Communist stronghold of Yen-an; however, during the Wallace mission, Chiang reversed his position and agreed to the mission. As Wallace prepared to return to the United States, Chiang sent a message to be presented to President Roosevelt saying:

If the United States can bring about better relations between the U.S.S.R. and China, and can bring about a meeting between Chinese and Soviet representatives, President Chiang would very much welcome such friendly assistance; [moreover,] . . . he would welcome the assistance of the President in the settlement of the Communist problem, even though it was an internal one.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>U. S. State Department, United States Relations with China, p. 56.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 57.

Wallace returned to Seattle where he gave an address extolling Chinese tenacity and Russian achievement. This address, which Harold Young, his political advisor, toned down, increased the belief that Wallace was pro-Russian. In the address, Wallace stated that "China and the U.S.S.R. [would] take the necessary steps to insure continuing peace and to promote cultural and commercial exchanges among the nations of the Pacific to the benefit of all."<sup>60</sup>

So concerned was he with the problems of China and the Soviet, Wallace failed to consider his own interests in the 1944 political campaign. Political advisors found him willing to talk about his Soviet-Asia mission but not about his chances for renomination as Vice-Presidential candidate. Young had brought a warning from Washington that the "inside gang" of the White House had worked against Wallace as the running mate of Roosevelt in the fourth campaign. Subsequently, Rosenman was selected to meet Wallace and tell him that he no longer had White House support for the Vice-Presidential nomination in 1944.<sup>61</sup> At a Washington meeting of Wallace, Rosenman, and Ickes, Wallace agreed not to run

---

<sup>60</sup>The New York Times, July 10, 1944.

<sup>61</sup>Rosenman, Working with Roosevelt, p. 441.

unless President Roosevelt wanted him.<sup>62</sup> It was thought that on the occasion of Wallace's presenting to Roosevelt the report of his Soviet-Asia mission that he was promised a place in the Cabinet if he withdrew gracefully.<sup>63</sup>

Regardless of what the "inside gang" and many political leaders thought, Wallace enjoyed a much stronger position in 1944 than he had in 1940. His following was composed of old New Dealers, the CIO, PAC, Negro leaders, and left-wing publicists. Additional support came to him from the Communist Daily Worker. Organized labor, headed by Sidney Hillman, had been drawn to Wallace largely by an address entitled "The Price of Free World Victory," delivered in 1942. His address had prophesied that "the century which will come out of this war--can be and must be the century of the common man."<sup>64</sup> Rosenman admitted that Wallace had the strong backing of organized labor and many liberal groups.<sup>65</sup> Harold Young estimated that he would have the support of some 290 delegates in the convention. The Gallup poll, which

---

<sup>62</sup>In retrospect, Wallace credits Ed Pauley, Bob Hannegan, and Ed Flynn as working against him and preventing his nomination in 1944. See U.S. News and World Report, XL (April 6, 1956), pp. 86-89.

<sup>63</sup>Rosenman, Working with Roosevelt, p. 443.

<sup>64</sup>Henry A. Wallace, The Century of the Common Man (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1943), pp. 19-20.

<sup>65</sup>Rosenman, op. cit., p. 443.

attempted to depict political strength by scientific methods, estimated that Wallace was the first choice of some sixty-five per cent of the Democratic voters.

In the Democratic Convention, held in Chicago, July 19, 1944, Senator Kerr, Oklahoma, nominated Roosevelt as candidate for President. It was seconded by Wallace. Judge H. Davis, Iowa, put Wallace's name in nomination as candidate for Vice-President. This was seconded by Mrs. Emma Guffey, Pennsylvania; Claude Pepper, Florida; Governor Ellis Arnall, Georgia; Richard Frankstein, Michigan; et al. Although Wallace led on the first ballot for Vice-Presidency, Senator Harry S. Truman, Missouri, was nominated on the second ballot. The Truman selection seemed a victory for the conservative Democratic leaders; besides, it represented a compromise between Southern and Northern factions by placing a man from a border state in succession to the Presidency in the advent of the death of FDR. Wallace, despite his failure to receive the nomination in the convention, campaigned for the nominees. That fact, coupled with his gracious acceptance of his earlier dismissal from the BEW, led the President to give Wallace his choice of Cabinet positions--apart from the post of Secretary of State.

Wallace elected to choose the Department of Commerce. His choice was said to be based "on a belief that he might be able to use some Government funds for the benefit of the

small business man, instead of having money go chiefly to large enterprises."<sup>66</sup> His choice, also, presented a difficulty, since the post was held by Jesse Jones; it was necessary for Roosevelt to ask him to resign.

After Wallace received the nomination for the post of Secretary of Commerce, the problem of the confirmation was made difficult by the friends of Jones in the Senate. Confirmation came for Wallace only after the Senate had separated the powers of the RFC from the Department of Commerce.

Confirmation of Wallace was followed by a national tragedy because President Roosevelt died the next month. It would seem fate had been unkind to Wallace, who, when Roosevelt died, missed the Presidency by a little over a month, and perhaps by the grace of Jesse Jones.

Wallace under Truman. Wallace in the Cabinet of Mr. Truman was a lonely New Deal figure as the Roosevelt Cabinet members one by one left their posts to be replaced by more conservative members. As the old Cabinet members departed from the scene, the country turned from the path of friendly relations with the Soviet nation. This trend became the chief concern of Wallace. On many occasions, he talked with President Truman, trying to counteract the drift and stress-

---

<sup>66</sup>The New York Times, January 4, 1945.

ing that co-operation with the Soviet nation was not impossible.

On September 21, 1945, President Truman decided to devote the Cabinet meeting to the problem of atomic energy. At the meeting, Wallace had been accused of taking the position of favoring giving the atomic bomb secret to the Soviet.<sup>67</sup> President Truman has denied in his Memoirs that Wallace did take such a position.<sup>68</sup>

In December, 1945, James Byrnes, Secretary of State, was preparing to leave for the Moscow meeting of the Foreign Ministers. Before his departure, he met with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Atomic Energy Committee, and explained that he would propose at the conference: (1) "an exchange of atom scientists and scientific information with Russia, . . ." and (2) "that Russia join us in setting up an Atomic Commission under the United Nations Organization . . ."<sup>69</sup> Vandenberg, ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has written that the committees regarded the statements with alarm as they were

---

<sup>67</sup>Walter Millis and E. S. Duffield, The Forrestal Diaries (New York: The Viking Press, 1951), p. 95.

<sup>68</sup>Harry S. Truman, Year of Decisions (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1955), p. 529.

<sup>69</sup>Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr., and Joe Morris, The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg (Boston: The Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952), p. 228.



"opposed to giving any of the atomic secrets away unless and until the Soviets [were] prepared to be 'policed' by the UNO in respect to this prohibition."<sup>70</sup>

President Truman appointed Vandenberg to attend the General Assembly meeting of the United Nations in London on January 10, 1946. During the meeting, Soviet behavior led Vandenberg to a conviction that America must choose a new firm philosophy to meet the post-war challenge.<sup>71</sup> Secretary Byrnes, through his dealing with the Soviet, had reached the same position independently.<sup>72</sup> These convictions led men in authority to a decided departure from the Wallace policy of friendly co-operation with the Soviet.

The Atomic bomb had brought many new problems to the Administration, among which, was the problem of who should control the bomb. Senator Brien McMahon, Connecticut, introduced a bill providing for civilian control by a five member board, serving terms of five years. The board was to have complete control over every phase of atomic research; production, engineering, and application. In the subsequent debate on the bill an intense struggle developed between

---

<sup>70</sup>Vandenberg, Jr., and Morris, The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg, p. 228.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 245.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 251.

factions who desired army control, scientist, or civilian control. Vandenberg introduced an amendment that authorized "a military liaison committee" because he believed "in the present state of world affairs the Army and the Navy" should not be excluded from "consultation when they deem the national security to be involved."<sup>73</sup> Wallace, who supported civilian control of the atom bomb, attached the Vandenberg amendment, in the following manner:

Opening a Commerce Department atomic energy exhibit, Wallace according to Vandenberg angrily declared that the Vandenberg provision carried the possibility of delivering the nation into the hands of 'military fascism.' 'I hope that, when the American people realize its significance, they will rise up in their wrath and let the Senate know what the action means.'<sup>74</sup>

Although many other prominent figures endorsed Senator Vandenberg's position, he was attacked severely.<sup>75</sup> The matter was finally resolved by limiting the military liaison committee's authority to the military use of the bomb.

Resignation from the Cabinet. The events which led to the resignation of Wallace from the Cabinet seemed to grow out of his conflict with Secretary Byrnes. Senator Vandenberg related in his diary April 28, 1946, a talk that he had

---

<sup>73</sup>Vandenberg, Jr., and Morris, The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg, p. 256.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 255.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

had with Byrnes while attending the Longchamps races in Paris. In his efforts to negotiate an operational contract with Iceland for the American built air base, Byrnes had been attacked by Wallace and Pepper, Senator from Florida, who had charged the foreign policy was too severe with the Soviets. Wallace and Pepper's speeches appeared during the Iceland election and prevented the consumation of the contract. At the next Cabinet meeting, Byrnes protested against being "'shot in the back' by his own colleagues."<sup>76</sup>

The advocates of a firmer policy with the Soviet received an impetus from the visit of Winston Churchill to the United States. On March 5, 1946, he gave an address at the Westminster College at Fulton, Missouri. In the address, "Alliance of English-Speaking People," Churchill reflected the idea that "our supreme task and duty is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors and miseries of another war," and advocated that, "the United Nations Organizations must immediately begin to be equipped with an international armed force."<sup>77</sup> Churchill stated that "it would be criminal madness to cast it [the atomic bomb] adrift in

---

<sup>76</sup>Vandenberg, Jr., and Morris, The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg, p. 266.

<sup>77</sup>Winston Churchill, "Alliance of English Speaking People," Vital Speeches, XII (March 15, 1946), 329.

this still agitated and un-united world."<sup>78</sup> Churchill called for "fraternal association" based upon (1) "intimate relationship between our military advisers," and (2) "the continuance of the present facilities for mutual security by joint use of all naval and air-force bases in the possession of either country all over the world."<sup>79</sup> Finally, Churchill said:

If we adhere faithfully to the charter of the United Nations and walk forward in sedate and sober strength, seeking no one's land or treasure or seeking to lay no arbitrary control on the thoughts of men, if all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the highroads of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time but for a century to come.<sup>80</sup>

Senator Pepper and Wallace attacked the speech on the grounds that no one should "gang up" on the Soviet, nor should the United States become the "guarantor of British imperialism."<sup>81</sup> Pepper wished further to destroy, in the best interests of peace, every atomic bomb that the United States had stockpiled.

In April, 1946, the Foreign Ministers met in Paris

---

<sup>78</sup>Churchill, Vital Speeches, XII, 330.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., p. 332.

<sup>81</sup>Walter Millis, The Forrestal Diaries (New York: The Viking Press, 1951), p. 154.

to consider peace treaties with the Axis satellites. As the conference progressed, the sentiment for a get-firm-with-Russia policy increased. Wallace became alarmed about the situation and on July 23, 1946, wrote a letter to President Truman. Wallace has related that "the high point of this letter was my urging that we develop, in co-operation with Russia, practical plans for the two nations to live in the same world without danger of eventual atomic bomb warfare."<sup>82</sup> This July 23 letter was kept at the White House, and at the time of the subsequent Madison Square Garden controversy, it was given to the press.

Wallace was asked to address a meeting to be held under the auspices of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the Political Action Committee at Madison Square Garden on September 12, 1946. Wallace wrote his speech and submitted it to the White House for clearance. At a press conference held earlier in the day of the scheduled address, Truman told the reporters "that he had read the entire speech and approved all of it."<sup>83</sup> The address, "The Way to Peace," presented personal convictions of Wallace which were contradictory to the policies being pursued by Byrnes,

---

<sup>82</sup>Henry A. Wallace, Toward World Peace (Reynal and Hitchcock, 1948), p. 9.

<sup>83</sup>Tris Coffin, Missouri Compromise (Boston: Brown and Company, 1947), p. 287.

Vandenberg, and Connally at Paris.<sup>84</sup> This difference in opinion was unfortunate because of Wallace's position in the Cabinet.

Secretary Byrnes had hoped for unified support of our foreign policy, particularly during the Paris Conference. With the Wallace address, the storm broke and was played up by the press at home and abroad. Truman's statement, given on the same day, that the address was made, was extremely damaging. Byrnes and our representatives, as a result, were asked by foreign ministers if they correctly represented American policy. Vandenberg issued the following statement:

The authority of American foreign policy is dependent upon the degree of American unity behind it. Rightly or wrongly, Paris is doubtful of this unity this morning.

---

<sup>84</sup>On September 22, 1946, The New York Times discussed the controversy between the position of Wallace and Byrnes. Wallace believed that the United States (1) should not pursue a harsh policy toward Russia; (2) should not interfere in the "political affairs of Eastern Europe;" (3) should not allow the "British imperial interests" to "control American foreign policy;" (4) should not continue "efforts to secure air bases spread over half the globe" and huge "post-war expenditures for armaments;" and (5) should not support the Baruch plan of control of the atomic bomb. On the other hand, Mr. Byrnes (1) had "resisted Russian demands in nearly every quarter of the globe;" (2) had "fought for a greater measure of a political democracy in the Balkans;" (3) had been "coincidental with British foreign policy in most spheres where conflict had arisen with the Russians;" (4) had been "unwilling to risk unilateral disarmament or weakening of American defenses in the present situation;" and (5) had been with the State Department "solidly behind the Baruch plan which Mr. Wallace has been attacking."

. . . Although differing on some points, most Republicans have been glad to join most Democrats, thus presenting a united American front to the world. This is the only road to organized peace and collective security. Those who leave this road jeopardize the very objective they profess to embrace.

. . . . .

But the situation equally requires unity within the Administration itself. We can only cooperate with one Secretary of State at a time.<sup>85</sup>

To add to the difficulties of the situation, Wallace's July letter was given to the press and the "reports persisted that Wallace had told Democrats they had been 'sucked in' on an anti-Russian Republican policy through Vandenberg's influence," were circulated.<sup>86</sup>

On Saturday, President Truman gave the following statement to the press:

There has been a natural misunderstanding regarding the answer I made to a question asked at the press conference on Thursday.<sup>87</sup> The question was answered extemporaneously and my answer did not convey the thought that I intended it to convey. It was my intention to express the thought that I approved the right of the Secretary of Commerce to deliver the speech. I did not intend to indicate that I approved the speech as constituting a statement of the foreign policy of this country.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup>Vandenberg, Jr., and Morris, The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg, pp. 300-01.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., p. 301.

<sup>87</sup>Coffin reported that President Truman said (September 12, 1946) cheerfully that he had read the entire speech (which Truman denied in his Memoirs) and approved of all of it.

<sup>88</sup>Coffin, Missouri Compromise, pp. 288-89.

This would seem to be a little lame, because Russell Lord records that Wallace and Truman had worked with two separate copies of the address simultaneously when the matter had been discussed previous to the White House clearing.

Pressure began mounting and Byrnes, supported by Connally and Vandenberg, held a teletype conference with Truman from Paris. Byrnes demanded that Wallace be kept quiet or he would be forced to resign as Secretary of State. In a conference held Wednesday, September 18, 1946, between Truman and Wallace, the latter cheerfully gave his promise to remain quiet during the Conference. The next day, Byrnes, talking with Truman by teletype, indicated that he felt that Wallace would continue his criticism, and he [Byrnes] felt that the important thing was to try and restore confidence in the Administration's foreign policy.<sup>89</sup>

On September 20, 1946, the President telephoned Wallace and asked for his resignation. Tris Coffin in his Missouri Compromise reported the incident as follows:

Henry Wallace was happily talking to his assistants about the mail flooding his office from all over the nation. He picked up the phone, and waited for the President's voice. The conversation lasted two minutes. Mr. Truman said he was sorry, but he would have to ask for the Secretary's resignation.

The assistant noticed the surprised look on Wallace's

---

<sup>89</sup>James F. Byrnes, Speaking Frankly (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), pp. 241-42.



face. He replied, 'If that is your decision, Mr. President, I will be glad to abide by it. Peace is more important than any one person.'<sup>90</sup>

The same day, Friday, September 20, 1946, at his press conference, Truman read the following statement on foreign policy:

The foreign policy of this country is the most important question confronting us today. Our responsibility for obtaining a just and lasting peace extends not only to the people of this country but to the nations of the world.

The people of the United States may disagree freely and publicly on any question, including that of foreign policy, but the Government of the United States must stand as a unit in its relation with the rest of the world.

I have today asked Mr. Wallace to resign from the Cabinet.<sup>91</sup>

The resignation became an actuality. After thirteen years of public service, Wallace became a private citizen, who might be critical of an office-holder. As Secretary of Agriculture, he had inaugurated a new program; as Vice-President, he had accomplished missions of state; as Secretary of Commerce, he became a misfit New Dealer under changed leadership. Soon, he was given an opportunity for a new type of liberal leadership as editor of The New Republic.

---

<sup>90</sup>Coffin, Missouri Compromise, p. 290.

<sup>91</sup>Raymond Dennett and Robert K. Turner, Documents on American Foreign Relations, Vol. VIII, July 1, 1945-December 31, 1946 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948), p. 66.

CHAPTER III

WALLACE, THE NEW REPUBLIC EDITOR

The dismissal and resignation of Wallace as Secretary of Commerce had brought him some "6,700 letters from veterans, ministers, businessmen, and other citizens promising their support and urging him to continue his talks for world peace."<sup>1</sup> This opportunity came by means of an offer to become editor of The New Republic, a liberal publication, whose influence greatly exceeded its circulation. The offer was accepted in October, 1946; he assumed the position in December of the same year. Commenting on his acceptance, Wallace stated:

I would not accept this platform if I did not have the assurance that every effort will be made to get The New Republic read by workers, small businessmen and farmers all over the United States. I want [The New Republic] to be the window on the future. I want it to be 'must' reading by liberals all over the world. I want it to be so simple that high school students can understand it and so sound that doctors of philosophy respect it. I want it to lead to action, to effective political action in terms of progressive Congressmen elected who will serve the interests of all the people regardless of special pressure groups. Education and sound analysis--yes. But always in terms of action.<sup>2</sup>

The New York Times commented on the new editor:

There was every reason why Mr. Wallace, with his

---

<sup>1</sup>The New Republic, CXV (October 7, 1946), 428.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., (November 11, 1946), 637.

definite disagreement with our present foreign policy, should not remain in the Truman Cabinet. There are just as good reasons why he should express himself fully, freely and regularly now that he is outside the cabinet. Discussion and debate of this sort are of the essence of our democracy. . . . We wish him a successful editorship.<sup>3</sup>

The critic of American foreign policy. Transformed into a private citizen, Wallace continued the criticism against governmental policies. Charges against the Administration were extended in the form of attacks made against the Baruch Plan, presented on June 14, 1946, to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission by Bernard Baruch, the United States delegate to the Commission.<sup>4</sup> The aforementioned July letter of Wallace to Truman (see pages 37, 39), published in September, 1946, made the following attack:

There is however, a fatal defect in the Moscow statement, in the Acheson report, and in the American plan recently presented to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. That defect is the scheme, as it is generally understood, of arriving at international agreements by 'easy stages,' of requiring other nations

---

<sup>3</sup>The New Republic, CXV (October 28, 1946), 533.

<sup>4</sup>Baruch had submitted a plan for control of atomic energy to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. The plan called for setting up an Atomic Development Authority to control all phases of the development and use of atomic energy. Once an adequate control system was set up then the bomb would be renounced as a weapon. Punishment for violators would be provided with no veto to protect them. The plan provided for a control plan to come into effect, through successive stages. As control would be established, the United States would reveal more information on atomic energy production with each successive stage. See Lawrence H. Chamberlain and Richard C. Snyder, American Foreign Policy (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1948), pp. 456-71

to enter into binding commitments not to conduct re-search into the military uses of atomic energy and to disclose their uranium and thorium resources while the United States retains the right to withhold its technical knowledge of atomic energy until the international control and inspection system is working to our satisfaction.

In other words, we are telling the Russians that if they are 'good boys' we may eventually turn over our knowledge of atomic energy to them and to the other nations. But there is no objective standard of what will qualify them as being 'good' nor any specified time for sharing our knowledge. . . .

It is perfectly clear that the 'step by step plan' in any such one-sided form is not workable. The entire agreement will have to be worked out and wrapped up in a single package. This may involve certain steps or stages, but the timing of such steps must be agreed to in an initial master treaty.<sup>5</sup>

In addition, Wallace believed that the United States "[was] asking for something completely irrelevant when it [insisted] that no power should have the right to veto an international atomic authority's ruling," that the United States was "disregarding a Russian counter-proposal which [showed] that Russia ' [might] be willing to negotiate if we [were],'" and finally, he questioned that the United States should "continue stockpiling of atomic bombs during the period of negotiations."<sup>6</sup>

While Baruch was making a report to President Truman on his work as a delegate to the Atomic Energy Commission of

---

<sup>5</sup>The New Statesman and Nation, XXXII (September 28, 1946), 224.

<sup>6</sup>Time, XLVIII (October 14, 1946), 24-25.

the United Nations, the Wallace letter appeared in the press. The matter was discussed by Truman and Baruch in their conference. A decision to counteract the impact of Wallace's critical attack on the Baruch plan was made. Accordingly, Baruch made on Friday, September 20, 1946, the following statement to the press:

With the authorization of the President and the State Department, I say there has been no change whatsoever in the attitude of this country with respect to our proposal for the international control of atomic energy, as outlined by me at the commission's first meeting on June 14.<sup>7</sup>

On September 24, Baruch replied to the attack of Wallace in a memorandum to President Truman. Baruch defended the necessity of the "step by step plan" since: "Obviously, the controls outlined in the memorandum cannot spring into existence full-grown and complete upon the legal establishment of the Authority."<sup>8</sup> Baruch claimed that all powers had sanctioned it in that they agreed in the Moscow conference that the "work of the commission should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken."<sup>9</sup> Baruch denied that the "United

---

<sup>7</sup>The New York Times, September 20, 1946.

<sup>8</sup>P. M. S. Blackett, Fear, War, and the Bomb (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949), p. 185.

<sup>9</sup>Chamberlain and Snyder, American Foreign Policy, p. 439.

States asked other powers 'to abandon research in military uses of atomic power,'" because "any contract," said Baruch, "would be illusory if a co-signer could repudiate it at will; i.e., by a veto."<sup>10</sup> Baruch charged that "Russia's counter proposal actually [added] up to a little more than a formal renunciation of atomic warfare," and that stock-piling bombs was a question to be decided by the people of the United States.<sup>11</sup>

Meanwhile, in a Chicago conference held under the auspices of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, the leaders called for "drastic revision of American foreign policy, including universal disarmament, withdrawal of United States forces in China and scuttling of the Baruch policy on the atomic bomb . . ."<sup>12</sup> For their platform, the delegates drew up planks advocating: "Immediate cessation of atomic bomb manufacture in the United States, destruction of all stock-piled bombs and simultaneous agreement by all nations to outlaw atomic weapons," "also modification of the Baruch plan of international atomic energy control to

---

<sup>10</sup>Time, XLVIII (October 14, 1946), 24-25.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>12</sup>The New York Times, September 29, 1946.

provide simultaneous disclosure and inspection of uranium and thorium resources and American 'know-how!'"<sup>13</sup> The conference appeared very definitely to have followed the July letter position of Wallace.

To combat the action taken in the convention, Baruch sent its leaders, Harold Ickes, Henry Morgenthau, and Phil Murray, a single telegram denying "that this country was asking the rest of the world to stop nuclear research and reveal its uranium resources while the United States retained complete freedom of action."<sup>14</sup> Again on October 3, 1946, Baruch defended his position by attacking Wallace for his failure to correct distortions of fact made in his July letter. According to The New York Times, Baruch charged: "These errors"<sup>15</sup> . . . not only are 'gravely dangerous to the delicate negotiations now under-way,' but 'create confusion and division among our people.'<sup>16</sup>

At a meeting arranged to discuss the matter on September 27, 1946, Baruch claimed that Wallace had admitted on

---

<sup>13</sup>The New York Times, September 30, 1946.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., October 2, 1946.

<sup>15</sup>These errors were according to Baruch that (1) United States alone would determine the stages, and (2) she demanded nations give up their development while the United States maintained her stockpile. Wallace made these claims in his July letter.

<sup>16</sup>The New York Times, October 3, 1946.

that occasion that "he 'obviously had not been fully posted as to the facts'" and regretted that he had not "discussed America's atomic policy with the United States delegation to the [United Nations] Atomic Energy Commission."<sup>17</sup> According to Baruch's version, Wallace went so far as to express approval of his plan and to agree to issue a statement to that effect. After the meeting, however, Wallace failed to make his promised statement, and reverted to his former critical position. Wallace's unavailability led Baruch to send him a telegram: "'You have no monopoly of the desire for peace,' adding, 'I have given thirty years of my life to the search for peace and there are many others whose aims have been the same.'"<sup>18</sup>

When the A.E.C. issued its First Report on December 31, 1946, it seemed that Wallace had evaluated the matter at least partially correctly:

The gist of Mr. Wallace's criticism of the American proposals [wrote Blackett] certainly applies to the majority report of the A.E.C., except in so far as it was not the Americans alone who would decide when a given stage was completed, but a majority of the A.E.C. This can be seen from the following sentences: 'In order that the transition may be accomplished as rapidly as possible and with safety and equity to all, this Commission should supervise the transitional process as prescribed in the treaty or convention and should be empowered to determine when a particular stage or stages

---

<sup>17</sup>The New York Times, October 3, 1946.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.



have been completed and subsequent ones are to commence.<sup>19</sup>

The difference in viewpoints of Wallace and Baruch was the difference between the Soviet and the United States on the atomic bomb. The Baruch Plan undoubtedly worked to the advantage of the United States in the initial stages in which sources of uranium and thorium would be revealed. In his July letter, Wallace pointed out that the advantage Russia had were: (1) "our lack of information on the state of her scientific and technical progress on atomic energy," and (2) "our ignorance of her uranium and thorium resources."<sup>20</sup> These we asked the Soviet to relinquish under the Baruch Plan. In the final stages of the plan, the Soviet obviously had much to gain; particularly, before she was known to possess the atom bomb (1949).

The matter became stalemated between the two countries. The United States insisted on the creation of an international authority to control all atomic energy activities. The Atomic bomb then would be outlawed and the international authority should have power to punish violators. The United States promised to stop manufacturing the bombs and to make available its scientific information, but only after effective

---

<sup>19</sup>Blackett, Fear, War, and the Bomb, pp. 185-186.

<sup>20</sup>The New Statesman and Nation, XXXII (September 28, 1946), 224.

international authority had been set up. The Soviet opposed an international control, since they wanted the renunciation of atomic weapons without the provisions of international control or inspection. The Soviet, however, subsequently agreed to accept international control of atomic bombs were prohibited and all plans turned over to the international authority simultaneously. The United States insisted on international control first. In many respects, this stalemate seemed to offer time for the Soviet to develop her own atomic bombs.

Wallace's viewpoint was extremely sympathetic to the Soviet's position on atomic energy. Much of the disagreement between the views of Wallace and Baruch seemed to lie in the implementation of the control of the bomb much in the same way as the Soviet and the United States failed to agree. Both Wallace and Baruch visualized co-operative action as the final objective, but disagreed on the methods to be employed.

Wallace became the active editor of The New Republic in December, 1946; the weekly provided a sounding board for Wallace to present his viewpoints. Early in January, he attacked the Fulton Speech of Winston Churchill, accusing the Briton of an attempt to "create an Anglo-American alli-

ance to encircle Russia."<sup>21</sup>

Churchill's scheme is now clear [wrote Wallace]. He assumes that our atom bombs and air power are at England's disposal. The first-line weapons are the foot soldiers and the industry of France and western Germany. France and Germany will guide Europe. England will guide France and Germany and, by the grace of God and Winston Churchill, the airplanes and the atom bombs of the United States will uphold her right arm.

.....

If the Tories of Britain have the right to appeal directly to the people of the United States, certainly we progressives of the United States have the right to appeal directly to the peace-loving people of Britain. In due time we shall exercise our privilege.<sup>22</sup>

In January, 1947, Secretary Byrnes resigned as Secretary of State and was replaced by General George Marshall. This event led Wallace to express his views on foreign policy. He believed that (1) we must "change our foreign policy" by new actions, (2) "we must help colonial peoples" in their struggle for freedom, (3) we must oppose dictators as Franco, (4) "we must act to implement the Atlantic Charter," (5) we must aid the peoples of devastated areas, and (6) we must realize "it is not Russia that is the enemy, but devastation itself."<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Henry Wallace, "Churchill's Crusade," The New Republic, CXVI (January 13, 1947), 23.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>Henry Wallace, "An Open Letter to Secretary Marshall," The New Republic, CXVI (January 20, 1947), 18.

In January, 1947, Wallace pointed out that there was a great need for progressive unity. "The United States cannot indefinitely go Right while the rest of the world is going Left, without an explosion," wrote Wallace.<sup>24</sup> Liberalism, explained Wallace, meant "that particular type of leftward trend which best preserves and enriches humanity in its control over and appreciation of Nature,"<sup>25</sup> Wallace recommended that "American progressivism . . . be developed which has as much driving power on the behalf of the common man in the United States as Marxism has in Russia," and be operated "as an example to the world that it is not necessary to have a 'police state' of either Left or Right in order to have peace and prosperity."<sup>26</sup>

In February, Wallace returned to the subject of the control of the atomic bomb. Warning against a wrong usage of the power of science, he protested against the military point of view being continued in peace times because he feared the development of a semi-military police state.<sup>27</sup> Later in the month, Wallace commented on Canada's ability to

---

<sup>24</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "The Enemy is Not Each Other," The New Republic CXVI (January 27, 1947), 23.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

<sup>27</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Science and the Military," The New Republic, CXVI (February 3, 1947), 27.

make plutonium [a radioactive element] by a better method than ours. Because of our early achievements in the atomic field, Wallace related that "at one time . . . the United States had the opportunity for a formidable moral leadership in the world because of its pioneer research work in atomic energy."<sup>28</sup> At that time (1947), Wallace believed that we no longer held this advantage and that we could now but cooperate "in a sincere search for enforceable disarmament, a world security system and the elimination of economic discriminations which are an essential preliminary to peace."<sup>29</sup>

In March, 1947, the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers was called to deal with the future of Germany and Austria. Writing on this meeting, Wallace prophesied if the meeting was unsuccessful that,

. . . we may expect the development of psychological warfare of a sort that will disintegrate almost every human being by its lies, [and] there will be an intensification of espionage, publicity machinery, diplomatic double-talk, military preparedness and economic planning, all in the framework of spiritual warfare preparatory to the final showdown when civilization blows itself to pieces.<sup>30</sup>

Almost simultaneously with the opening of the Moscow

---

<sup>28</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Whose Atomic Secret," The New Republic, CXVI (February 17, 1947), 27.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "The Moscow Conference Can Succeed," The New Republic, CXVI (March 10, 1947), 21.

Conference,<sup>31</sup> another problem presented difficulties to the country. The crisis came from the countries of Greece and Turkey. During the second World War, Greece had put up a valiant fight against the Italians and later against the Germans. After the war their country became the scene of a civil war. In 1945, British troops restored order and provided aid to Greece. Byrnes was approached by the Greek Prime Minister Constantin Tsaldaris for economic aid in 1946. Greece was burdened with the problems of maintaining an army to deal with guerrilla groups, who, Greece charged, were reinforced by groups crossing the border from the neighboring countries of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. Thus burdened, the Greek Government was accused of using repressive measures to restore order.<sup>32</sup> A United Nations Balkan Commission of Investigation's findings seemed to substantiate the Greek Government's charges against her neighbors. Byrnes had recommended that Tsaldaris seek aid from the

---

<sup>31</sup>Actually the Conference after meeting for forty-six days adjourned without solving the important problems of Germany and Austria. A deadlock occurred when "Secretary Marshall and British Foreign Minister Bevin advocated a federal form of government for Germany, as opposed to Russia's demand for a centralized state, and rejected the Soviet claim for \$10 billion reparations" which the American and British delegates opposed as an intolerable burden on the German economy. See Morris, Encyclopedia of American History, p. 393.

<sup>32</sup>Wallace and leftists made such charges against the Greek Government. See pp. 97-101 of Toward World Peace.

Export-Import Bank and, with President Truman, surveyed the situation with the directors of the bank. The directors said that,

. . . under the statute, they could not make a loan unless they had 'reasonable assurance of its repayment,' and they doubted whether this condition could be met for Greece considering the unsettled conditions there.<sup>33</sup>

With Turkey the question was more a problem of sovereignty rather than economic necessities as in Greece. Soviet Russia for centuries had looked with longing at the Dardanelles. In 1940, Molotov requested from Hitler approval to establish a naval base in the Straits. This request was repeated by Stalin at Potsdam--this time to the Western leaders. Neither of these attempts proved successful. Finally in 1946, Russia made a direct request to Turkey for naval base rights in the Straits and the cession of the adjoining provinces of Kars and Ardahan. This activity warranted Turkey's maintaining a large army to protect the border of her country. Her financial situation made it impossible for Turkey to maintain such an army and at the same time rehabilitate and develop her economy. Consequently, Turkey made a request to Byrnes for American aid. In his Memoirs, Byrnes related this request and that "I took the same position toward Turkey that I took toward Greece--we

---

<sup>33</sup>Byrnes, Speaking Frankly, p. 300.

could not furnish military equipment but would do everything possible to help economically."<sup>34</sup> Subsequently, as the Soviet Union renewed "the demand for base rights in the Straits," Byrnes recorded that he advised Turkey "that the revision of the Montreux Convention should be the subject of an international conference," and "Defense of the Straits . . . should be based upon, and administered in accordance with, the purposes and principles of the United Nations."<sup>35</sup> On March 1, 1947, "the British Government informed the United States that it could give no further economic or military aid to Greece and Turkey after March 31."<sup>36</sup>

As a result, Congressional leaders were called to the White House; the facts of the situation of Turkey and Greece were presented to them by Truman and Marshall.<sup>37</sup> Of the meeting, Vandenberg wrote that "Britain, in extreme economic distress herself, now was forced to pull out of Greece and end economic and military aid."<sup>38</sup> Likewise, "Greece was threatened by civil war with the Communists who were--

---

<sup>34</sup>Byrnes, Speaking Frankly, p. 301.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Vandenberg, Jr., and Morris, The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg, p. 338.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.



prior to Tito's defection--supported from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania."<sup>39</sup> It seemed that economic collapse of Greece was inevitable and Communist control a certainty.

President Truman, in attempting to resolve the crisis, appeared before Congress on March 12, 1947, and asked "the Congress to provide authority for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the amount of \$400,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1948"<sup>40</sup> The President based his demand on his belief that our policy must be to give financial and economic aid "to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."<sup>41</sup> While the debate in Congress continued, Wallace began to attack the program. His criticism developed the ideas that (1) it was a radical change in American foreign policy; (2) although Truman justified it in the name of crisis, it was not a war crisis; (3) it bore no relation to the real crisis--the destitute people of the world; and (4) it was apt to widen the gap between the United States and the Soviet.<sup>42</sup> As an alternative, Wallace proposed an "all-out

---

<sup>39</sup>Vandenberg, Jr., and Morris, The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg, p. 338.

<sup>40</sup>Chamberlain and Snyder, American Foreign Policy, p. 573.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 572-73.

<sup>42</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "The Fight for Peace Begins," The New Republic, CXVI (March 24, 1947), 12-13.

worldwide reconstruction program for peace," under the organization of the United Nations and financed by the "International Bank."<sup>43</sup>

Wallace was opposed to aid if its chief purpose was to maintain either the British rule, or the existing government of Greece, which he felt was repressive and taxed the poor for the benefit of the rich. If the loan was made, said Wallace, it should be made through the supervision of an international commission. The funds should be used for the purposes of rehabilitation and reconstruction. In the matter of the Turkish loan, Wallace maintained "there is not a shred of evidence before the American people to justify giving her a loan."<sup>44</sup>

The European tour. After Wallace had resigned from the Cabinet, he had been invited by Kingsley Martin of The New Statesman and Nation, a socialist weekly published in London, to go there and express his views. Wallace wrote as follows in regards to his invitation:

Kingsley Martin is one of those Britishers who doesn't like the idea that England's function in the next war is to serve as an advanced air base for which the United States will furnish atom bombs and eventually

---

<sup>43</sup>Wallace, "The Fight for Peace Begins," The New Republic, 13.

<sup>44</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "The Truman Doctrine--or a Strong UN," The New Republic, CXVI (March 31, 1947), 13.

the men after Britain has been destroyed. He was delighted to find an American who had another point of view. I agreed to go to England long before the Truman Doctrine was announced.<sup>45</sup>

Accompanied to La Guardia airfield by Jo Davidson, the Co-chairman of the Progressive Citizens of America, Wallace issued the statement to the reporters that "he was allergic to all imperialism and use of force," which he regarded as no solution to the world's problems.<sup>46</sup> On this occasion Wallace declared his remedy to be "the application of the widespread principles of justice and liberty."<sup>47</sup> Wallace left for London in April, 1947; he was accompanied on the tour by Michael Straight (The New Republic), Ned Roberts (United Press), Ed Campbell (Associated Press), John Chabot Smith (Herald Tribune), and Honor Balfour (Time).<sup>48</sup> In England, Wallace was joined by Ellis Smith, MP.

In England, Wallace was given many opportunities to present his viewpoints to the English people. He delivered addresses at London, Manchester, Liverpool, and Stokes-on-Trent. The facilities of the BBC were extended to him on two occasions; meetings with members of Parliament were made possible.

---

<sup>45</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 10.

<sup>46</sup>The New York Times, April 8, 1947.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Report from Britain," The New Republic, CXVI (April 28, 1947), 12.

In a press conference on April 9, Wallace warned that "there is being established in the next three months a kind of pattern [Truman Doctrine] which, if it hardens, will lead us to war;" while, he referred to the United States and the Soviet Union as "two great giants getting ready for a death struggle."<sup>49</sup> On being pressed for his solution to prevent such a struggle,

. . . his replies, though they varied slightly, all boiled down to his well-known contention [said The New York Times] that to oppose Russia and Communism could lead only to depression and war, whereas the only peaceful course was to seek 'understanding' with the Russians.<sup>50</sup>

Wallace carried his attack on the Truman Doctrine further in an address, delivered April 11, 1947, at Central Hall in London:

I am opposed to the President's program of unconditional loans to anti-Soviet Governments, because I believe it bears no relation to the needs of the world. . . . This two-world program is costly and it is futile. It is undertaken in the name of stopping communism. Instead, it will lead to Communist revolutions.<sup>51</sup>

Again as a solution to many of the world's problems, Wallace continued to recommend that fifty billion dollars be spent by the United Nations on world reconstruction.<sup>52</sup> "The Truman Doctrine of aid to Greece and Turkey was simply an

---

<sup>49</sup>The New York Times, April 10, 1947.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., April 12, 1947.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

'amazing political maneuver' intended to steal the thunder of the Red issue from the Republicans," charged Wallace, in the same address.<sup>53</sup>

When Wallace's comments reached the Senate, much criticism developed. Senator James O. Eastland, Mississippi, commented:

America has grown and thrived . . . upon the political differences of its citizens. Any American citizen, be he proud or humble, is privileged to criticize, vociferously if he will, any policy of the American Government.

But I do not believe our history records an instance of a man who has been honored to the extent that former Vice-President of the United States Henry A. Wallace had been honored, who has flown to a foreign country and attempted to induce the friends and allies of his country to desert her.

No American citizen has the moral right to conspire with foreign peoples in order to undermine and to weaken the hand of his country. The least that can be said is that Mr. Wallace is performing a grave disservice to the American people when he attempts to induce Great Britain to desert the United States and thereby force us to sail the perilous seas alone.<sup>54</sup>

In Manchester on April 12, 1947, "Wallace struck out at what he termed the imperialism clique in the United States and its British sympathizers," while, "he ridiculed the idea that the United States should become empire-minded."<sup>55</sup> In

---

<sup>53</sup>The New York Times, April 12, 1947.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., April 13, 1947.

referring to the Greek and Turkish aid program, Wallace censured the thought that a "band of rugged volunteers in the Greek Mountains" presented "such terrible threat to the world that the President had to address Congress as though another Pearl Harbor had struck America."<sup>56</sup> "We cannot buy off world communism," warned Wallace, "any more than we can suppress the idea of communism by force of arms."<sup>57</sup>

While Wallace presented his address, the feeling against Wallace increased in intensity. Senator Vandenberg commented: "I think it is a shocking thing when an American citizen goes abroad to organize the world against his own Government."<sup>58</sup> Senator George "asserted that Mr. Wallace's attitude was 'most hurtful to the purposes and policies of our country;'" while, another opinion came from Senator Fulbright: "I don't know what he is up to. His speech sounded just as though it had been written in the Kremlin."<sup>59</sup>

Speaking at Liverpool, England, on April 13, 1947, Wallace defied his American critics and told the National Union of Students that he was within his legal rights in hitting out at American foreign policy and intended to con-

---

<sup>56</sup>The New York Times, April 13, 1947.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid.

tinue to do so on his tour.

In an address over BBC, April 13, 1947, according to The Times, "Mr. Wallace spoke of poverty as the main cause of war and called for economic cooperation between the nations of the world."<sup>60</sup> "The immense power and wealth of America," said Wallace, "is being used for strategic and military purposes rather than to raise the standard of living in countries which could become a great market for American exports."<sup>61</sup> Wallace advocated, as a basis of peace, a world New Deal similar to the one introduced in the United States by President Roosevelt, which would cope with the problem of communism in Asia. Wallace felt that a new "national awakening" had arisen in Asia, which would cause its peoples to turn to communism unless the United States worked for the interests of the common man.<sup>62</sup>

In the United States bipartisan demands were made that the passport of Henry A. Wallace be revoked. Requests that he be prosecuted for his activities and utterances abroad arose in the House of Representatives. J. Parnell Thomas, Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities,

---

<sup>60</sup>The Times, April 16, 1947.

<sup>61</sup>The New York Times, April 14, 1947.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

thought the Logan Act<sup>63</sup> of 1799 "[covered] 'Wallace like a cloak,'" and he believed "it was the 'obligation' of the Justice Department, he held, to take action."<sup>64</sup> Wallace replied insisting that only if a state of war existed could he be charged with "treasonable utterances" and by pointing out "the fact that such words as 'treason' have been used in describing my trip indicates that in the minds of the men who used these phrases we actually are at war."<sup>65</sup>

In England as well as in America, criticism mounted.

The Daily Mail commented:

Last September an authoritative American voice said: 'We like the British as individuals, but to make Britain the key to our foreign policy would be the height of folly.' The speaker was Henry Wallace.

Now he should try to explain in words that really mean something whether he thinks Britain should be 'the Key' or not, and how it is to be done. And he should not make offensive remarks about members of one political party in the country where he is a guest.<sup>66</sup>

The Spectator said that "it is difficult to know what benefit has accrued to anyone from Mr. Henry Wallace's visit;"

---

<sup>63</sup>The Logan Act prohibits any American citizen from dealing with a foreign government or its agents in a matter in dispute between the countries or to defeat the measure of the Government of the United States. The law provides the maximum penalties of \$5,000 in fines and imprisonment for three years.

<sup>64</sup>The New York Times, April 15, 1947.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., April 14, 1947.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid.



although "it seems clear that Mr. Wallace's speeches in England have distinctly strengthened President Truman's position in America." "That," said The Spectator, "provides considerable justification for the invitation extended to Mr. Wallace from this side."<sup>67</sup> From the same publication, Sir Norman Angell commented on Wallace's critical statements: "Nowhere in the world or in history has the common man of Mr. Wallace's oratory attained so high a standard of living as under the much abused economy."<sup>68</sup>

Criticism also appeared in Parliament, "Lord Vansittart said that the critics of Mr. Bevin had imported the 'woolly Mr. Wallace' at a time when he was likely to embarrass the Foreign Secretary in the conduct of his arduous and thankless task."<sup>69</sup>

Lord Barnby asked the Government on what basis on their visits to this country was radio time allocated by the B.B.C. to former Cabinet Ministers of existing administrations of friendly foreign countries when they were known currently to be a variance with the fundamental policies of their former colleagues."<sup>70</sup>

Lord Swinton thought that "Mr. Wallace appeared to be as well equipped to deal with Communism as was a rabbit to deal

---

<sup>67</sup>The Spectator, April 18, 1947.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., April 25, 1947.

<sup>69</sup>The Times, April 30, 1947.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

with a boa constrictor."<sup>71</sup> The Manchester Guardian attacked Wallace in respect to Communism: "One is left with the impression," it said, "which is certainly false, that in the world today Russia remains passive and inert, the helpless victim of American expansion."<sup>72</sup>

On April 15, Wallace was a guest of some British Members of Parliament at a luncheon and at a dinner held in his honor in the House of Commons. He attended a session of the House of Commons and then discussed scientific farming with the Minister of Agriculture. The next day, Wallace brought his British visit to a close by addressing a big all-party evening meeting at the House of Commons. In this final meeting, Wallace was given a letter of sincere thanks and appreciation, signed by 111 Laborite members.

Wallace had aroused Churchill by his critical speeches in England. After the former's departure from England, the ex-Prime Minister warned the British people to counteract Wallace's influence: "Great Britain is 'being drawn to ruin,'" Churchill said, "and the empire 'scattered and squandered.'"<sup>73</sup> Churchill alluded to Wallace as "one of

---

<sup>71</sup>The Times, April 30, 1947.

<sup>72</sup>The Manchester Guardian, April 17, 1947.

<sup>73</sup>The New York Times, April 19, 1947.

'that happily small minority of crypto-Communists.'"<sup>74</sup> This statement began an exchange of critical comments with Wallace as he continued on his tour.<sup>75</sup>

Wallace had advocated that he had the same privilege that Churchill had exercised at Fulton, Missouri. To this statement, Churchill said pointedly, that "when I am abroad, I always make it a rule never to criticize or to attack the Government of my own country," but, "I make up for lost time when I get home."<sup>76</sup> Wallace replied from Stockholm: "I refused to be disturbed by name-calling or hatred, no matter how distinguished the source from which the name-calling comes."<sup>77</sup> Pursuing the subject, Wallace commented that "it is a source of sorrow that Britain's great fighting leader cannot use his genius in fighting for peace."<sup>78</sup> Churchill replied commenting that "war isn't inevitable, but it would be inevitable if Britain and the United States were to follow

---

<sup>74</sup>On being asked to define a crypto-Communist, Churchill explained a crypto-Communist as "one who has not the moral courage to explain the destination for which he is making." Later, Churchill said Wallace was not a crypto-Communist but "foregathered with such persons in England." See The New York Times for April 19-20, 1947.

<sup>75</sup>The New York Times, April 19, 1947;

<sup>76</sup>Ibid.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., April 20, 1947.

the policy of appeasement and one-sided disarmament which brought about the last war."<sup>79</sup> Wallace presented his position on April 21, 1947: "I have more faith that what can be accomplished at the International Trade Conference in Geneva will have more effect than the great increase in armaments, which is what Mr. Churchill suggests."<sup>80</sup>

Meanwhile, as the exchange of views was taking place, the largest conference ever to be held by the British Liberal Party was meeting at Bournemouth, England, April 25, 1947.<sup>81</sup> The Party repudiated Wallace's ideas on foreign policy and endorsed the Truman Doctrine.

While his debate with Churchill continued, Wallace proceeded to Scandinavia. The news of the Wallace controversy with his Government had preceded him. The American State Department representatives would have nothing to do with the remainder of his tour; consequently, his contacts became more often with leftist groups in his host countries. Similarly, Wallace was met at the airport in Stockholm by a singing chorus of carpenters, bricklayers, and metal workers.

In talking with the Social Democrats of Sweden, Wallace learned many of their problems as seen through a

---

<sup>79</sup>The New York Times, April 21, 1947.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., April 25, 1947.

socialist outlook. The Socialists told Wallace that Sweden feared Soviet expansionist tendencies because Sweden had often been the aggressor against Russia in past history. Sweden was worried about the increasing tension between America and the Soviet because the Swedes wished to maintain friendly relations with both countries. As the only alternative to Soviet coal, American coal was both expensive in price and inferior in quality; it was necessary therefore, for Sweden to secure coal from the Soviet Union. To solve her problems, Sweden needed financial assistance from an agency such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In Norway, Wallace found that Haakon Lie, Secretary General of the Norwegian Labor Party and Wallace's host, combined a deep love of America with a desire for friendship with Russia and a desire for Norway to go her own way in peace. In the United Nations, Lie desired an equal partnership between large nations and independence for the smaller nations. In this land which still showed traces of German occupation, Wallace was "reminded that the world is one; this [Norwegian] audience, in looks and attitude, was like any comparable group in our own Middle West."<sup>82</sup> Lie

---

<sup>82</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Scandinavia--Between Two Worlds," The New Republic, CXVI (May 5, 1947), 14.

predicted that Wallace in a return visit would find Norway changed: "For the better . . . . We have ended the inflation; now we shall end poverty."<sup>83</sup>

From Norway, Wallace went to Denmark, where he was met by a Danish businessman, Paul Hagerup. Here the hosts of Wallace, the Social Democrats, were made up largely of the resistance leaders during the German occupation. In Copenhagen, Wallace found a great deal of pro-German feeling and a fear of Russia. The Danes, Wallace wrote, had been disappointed because of the failure of England to make the delivery of promised goods and they desired to renew trade with a more prosperous Germany. Denmark, an agricultural nation, was short of dollars with which to purchase livestock feed, oil-cake, and fertilizer. Likewise, it was short of machinery which only America could provide; unfortunately America was a nation that imported very little from Denmark. Denmark, Wallace learned, had made an application to the Export-Import bank; her application for a loan of \$50,000,000 was rejected on the ground that the International Bank would soon be operating. This rejection, said Wallace, led Denmark to wonder if it would not be better "for her to turn instead toward trade with Eastern Europe and the

---

<sup>83</sup>Wallace, "Scandinavia--Between Two Worlds," The New Republic, 14.

USSR."<sup>84</sup>

From Denmark, Wallace flew to France. In this country, Wallace was shunned by most political leaders because of his critical attitude toward Washington. However, he was able to meet many of the Socialist and Communist leaders who became his principal source of information. In France, Wallace found that a critical need existed for coal, wheat, basic farm as well as factory machinery, and machine tools. "If American aid is given to France on a non-political basis, then democracy will be strengthened," wrote Wallace; on the other hand, "any attempt to use America's tremendous economic power to drive France to the Right and into an anti-Soviet bloc may end in bloodshed."<sup>85</sup> Wallace was also given the opportunity to address the Foreign Affairs Committee of the French Chamber of Deputies in regards to Russia. On this occasion, Wallace advocated,

. . . in view of the fact that the United States was the only country capable of supplying Russian needs, that the United States make Russia a large, long-time loan at low interest rates as a part of an over-all program for world reconstruction.<sup>86</sup>

Although Wallace was opposed to political loans, he wanted

---

<sup>84</sup>Wallace, "Scandinavia--Between Two Worlds," The New Republic, 45.

<sup>85</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Report on France," The New Republic, CXVI (May 12, 1947), 12.

<sup>86</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 12.

safeguards on such a loan that the money would be used "on behalf of the common man in rebuilding the world."<sup>87</sup>

In conferences with the French leaders, Wallace learned the Communists of France felt that friction between the United States and the Soviet would be disastrous for French foreign trade. The French Communists were also alarmed by President Truman's Waco, Texas, address in which he said that "America valued freedom, including freedom of enterprise, more than peace."<sup>88</sup> This "was used in France to create the impression that America would oppose the nationalization of French industry and the presence of the Communists in the government."<sup>89</sup> Above all, the French Communists disliked the idea that American aid would be given only if Communists were to be removed from the government. The Communists were considered as indigenous in France and extremely powerful. They were supported by the peasants and middle classes, largely because of the respect they earned during the period of occupation. If the leftist groups would be removed from government, it would lead to violence and bloodshed.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 12.

<sup>88</sup>Wallace, "Report on France," The New Republic, 14-15.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>90</sup>Facts used in describing the Communists are taken from "Report on France," p. 15.



Wallace "left Europe [September 26, 1947] to return to the United States after a busy seventeen day speaking tour that had carried him to five western European countries;" a journey that he regarded as a peace mission "to rally world opinion against the dangers arising from Soviet-American rivalry."<sup>91</sup>

Arriving home Sunday, April 27, at La Guardia Field, Wallace was greeted by 50 enthusiasts shouting: "We want Henry!"<sup>92</sup> In addressing this group, Wallace stressed the fact that people in Europe were more concerned about peace than we are, and that we were on our way to ruthless imperialism. He believed that the Truman Doctrine had brought France to the brink of civil war and would divide the world into warring factions. Wallace said also that he had gone to Europe not to criticize the United States but to strengthen world peace.

The transcontinental tour. In May, 1947, Wallace began a tour of the United States by traveling to the Midwest. Although the announced purposes of his trip were to express his viewpoints on world peace and to criticize the Administration, the journey provided an excellent opportunity to

---

<sup>91</sup>The New York Times, April 27, 1947.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., April 28, 1947.

assess the political situation in the United States. On

May 23, The United News commented:

Henry Wallace, on a barnstorming trip through the Middle West, is accusing the President of selling out to the Republicans. He says the Truman foreign policy is being directed by the Republicans, and drops hints that a new, liberal political party is taking shape.<sup>93</sup>

Wallace himself recorded that "disturbing divisions within the progressive movement alone prevented the swift emergence of a new political force in American life."<sup>94</sup> On June 6,

The United States News commented:

For the moment, Mr. Wallace simply is trying to alter the direction of the Democratic Party, inside the party. But the threat of a third party is plain. And such a party would take votes away from Mr. Truman, not from his Republican opponent.<sup>95</sup>

Significantly, Wallace believed that he had found on his tour a new spirit stirring which was being ignored by the major political parties.<sup>96</sup>

Writing of his Midwest tour, Wallace reported that the Minnesota farmers "blamed the 80th Congress for failing to

---

<sup>93</sup>The United States News, XXII (May 23, 1947), 22. (The United States News didn't become The United States News and World Report until July, 1948).

<sup>94</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Report from the Middle West," The New Republic, CXVI (May 26, 1947), 11.

<sup>95</sup>The United States News, XXII (June 6, 1947), 28.

<sup>96</sup>Wallace, loc cit.

support farm commitments made by the 79th Congress."<sup>97</sup> In Chicago, Wallace found that Mayor Kennelly had made a start in civic reform, but that the CIO, where Wallace hoped for support, was divided.<sup>98</sup> From the situation in Detroit, Wallace believed that its many workers should provide the strongest progressive political organization in America. Wallace commented: "The U.A.W., with 891,000 members, is the largest and most democratic union in America," however, "most of their energy is expended in factionalism."<sup>99</sup> For this reason, Wallace urged "the progressives to stop hating each other and to wake up."<sup>100</sup>

From Detroit, Wallace flew to Austin, Texas, to speak at a mass meeting at the University of Texas. The meeting was arranged by the "American Veteran's Committee, a group that invariably brought together the ablest and most progressive veterans in each community."<sup>101</sup> Having been warned by a friend that the press opposed the meeting, Wallace was

---

<sup>97</sup>Wallace, "Report from the Middle West," The New Republic, 11.

<sup>98</sup>Ibid., p. 37.

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., pp. 37-38.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>101</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Report from the Southwest," The New Republic, CXVI (June 2, 1947), 11.

met in Austin by five boys, led by the son of an oil producer--all waving red flags and singing the Internationale.<sup>102</sup> In spite of this demonstration, "an audience of 10,000," said Wallace, "cheered every assertion of liberalism, as loudly and as long as the progressives of Chicago and Detroit had done."<sup>103</sup>

Wallace traveled from Austin to Los Angeles, California. In the Alexandria Hotel, Wallace met with the officials from AFL, the Railroad Brotherhood, and the CIO. Wallace recorded that he found among them great concern over the Taft-Hartley bill and the effects of the Truman Doctrine.<sup>104</sup> Because of the political dissatisfaction, labor, said Wallace, was being driven to political unity and action. Congressional cuts in reclamation projects had hampered development in the Central Valley project of California. Resentment against the Republicans, Wallace learned, was rising as the voters came to believe the motive was not so much economy but pressure from large farming interests.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup>Wallace, "Report from the Southwest," The New Republic, 11.

<sup>103</sup>Ibid.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

Trouble also existed between the vast shipping interests, who had large stakes in the Southern Pacific and the extension of American power abroad, and the longshoremen, who felt the ship owners were trying to break their union. Labor had begun to think that both parties were against their interests. They were dissatisfied with the state legislature one-party government and the one-party press; they disliked the system in California, which permitted a candidate to file on every ticket. This method had allowed Warren, a Republican, to win the endorsement of the Democratic Party and become its titular head with his election as Governor of California.<sup>106</sup> In this California visit, Wallace was denied the use of the Hollywood Bowl in Los Angeles and the University Campus in Berkeley; nevertheless, his meeting at Gilmore Stadium, Los Angeles, and on a street corner in Berkeley were well attended.<sup>107</sup>

Wallace believed on the basis of his findings on his transcontinental trip that the greatest story in the United States was the "awakening of the farmers."<sup>108</sup> Everywhere in

---

<sup>106</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Report from California," The New Republic, CXVI (June 9, 1947), 12.

<sup>107</sup>See "Report from the Southwest," and "Report from California."

<sup>108</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Report on the Farmers," The New Republic, CXVII (June 30, 1947), 12.

the Western and Northwestern states, Wallace believed that he found a new progressive movement developing. In Jamestown, North Dakota, a two-day conference was held for founding the Farmer Union Progressive Alliance. The alliance was open to all the citizens of North Dakota; on the other hand, it was hoped the movement would spread to other states. The farmers in North Dakota were concerned with the Government's cutting back reclamation service and crop insurance.<sup>109</sup> In Colorado, Wallace found similar problems existed, aggravated by a record crop of wheat which threatened a shortage of elevator storage space and freight cars.<sup>110</sup> This situation caused the governors of the wheat producing states to demand federal action to purchase and ship wheat for overseas relief.

Wallace believed that "wheat and cotton prices will be the first to break when depression hits America."<sup>111</sup> Lee Fryer, farm economist of the Farmers' Union, remarked to Wallace as follows:

The farmers are losing faith in the leadership of the political parties. . . . More and more they have a feeling of futility. They feel as if they are little

---

13. <sup>109</sup>Wallace, "Report on the Farmers," The New Republic,

<sup>110</sup>Ibid.

<sup>111</sup>Ibid.

men who don't count and can't control events.<sup>112</sup>

Fryer, said Wallace, felt the farmers had had the opportunity to govern their own lives through the committee system as it was set up under the AAA, but that "the committee system and the whole program are being destroyed."<sup>113</sup> In addition, Fryer predicted that "the farmers believe that a depression is coming, and that when prices break, Congress will default on its obligations to maintain farm prices. That means the last opportunity for the small farmer will be gone."<sup>114</sup>

Wallace found in Billings, Montana, a group of 40 citizens to meet him as his plane made a half-hour stop at midnight. Wallace wrote concerning this impromptu meeting:

One after another, as we sat in the airlines terminal, members of the group stood up to talk. Many were old-timers, such as one who had carried the first hundred copies of the old Socialist paper, Appeal to Reason, into North Dakota. They were all angry men and women. 'We don't live in a free country here,' Kinney an automobile dealer said. 'Our boys work in a slave market. Their wages are rigged by the employers' association.'

'When Mr. Sutton called me tonight, I telephoned the radio stations and said I'd pay for an announcement that you were coming. They refused. The press won't even mention any opposition now. We just aren't free any more.'

---

112Wallace, "Report on the Farmers," The New Republic, 13.

113Ibid., p. 37.

114Ibid.

.....  
 'As far as a free press and radio telling us the truth is concerned, we live in the darkest Africa here in Billings.'

To me it was alarming to listen to these angry voices. To believe in democracy, Americans must believe that they are getting the truth. Without the truth they cannot intelligently direct our free institutions.<sup>115</sup>

From Iowa, Wallace reported, a situation not unlike other western states. He wrote:

Everyone I talked with criticized Congress for killing the AAA, but everyone admitted that the farmers were rolling in money. . . . In every county in Iowa the leading farmers think that trouble is coming, and while they say the death of the AAA farm program was a tragedy, they don't believe the farmer generally will become indignant until low prices arrive.

.....  
 There is an extraordinary complacency in Iowa these days, but at the same time a great underlying fear.<sup>116</sup>

In July, Wallace traveled to North Carolina where he met Josephus Daniels, the Secretary of Navy under Wilson. Daniels had a great distrust of big business and the military interests of the country.<sup>117</sup> For that reason, he feared the outlook of the world was very dark and thought,

---

<sup>115</sup>Wallace, "Report on the Farmers," The New Republic, 38.

<sup>116</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Report from Iowa," The New Republic, CXVII (July 7, 1947), 15, 35.

<sup>117</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Report on the South," The New Republic, CXVII (July 14, 1947), 14.



said Wallace, the future promised long years of domination by the military powers. Similarly, Daniels feared big business would be in a position to dominate the country.<sup>118</sup> From this North Carolina visit, Wallace recalled that meeting, held for an unsegregated audience at Raleigh, was the most interesting of the trip:

This unsegregated political meeting, with 2,700 paid admissions, was further evidence to me that those sincere Southern liberals who believe it is necessary to maintain certain undemocratic 'traditions' for political effectiveness, are grossly mistaken.<sup>119</sup>

In Alabama, Wallace found the progressives were aiding Governor Folsom against a combine of northern industrialists and aristocratic Southern leaders, which tended to keep the Negro in peonage.<sup>120</sup> This situation led Wallace to say: "I am convinced that progressive Americans must concentrate their political energies more on the Congressional races than on presidential campaigns," because, "the monied interests almost invariably run the legislative bodies, except in times of great crisis."<sup>121</sup> Governor Folsom, who accompanied Wallace on his tour of the fourteen southern

---

<sup>118</sup>Wallace, "Report on the South," The New Republic, 14.

<sup>119</sup>Ibid., pp. 14-15.

<sup>120</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>121</sup>Ibid.

states, had been elected Governor, said Wallace, by the votes of dirt farmers, laborers, small storekeepers, and veterans.<sup>122</sup> The farmers and the Farmers' Union in Alabama wanted to establish a big fertilizer co-operative because they accused the fertilizer companies of limiting production in order to control prices. From the South, Wallace reported: "At base, the problem of the South is the same as it is everywhere--how to improve the standard of living by increasing efficiency and reducing exploitation;" moreover, he felt that "as the small farmers and businessmen of the South really find out what has been going on, the Democratic Party will be a democratic party in fact as well as in name."<sup>123</sup>

An October trip in 1947 to the New England states caused Wallace the report that the New Englanders were concerned about the "course of our present foreign policy and the failure to take steps which will either avert or cushion the oncoming depression."<sup>124</sup> New England was faced with serious problems, wrote Wallace, as both manufacturing and agriculture declined. Wallace thought the solution to the

---

<sup>122</sup>Wallace, "Report on the South," The New Republic, 15.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>124</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "New England Today," The New Republic, CXVII (October 20, 1947), 10.

problem lay partly in New England's need for cheap power which could be obtained by developing the Merrimack, Connecticut, and St. Lawrence Rivers. In Claremont, New Hampshire, Wallace found the town meeting type of government still in existence. Out of a population of 15,000 in Claremont, only a few hundred citizens attended the town meetings called to make major decisions. Wallace commented: "The abdication of responsibility by so many citizens is the greatest threat to our country. We have the machinery for political democracy, but we still haven't used it."<sup>125</sup>

The Palestine tour. In the autumn of 1947, Wallace turned his attention to the problems of Palestine.<sup>126</sup> Wallace became interested in seeing conditions in Palestine from two standpoints: (1) as a problem of the United Nations;

---

<sup>125</sup>Wallace, "New England Today," The New Republic, 11.

<sup>126</sup>For the first eleven months of 1947, Palestine, a trouble spot, was under the rule of the British High Commission supported by some 100,000 soldiers and policemen. The British, after a London Conference with Arab and Jewish leaders had failed in January, requested a special meeting of the United Nations General Assembly at Lake Success in May, 1947, to work out an acceptable plan to partition Palestine. On August 31, 1947, seven members of a United Nations Special Commission on Palestine submitted a report which recommended the partitioning of Palestine into a Jewish state, an Arab state, and a separate city of Jerusalem. The transition from a British mandate would be supervised by an United Nations Commission. The Jews were agreeable to the report, but the Arabs opposed it. Trouble broke into the open in December 1947, and continued through 1948.

and (2) as a locale using scientific methods applied to agriculture and reclamation. In The New Republic, he wrote: "I want to see what is being done in the way of plant and animal husbandry, the new plastics industry, the possibilities of a Jordan Valley Authority for hydroelectric power and irrigation, and many other things."<sup>127</sup>

Wallace reached Palestine on November 3, 1947, after a 44 hour flight from New York to Lydda airport, some 40 minutes from Jerusalem. An address of Wallace, which favored the United Nations' plan for partitioning Palestine, had been printed in the local papers and led the British to furnish him with an armed guard. Nevertheless, Wallace found little of the tension that he had been led to expect. Concerning the Jewish attitude toward the Palestine problem, Wallace wrote:

There's no hysteria. They face the facts as they are. They know there is still a long road ahead for a Jewish state which . . . is not conceived as a theocracy but as a democracy with full citizenship rights regardless of race, religion or national origin. They are convinced that there must be a solution and soon. They are not happy about partition. But if partition is the only way to achieve a Jewish state . . . then partition must be accepted.

. . . . .

Just before we left, Eli Ostrovsky, one of the

---

<sup>127</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Trip to Palestine," The New Republic, CXVII (October 13, 1947), 11.

settlers, summed up the work of Bet Haarava in brief, memorable words: 'Please understand, we don't want to take land from others. We want to build land. What we are doing here is using land that has never been used before. All we ask is the opportunity to be like any other people anywhere else in the world.' It is this spirit which is my strongest first impression of modern Jewish Palestine. I am impressed with the willingness to work, the eagerness to apply science to the solution of human problems and the atmosphere of great courage in facing the most difficult problems of nature.<sup>128</sup>

Wallace traveled over Palestine, seeing its Biblical geography as well as the birth of a new experiment in an "old historic land."<sup>129</sup> Despite the difficulties, Wallace believed that if progress continued "Palestine may be one of the loveliest garden spots of the world."<sup>130</sup> In a later issue of The New Republic, Wallace described the new experiment as follows:

In once barren sand dunes we bent under the branches of orange trees laden with fruit. In northern Palestine, where the River Jordan flows into Lake Huleh, we stepped into a small boat and headed into the interior of the great Huleh Swamp. . . . We pushed our way through a narrow channel overhung with Egyptian papyrus, and later jumped out upon a black peat bog which shook under our footsteps. Farmers of this region have for centuries been weakened by malaria--carried by mosquitoes bred in this swamp. Today the Jews are planning to drain and settle this entire area.

A people concerned with cash returns alone would choose easier field of endeavor. There aren't any easy

---

<sup>128</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "First Impressions of Palestine," The New Republic, CXVII (November 3, 1947), 12-13.

<sup>129</sup>Ibid.

<sup>130</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "The Conquerors of the Negev," The New Republic, CXVII (November 10, 1947), 4.

fields in Palestine. But the needs of immigration are desperate.<sup>131</sup>

Because of the great difficulties, said Wallace, the land is beyond the resourcefulness of the individual; hence, the Jews resorted to collective effort.<sup>132</sup> Wallace wrote that three kinds of collectives existed. The first type, Kibbutz, had a town meeting form of Government. Under this system, the settlers lived in a communal hall with separate rooms. No wages were paid to the workers, who received only pocket money. A second type, Moshav Shitufi, was a modified form. Many war veterans lived in this arrangement owning their own homes. A third type, Moshav Ovdim, provided each member with his own ground. Wallace asked a third generation Palestinian private farmer "whether private-enterprise farmers or collective settlers contribute more to the development of new agricultural methods . . .?"<sup>133</sup> The farmer thought the,

. . . individual farmer [was] possibly afraid to take responsibility for error, while in the Kibbutz decisions for new directions are taken by the membership, so the responsibility is shared. . . . As a result, there is likely to be more progress along such lines in the Kibbutzim.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup>Wallace, "The Conquerors of the Negev," The New Republic, 4.

<sup>132</sup>Ibid.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>134</sup>Ibid.

In his investigation of labor, Wallace found a unique labor organization called the Histadrut. This consisted of,

. . . one hundred seventy-five thousand wage and salary workers [office workers], both industrial and agricultural, are members of the Histadrut, which is particularly noteworthy because of its operations of some of the major industries of Jewish Palestine through the Solel Boneh.<sup>135</sup>

The Solel Boneh, the largest roadbuilding contractor of the Middle East, ran a transportation system, a rubber and tire plant, a glassmaking plant, a cement factory and others. The membership of the Solel Boneh owned and conducted it on principles of "national ownership of the land, self-labor on the farm, mutual aid and development, and purchasing and marketing co-ops."<sup>136</sup>

On the basis of his Palestine visit, Wallace thought that Jew and Arab must live together in a land long beset by difficulties and they would rise with the United Nations. "From now on," he wrote, "the Un, the USSR, the US, the British, the Jews, and the Arabs are tied together in a drama which can end in degeneration and death or in cooperation between the participants."<sup>137</sup> Wallace believed that if

---

<sup>135</sup>Wallace, "The Conquerors of Negev," The New Republic, 11.

<sup>136</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>137</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "Palestine: the UN's Task," The New Republic, CXVII (December 15, 1947), 15.

co-operation failed "the end result [would] be violent revolution in the Arab lands and new chaos in the Middle East."<sup>138</sup>

Wallace had been given an opportunity in his own country as well as abroad to present his views and to learn problems for many peoples:

In the space of two months I spoke in five countries and fourteen states to nearly 300,000 people face to face. More and more I reached the conclusions that I was speaking, not primarily as a citizen of the United States, but as one of millions of world citizens on behalf of a world program for reconstruction in which the help of the United States, Russia, and Britain is absolutely vital.

More and more I reached the conclusion that my supreme objective was to destroy the feeling that war between the United States and Russia was inevitable. Again and again I said I hoped that various types of socialism would succeed in Western Europe, communism in Russia, capitalist democracy in the United States, and that all three would live in peace with each other.<sup>139</sup>

Soon after Wallace returned to this country, he embarked upon a new phase of his career as the candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

---

<sup>138</sup>Wallace, "Palestine: the UN's Task," The New Republic, 15.

<sup>139</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 13.



## CHAPTER IV

## CANDIDATE OF THE PROGRESSIVE CITIZENS OF AMERICA

The political strength of Wallace seemed to be based on many factors. The New Dealers of the Administration tended to regard Wallace as the logical heir to Roosevelt. Wallace's championship of the "Century of the Common Man" had brought to his support Sidney Hillman and large segments of labor. Although Wallace had not materially supported Negro's cause as Secretary of Agriculture, most Negro leaders favored his candidacy.<sup>1</sup> Leftist independents seemed to have been drawn to him about the time of his mission to Asia in 1944. Most of his support appeared to come from New Dealers, labor, Negroes, independents, and leftists.

On the other hand, Wallace had lost other sources of political strength. He had alienated conservative leaders such as Jesse Jones, Cordell Hull, James Byrnes, and others. Further opposition to Wallace developed among the Democratic city bosses who prevented his renomination for the Vice-Presidency in 1944.<sup>2</sup> His continuance in the Cabinet revived his followers' hopes for his availability in 1948. These

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry Lee Moon, Balance of Power: The Negro Vote (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1948), p. 204.

<sup>2</sup>See page 28 of this manuscript.

hopes were weakened; however, by such factors as (1) his dismissal from the Cabinet, and (2) his difficulties with important political figures: Secretary Byrnes, Senator Vandenberg, Bernard Baruch, and others.

During his public career, Wallace had been approached on several occasions on the idea of forming a third party. One group which was most concerned in the formation of a third party and which advocated Wallace as a leader, was the Independent Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions. This liberal group was later expanded into the Progressive Citizens of America. The original committee reputedly had been formed in 1944 by Red agents working in the background. Louis Budenz, a one-time Communist worker, tells the story in his writing, Men Without Faces:<sup>3</sup>

The committee was created in my office in the Daily Worker, and largely at my instigation.

.....

Then I proposed that we capitalize on these 'gains' [success among the cultural classes] to strengthen the party's leadership among American intellectuals of all kinds. The best way, I suggested, would be to channel our present strength into a committee for the re-election of Mr. Roosevelt. Naturally, it would be completely under Red domination. We knew, of course, that the same Red professionals who had denounced the President as 'another Hitler' in 1940 could be counted on to cheer him now, if told to.

---

<sup>3</sup>Louis Francis Budenz, Men Without Faces (New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1950), pp. 219, 220, 221, 222, 268.

. . . the comrades on the Coast had persuaded Dr. Robert Sproul, president of the University of California to lend them the campus for meeting place and to let them use the University's name as a co-sponsor [sic] of the event. Under its win-the-war dress, the Congress had been successful--and a marked triumph for the party.

The Politburo was therefore eager to go ahead with the suggestion of our Daily Worker group. . . . We had some difficulty at first in deciding upon a chairman, the choice lying between a noted and handsome motion-picture actor and the man finally selected, Jo Davidson, the sculptor. The Politburo's decision in favor of Davidson rested on his 'long relationship with the Party, since the days on his friend, Lincoln Steffin.'

. . . . .

. . . As a start, they the party workers simply got in touch with small knots of Communists writers, artists, and scientists in New York and Hollywood. These men and women immediately asked others, friends and acquaintances, to join them on the Committee. Since the idea of supporting Roosevelt was in itself a popular one, an impressive list was soon run up. . . . Then an order in the name of the Politburo went out through our mail-drop system to every district organizer in the country, instructing them to mobilize their local cultural workers in like fashion.

As usual, the Communist leaders made sure that they had secret control of the apparatus of the organization. That meant having enough concealed Communists on the executive committee and in the key posts of the outfit to exercise directing power.

. . . . .

Eventually the Independent Committee went through a couple of transformations, to end up in the Progressive Citizens of America and finally the Progressive Party. But the special section of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was continued as an auxiliary, to be called upon for a big demonstrations when necessary.

. . . . .

Wallace, Budenz related though not a Communist, [had]

the unique distinction of having been directly chosen by the Kremlin to lead the 'progressive' political forces in this country. Not even the top men of the American Communist Party know what, if anything, happened during Wallace's visit to Siberia to cause the Kremlin to send urgent directives to this country that his political ambitions were to be supported.

Similarly, Budenz related that word from Moscow came to a meeting of the National Communist Board that they were to give all-out support to Wallace for the "Vice-Presidential nomination at the forthcoming Democratic National Convention (1944)."<sup>4</sup> The message had come through Gerhart Eisler, and was presented to a group of Communists leaders, among whom were Earl Browder, Eugene Dennis, Alexander Bittelman, well-known leftist leaders.

As far as I know, [wrote Budenz] Wallace was not told that he had been adopted as the darling of the comrades. There is no doubt, however, that the Communists did all in their power to see that Moscow's wishes were carried out. Nearly all the public sentiment which developed in favor of Wallace during the few weeks prior to the Democratic Convention of 1944 was fomented and organized by the Communists.<sup>5</sup>

On other occasions, Wallace was the recipient of Communist support or praise. The Communists, according to Budenz, worked for his confirmation as Secretary of Commerce.<sup>6</sup> In April of 1945, he was singled out for praise by Jacques

---

<sup>4</sup>Budenz, Men Without Faces, p. 269.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 271.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 272.

Duclos, the general secretary of the French Communist Party and known as the "voice of Moscow to the West."<sup>7</sup> "It is known [said Duclos] that the former Vice-President of the United States, Henry Wallace, had denounced their evil doings [American foreign policy] and their anti-national policy."<sup>8</sup> When the American comrades booed Wallace at Madison Square Garden, they were rebuked by Moscow. In Russia, Pravda, a Soviet newspaper, praised Wallace for "having detected and opposed America's 'imperialistic designs.'"<sup>9</sup>

In August, The United States News commenting on the "Communists' Shift within CIO," reported that a "third party is listed as a must for the 1948 presidential campaign" by the Communists.<sup>10</sup> They hoped "to rally all progressives and democrats' (small d), and all those who 'desire peace and are opposed to fascism.'" "This group," said The United States News, "includes the Wallace and labor forces, as well as Communist Party members."<sup>11</sup> The publication believed that "it is obvious that they expect Henry A. Wallace to

---

<sup>7</sup>Budenz, Men Without Faces, p. 272.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 272-73.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 273.

<sup>10</sup>"Communists' Shift within CIO," The United States News, XXIII (August 15, 1947), 19.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

lead a third party."<sup>12</sup>

At a meeting of the Progressive Citizens of America, held in Philadelphia on October 4, 1947, the board of directors criticized the Democratic Administration for betraying "the principals [sic] of Franklin Roosevelt," and predicted that such a leadership "will lead to disastrous defeat of the Democratic party in 1948 and victory for the Republic party, the main arm of reaction."<sup>13</sup> The PCA believed "the international situation has become even more critical," "prices have risen still further unchecked," and "civil liberties have even been more sharply curtailed."<sup>14</sup> "Millions of Americans," said the PCA, "will stay away from the polls if they are confronted with only a choice between two brands of reaction," whereas, "only if Mr. Wallace runs as an independent candidate will they have a choice."<sup>15</sup>

Early in December, 1947, the PCA began to urge Wallace to make the race for president. The executive board of the organization extended such an invitation to Wallace, anticipating a confirmation of their board of directors

---

<sup>12</sup>"Communists' Shift within CIO," The United States News, 19.

<sup>13</sup>The New York Times, December 17, 1947.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

meeting in January. Once the matter had been confirmed, they said, the Progressive Citizens would call for a nominating convention of a "Progressive Party," to be named at a later date. The New York Times commented on the movement:

It is regarded generally as being well to the left of the political spectrum, and if it follows the third party path, will go into the 1948 campaign without the support of the CIO and other union groups that backed the Roosevelt candidacy in 1944.<sup>16</sup>

The action of the executive committee in supporting Wallace as the candidate in a third party movement lost Wallace the support of men who otherwise would have backed him. Among these were: Jack Kroll, Chairman of the CIO; Louis Hollander, Chairman of the New York State CIO; Jacob Polofsky, President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; A. E. Whitney, President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; and Walter Reuther, Chief of the United Auto Workers. Reuther commented as follows:

I think Henry is a lost soul. He is a great disappointment to many decent people in America. People who are not sympathetic with democracy in America are influencing him. Communists perform the most complete valet service in the world. They write your speeches, they do your thinking for you, they provide you with applause and they inflate your ego as often as necessary.

I am afraid that's the trouble with Henry Wallace.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>The New York Times, December 17, 1947.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., December 19, 1947.

Another critic of Wallace, Alec Rose, President of the American Liberal Party, declared that:

The decision of the PCA to run Mr. Wallace for President was the direct result of the failure of the Council of Foreign Ministers in London, and that the Communists' fight against President Truman and the Marshall plan was being transferred to the United States.<sup>18</sup>

"The PCA movement for a third ticket," said Rose, "is not a genuine attempt for a third national party movement but an attempt of political extortion."<sup>19</sup> Rose believed that "the third ticket will be the fifth column in action and will meet with the opposition of the entire American labor movement," and "complete the disaffiliation of American liberals and the progressives from every organization dominated by the Communists."<sup>20</sup>

On the other hand, delegations called on Wallace in his New Republic office to urge him to run for President on a third ticket. A delegation from Massachusetts PCA brought a resolution, which read in part:

The enemies of American democracy have secured control over the two old parties in this country. When the last shred of the Roosevelt influence in this country has been torn away, it is time to rally around the man who for millions of Americans has come to mean democracy, security and peace.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>The New York Times, December 18, 1947.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., December 19, 1947.



Other groups came to Wallace unofficially: students from colleges and universities of New York City, PCA members from New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and representatives from labor unions all requesting him to run for President on a third party ticket.

Likewise, the Daily Worker approved of Wallace and commented that "a contest between President Truman and Senator Robert A. Taft, General Dwight D. Eisenhower or Governor E. Dewey would be a 'cynical heads-I-win-tails-you-lose skin game for the entire American electorate!'"<sup>22</sup> Moreover, it continued, "Wallace alone among the possible candidates speaks for the interests of the common man and a democratic America," the editorial declared.<sup>23</sup>

As the sentiment for Wallace's candidacy grew, he remained silent on his plans. On December 23, 1947, Governor M. E. Thompson of Georgia made a statement "that he had 'positive information' from Washington that Mr. Wallace would announce next Monday as third party candidate."<sup>24</sup> "He termed it the action 'ill-advised and ill-considered' and predicted President Truman's re-election."<sup>25</sup> This statement

---

<sup>22</sup>The New York Times, December 19, 1947.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., December 3, 1947.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

was followed two days later by Wallace's announcement that he would state his own views on the election of 1948 on Monday night, December 29, 1947, over the Mutual network from Chicago.

On December 25, Michael Straight, the publisher of The New Republic announced that "Henry A. Wallace will cease to be editor of The New Republic magazine when and if he becomes a candidate for President on a third-party ticket;" in addition, Straight said, "The New Republic 'will not be the organ of a third party.'"<sup>26</sup> On December 28, dissension developed in the staff of The New Republic. William Harlan Hale, editor in charge of articles, resigned, having tried and failed to get the magazine to dissociate itself completely from Wallace's campaign. Hale pointed out that "if the magazine planned to open its pages to Mr. Wallace, even as a contributing editor, it would give the impression of a 'virtual endorsement' of the candidacy." "Such a show of sympathy," he declared, "could not be construed otherwise."<sup>27</sup>

On Friday, December 26, 1947, Senator J. Howard McGrath, National Chairman of the Democratic Party, said that "the Administration would welcome Henry Wallace's support in the 1948 election, but will not change its policies

---

<sup>26</sup>The New York Times, December 25, 1947.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., December 28, 1947.

to win it."<sup>28</sup> "He [Wallace] is acting as a free citizen," said McGrath, "and has a perfect right to follow such a course as he feels is to his own interest."<sup>29</sup>

From the beginning of the third party venture of Wallace, it seemed that disavowal came from labor groups because it was difficult to see a genuine demand for a third party and because the party was thought to be dominated by leftist influence.

December announcement. While Wallace was in Tulsa for an address to a Negro fraternity on December 28, 1947, the Chicago Sun expressed its views on the situation as follows:

Henry Wallace will make a serious mistake if he accepts the third party nomination for President. There could be times and circumstances when third party strategy promised to advance the progressive cause. . . . But in the circumstances of today, a national third party futilely bidding for the presidency would not advance but set back the principles which Mr. Wallace believes in.

Surely he must recognize, that, while the threat of a third party may have some usefulness in pulling administration policy toward the progressive side, the actuality of it this year, in advance of the conventions, would inevitably encourage the Republicans to nominate their most conservative candidate.<sup>30</sup>

On Wallace's arrival in Chicago prior to his promised

---

<sup>28</sup>The New York Times, December 26, 1947.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Chicago Sun, December 29, 1947.

broadcast, he was met by delegations from 18 states and the District of Columbia. In a closed meeting held at the Knickerbocker Hotel, Wallace was asked to run for President in the 1948 campaign, sponsored by the newly organized Progressive Citizens of America. In the address, originating from Chicago, Wallace answered their request affirmatively.

Wallace's address, delivered Monday, December 29, 1947, was entitled "I Shall Run in 1948;" he presented his political position as follows:

Everywhere in the United States today, among farmers, workers, small businessmen and professional men and women, I find confusion, uncertainty and fear. The people do not ask 'will there be another war'--but 'when will the war come?'

.....

Peace and abundance means so much to me that I have said at a dozen press conferences and in many speeches when asked about a third party, 'if the Democratic party continues to be a party of war and depression, I will see to it that the people have a chance to vote for peace and prosperity.' To those who have come to me asking the conditions of my adherence to the present Democratic administration, I have said, 'let the administration repudiate universal military training and rid itself of the Wall Street military team that is leading us toward war.'

I have insisted that the Democratic administration curb the ever-growing power and profits and monopoly and take concrete steps to preserve the living standards of the American people. I have demanded that the Democratic administration cease its attacks on the civil liberties of Americans. In speeches in the North and in the South at non-segregated meetings I have stated the simple truth that segregation and discrimination of any kind or character have no place in America.

My terms to the Democratic high command have been

well known. By their actions and finally by their words, they have said--'Henry Wallace, we welcome your support but we will not change our policies.'

In answering me, the Democratic leadership also gave its answer to millions of Americans who demand the right to vote for peace and prosperity. Thus, the leadership of the Democratic party would deprive the American people of their rightful opportunity to choose between progress and reaction in 1948. As far as the Republican party is concerned there is no hope--as George Norris, Fiorello La Guardia, and Wendell Willkie long ago found out.

When the old parties rot, the people have a right to be heard through a New Party. . . .

The lukewarm liberals sitting on two chairs say, 'why throw away your vote?' I say a vote for a new party in 1948 will be the most valuable vote you ever have cast or ever will cast. The bigger the peace vote in 1948, the more definitely the world will know that the United States is not behind the bi-partisan reactionary war policy which is dividing the world into two armed camps and making inevitable the day when American soldiers will be lying in their Arctic suits in the Russian snow.

. . . . .

A New Party must stand for a positive youth program of abundance and security, not scarcity and war. We can prevent depression and war if we only organize for peace in the same comprehensive way we organize for war.

. . . . .

Today there is a greater menace then ever before--a menace more serious than has ever confronted the human race.

That menace can be met and overcome only be a new political alignment in America which requires the organization of a new political party.

To that end I announce tonight that I shall run as an independent candidate for President of the United States in 1948.

. . . . .

We face the future unfettered--unfettered by any principle but the general welfare. We owe no allegiance to any group which does not serve that welfare. By God's grace, the people's peace will usher in the century of the common man<sup>31</sup>

In the address, Wallace set the groundwork for the slogan of "Peace, Freedom, and Abundance," which later became the slogan of the new party. Finally, Wallace charted the course of the new party against the two older parties which he characterized as having the same reactionary thought.

Comments on Wallace's announcement soon appeared. The Chicago Daily News carried remarks from Paul R. Leach, its Washington correspondent: "By announcing his third party presidential candidacy, Henry A. Wallace has dumped a carload of scrap iron in the path of Harry S. Truman's Democratic re-election special. It is Mr. Truman's biggest obstacle."<sup>32</sup> On the same subject, the News said editorially on December 30:

In anticipation of Mr. Wallace's announcement, Truman Democrats have been seeking solace for several weeks. They have found some, but it is slim picking. They definitely don't like the picture.

They say the Wallace candidacy, whooped up by the Communist Daily Worker, permits Mr. Truman to forget the extreme left wing that went into the Democratic party for Roosevelt. The Republicans have been linking Mr. Truman's party with the Communists.

---

<sup>31</sup>Henry A. Wallace, "I Shall Run in 1948," Vital Speeches, XIV (January 1, 1948), 172-74.

<sup>32</sup>The Chicago Daily News, December 30, 1947.

Top leaders of organized labor have been shying away from the Wallace movement, saying they are for Mr. Truman. But political analysts here say that while Mr. Truman can forget the lefties and the Communist vote, he will have to go all out for labor from now on to hold the labor vote in line.

.....

New Dealers have been rallying to Mr. Truman lately. Senator Pepper who was counted on for a while to be Wallace's running mate, has said he would have none of the third party.<sup>33</sup>

On December 31, the News said that "actually the record shows him [Wallace] to be the worst qualified intellectually and temperamentally of any who are seeking office. Instability and irresponsibility, compounded with a naive good will and bewildered sincerity, are his outstanding traits."<sup>34</sup> "Wallace assumes," said the News, "that if war comes it will be our fault." "He assumes we have the power to prevent it by yielding to Soviet policy all over the world."<sup>35</sup>

The Chicago Daily Tribune thought that Wallace's candidacy would make Taft's nomination by the Republicans more likely as Wallace, by mobilizing the left wing Democrats, had "dealt a body blow not only to the candidacy of President Truman in the 1948 election but to the aspirations of Governor Dewey of New York to the Republican nomination for

---

<sup>33</sup>The Chicago Daily News, December 30, 1947.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., December 31, 1947.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

President."<sup>36</sup> The Tribune believed "that a split in the Democratic party, particularly in New York, Illinois, Michigan, California, and Washington, could easily defeat the President;" on the other hand, "Democrats contended that the left-wing candidacy of Wallace [would] tend to solidify conservative Democrats behind Truman and attract enough independent Republicans to assure him of the election."<sup>37</sup> The Daily Worker commented:

Every honest American must know that the Truman Democratic party and the Taft-Dewey GOP are at bottom a single party, united on the same platform of reaction, profiteering and war.

Wallace's declaration should be studied for what it is--a historic challenge to a vast and sinister conspiracy against the true interests of the United States. . .<sup>38</sup>

Clarence Brown, a Taft political supporter, said: "While I have been confident that the Republican candidate for President would be elected next November, the candidacy of Mr. Wallace assures Mr. Truman's defeat."<sup>39</sup> Republican National Chairman Reece assessed the situation from a Republican viewpoint as follows: "The Moscow wing of the Democrat party has now parted company from the Pendergast wing."<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup>The Chicago Daily Tribune, December 31, 1947.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>The New York Times, December 30, 1947.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid.

<sup>40</sup>The Chicago Daily Tribune, December 31, 1947.



Democratic National Chairman McGrath commented the motive of Wallace was "to defeat the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States, which can have only one effect, namely-- a victory for the Communist foreign policy of Russia."<sup>41</sup>

James Roosevelt saw the announcement "as bringing closer to reality 'the dangers in a return to power of the Republican party.'<sup>42</sup> Senator Wayne Morse thought the announcement would not "materially affect either the Republican or Democratic campaigns of 1948 or their outcomes."<sup>43</sup>

By a statement, made after his address to a press conference, Wallace indicated "that if either of the major parties became 'a peace party' he would withdraw his name as Presidential aspirant."<sup>44</sup> Before leaving for Milwaukee, Wallace said "that he had no running mate, no definite plans for getting on the ballot in any state, and headed a party without name."<sup>45</sup> It would seem that his remarks could be interpreted to mean that he still hoped to sway the course of action taken by the old parties.

After his Milwaukee speaking engagement, Wallace

---

<sup>41</sup>The New York Times, December 30, 1947.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid.

<sup>45</sup>The Chicago Daily News, December 30, 1947.

returned to his East Salem home in New York for a rest after post-announcement activities. Over a thousand persons sent Wallace telegrams and letters encouraging him in this new role. From his home Wallace issued a statement to the press on January 5, 1948, "inviting supporters and others interested to write him regarding regional, State and local issues."<sup>46</sup>

The Wallace announcement caused dissension in the ranks of labor. The New York Board of the CIO called on all of the CIO unions to quit the American Labor Party if it endorsed Henry A. Wallace in his third party candidacy.<sup>47</sup> At the same time, the board endorsed the Marshall Plan and denounced the attack of Wallace on it. Within a CIO board meeting held early in January, 1948, it became evident that the labor parties believed the support came from the Communists and for that reason were opposed to him as Presidential candidate. Because of their opposition to Wallace, Blumberg, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and Chapman, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, resigned as Executive Vice-Chairman and Treasurer of the American Labor Party. Blumberg was

---

<sup>46</sup>The New York Times, January 5, 1948.

<sup>47</sup>The American Labor Party was formed by Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, in 1936. Composed of New York socialist workers, it provided a means to support Roosevelt without allegiance to Tammany Hall.

replaced by Vito Marcantonio, a pro-Wallace, New York City politician. By January 9, the CIO repudiated Wallace further by sending letters to all local union affiliates stating that the American Labor Party was no longer the "political arm" of the New York CIO.<sup>48</sup>

Meanwhile, the AFL, following the path of the CIO, disavowed the candidacy of Wallace, also. In the AFL Executive Council meeting, it was charged that Wallace was a "front spokesman" and "apologist" for the Communists.<sup>49</sup> A. E. Whitney, Chairman of the Railroad Brotherhood, likewise repudiated Wallace. On the other hand, there were labor leaders who were favorable to Wallace. Among these were: Albert Fitzgerald, United Electrical and Radio Workers Union; Harry Bridges, International Longshoremen and Warehousemen Union; and Hugh Bryson, Marine Cooks and Stewards.<sup>50</sup> Lee Pressman, who had served under Wallace in the Department of Agriculture, resigned his post as general counsel for the CIO to support Wallace. It seemed, however, that although the leadership of the labor unions were actively opposed to Wallace, he had in the early part of 1948 the support of many individual members of labor organizations.

---

<sup>48</sup>The New York Times, January 10, 1948.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., February 3, 1948.

<sup>50</sup>All these unions were CIO affiliates.

As the labor support for Wallace dwindled, he was endorsed by several Red rallies. William Foster, the National Chairman of the Communist Party, told his followers "that millions of Americans believe that 'the Wallace movement is the one movement that has the possibility to put a halt to this drive toward a new war.'"<sup>51</sup> Foster pictured the new party as capable of arousing "millions of passive voters" and of drawing "'heavily' on the Negro voter, the foreign-born, especially in agricultural areas, and primarily on those 'disgusted with Truman and the Democratic ticket.'"<sup>52</sup>

On February 23, 1948, the Daily Worker announced that Glen H. Taylor of Idaho would be Wallace's running mate. Taylor's statement appeared the next day as follows:

Now I will be free to fight this bipartisan coalition and all its works: Taft-Hartley, universal military training, the drive toward war, high prices and racial discrimination, and suppressed civil liberties.<sup>53</sup>

The source from which the news appeared tended to confirm the belief that the Wallace party was under leftist influence.

After the Wallace announcement, the progressive

---

<sup>51</sup>The New York Times, January 15, 1948.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., February 24, 1948.

forces became active as they organized their party in twenty-six states. Within the Progressive Party organization, C. B. Baldwin served as campaign manager, while Jo Davidson and Rexford Tugwell served as co-chairmen of the National-Wallace-for-President-Committee. Lee Pressman, who resigned as General Counsel of CIO, and John Abt, who took a leave from the position of General Counsel of the Amalgamated Workers, became important leaders in the Progressive movement. The New York State Committee of Progressives, which tended to dominate the initial movement, was composed of Louis Untermeyer, Mark Van Doren, James Waterman Wise, Leo Isacson, and Vito Marcantonio. In many other states, Progressives were engaged in securing signatures to place the Wallace ticket on their state ballots. To further the Progressive's cause, Negroes were encouraged to appear on ballots in Brooklyn, Chicago, Cleveland, St. Louis, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Los Angeles, and Harlem. Moreover, a schedule for state conventions was set up in six states: Pennsylvania, Illinois, Connecticut, Missouri, Wisconsin, Louisiana, and New York. As the organization grew, plans were made for a national founding convention to be held in Philadelphia in July, to be made up of some 2,531 delegates. Progressive enthusiasts prophesied the party would poll five million votes in 1948, and they would appear on the ballot in forty-five states. On the progressive activity, The New

York Times commented as follows:

The principle strength of the PCA today appears to be in large industrial areas. Its present strongholds are in New York, Illinois, and California. It is gaining ground in the Northwest, New England and among the newly industrialized communities of the South.<sup>54</sup>

Financially, the Progressives had finished the year of 1947 with a deficit of two thousand dollars, compared with a gross income of \$421,000. Of this amount, Wallace had raised half the income by his addresses during the year. The policy of charging admission to Wallace's political meetings was continued in hope that a million dollars might be raised by this means. The party hoped to raise another million from left-wing union sources; the party hoped for large donations from the theatrical and entertainment fields. "Although Wallace was himself a millionaire," said The New York Times, he was not expected to advance money for the campaign as "Wallace [was] noted for his careful personal spending."<sup>55</sup> One of the most important figures for raising money for the Wallace-for-President movement was Mrs. Elinor Gimbel of New York, who served as the head of the women's division for the progressives. Many donations were received at dinner meetings held to promote the candidacy of Wallace. By all these means, Wallace backers hoped to raise three million

---

<sup>54</sup>The New York Times, January 25, 1948.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., February 2, 1948.

dollars for the campaign.

In addition to the problem of raising funds, the Progressive movement became subject to various attempts at petty persecution. The Greater Council of the CIO charged that the left-wing CIO locals were subject to successive visits of FBI agents during the month of March, seemingly to curtail their political activity on behalf of Wallace.<sup>56</sup> Wallace was booed by a group of five-hundred veterans in the Red Hook section of Brooklyn on April 1, 1948. The audience used such phrases as "You can have him--we don't want him--he's too Red for us," "Down with Wallace," and "Send him back to Russia."<sup>57</sup> Paul Robeson and Wallace were denied rooms in an Indianapolis hotel.<sup>58</sup> Two Oklahoma girls, active in getting Negro citizens to sign Wallace petitions, were arrested.<sup>59</sup> A customs official was said to have broken deliberately an egg sent from Denmark for breeding purposes.<sup>60</sup> Wallace's running mate, Senator Glen Taylor, was arrested and convicted in Alabama for disorderly conduct. The New York Times related that the "charge against the Vice-Presidential

---

<sup>56</sup>The New York Times, February 27, 1948.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., April 1, 1948.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., April 20, 1948.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid.

candidate on Henry Wallace's third party ticket resulted from his efforts last Saturday to enter a church through an entrance set aside for Negroes."<sup>61</sup> Taylor tried to force his way in past a policeman, and this resulted in a brawl involving some half dozen policemen. As a result, Taylor was fined fifty dollars and costs and sentenced to one hundred-eighty days in the city jail; however, the sentence was suspended and Taylor placed on probation for six months. Nevertheless, the "Police Court Judge Oliver Hall gave the Senator a tongue-lashing for introducing the racial issue into the case."<sup>62</sup> On May 17, 1948, C. B. Baldwin, Wallace's campaign manager, engaged in "harsh words and near fist-cuffs" as the California reporters accused the Progressive candidate of "giving the Beverley Hills audience 'a different story' from what he had given to an open Negro gathering in the afternoon."<sup>63</sup> These with many other similar incidents led Wallace to charge: "Today the United States is operating under a pseudo-two-party system which is proceeding with frightening speed toward that preliminary type of police state which smiles on unofficial violence from the Right."<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup>The New York Times, May 5, 1948.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., May 17, 1948.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., April 20, 1948.



Another form of persecution, from the Wallace interpretation, was the increased public censure of the Communists prior to the 1948 election. The House Un-American Activities Committee had uncovered a great amount of evidence against the Communists in the United States. Their charges were that the Communists had tried to control labor unions and had spread propaganda for the over-throw of the government by force. They had carried on much of this work through Communist front organizations. On May 19, 1948, Congress passed the Mundt-Nixon Communist control bill to cope with the difficulty.<sup>65</sup> In addition, the Supreme Court upheld the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law which required all union members to sign anti-Communist affidavits.

Surprisingly, Wallace, who denied the Communists by words by not deeds, came to their defense. To counteract the activity against the Communists, Wallace asserted the Mundt-Nixon Bill was "an offensive act in 'the cold war' against Russia."<sup>66</sup> "Its sponsors," declared Wallace, "were

---

<sup>65</sup>The Mundt-Nixon bill would make it a crime punishable by ten years' imprisonment and loss of citizenship to attempt to establish a foreign controlled totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. The Communist Party was required to register with the Attorney General as were the Communist front organizations. In addition, they were required to file financial reports and to name their leaders as well.

<sup>66</sup>The New York Times, May 30, 1948.

'warmongers, fearmongers and hatemongers' who in history would stand as 'American counterparts of Mussolini and Hitler.'"<sup>67</sup> In speaking to 8,500 people at the Cow Palace in San Francisco, Wallace continued his attack, charging "that the real instigators of the cold war were international big business, monopolists and 'hugely rich' American corporations."<sup>68</sup> "It has been less a war against Russia, he said, "than a war against the American people; less of a war against communism than a war against democracy."<sup>69</sup> Wallace charged further:

- (1) This war's objectives . . . are to burden the United States people with inflation, strip us of civil liberties and undermine our trade unions.
- (2) Overseas . . . the cold war had meant support for kings, fascists and reactionaries; here at home it had meant an all-out attack on civil liberties, trade unions, individual enterprises and the living standards of the American people.
- (3) The initial victories of the 'monopolists' were the removal of price controls, the attack of free speech in the 'incredible star chamber proceedings of the House Un-American Committee,' and the 'offensive against labor barricaded behind the Taft-Hartley law.'<sup>70</sup>

The most serious set-back to the Communists came in July when top ranking Communists were indicted by a Federal

---

<sup>67</sup>The New York Times, May 30, 1948.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., May 19, 1948.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

grand jury in the New York City on charges of teaching the violent overthrow of the United States Government in violation of the Alien Registration Act of 1940. This group was composed of William Z. Foster, Chairman of the Communist Party; Eugene Dennis, Secretary; Ralph J. Davis, New York City Council Member; and John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, et al. Many of this group had made active plans to attend the Progressive Convention.

To summarize Progressive activity prior to the founding convention, Wallace's candidacy seemed to attract left-wingers but to alienate important labor groups. The old parties had been attacked by the Progressives as reactionary; on the other hand, a haven for disgruntled voters was offered by the new party. In the political scene, the undetermined strength of the third party offered a real threat to the established parties.

Philadelphia Progressive Convention. Preparations went forward for the Progressive Convention of July 24, 1948, as the rival parties' conventions became history. The Republicans met in Philadelphia, June 21-25, and nominated the ticket of Thomas Dewey and Earl Warren. The Democratic Convention followed on July 12-16, and nominated Harry Truman and Alben Barkley. Another group, the Southern Democrats held their convention in Birmingham on July 23, 1948, and

nominated J. Storm Thurmond and Fielding Wright.

The Progressives opened their convention preliminaries with a meeting on July 20, of their seventy-four member platform committee, headed by Rexford Tugwell. This committee planned a two-day period of open hearings on the platform preparatory to the regular convention, which was to open officially on Friday, July 23, 1948. Plans were formulated to have the nominations of Wallace and Taylor take place on Saturday at Shibe Park.<sup>71</sup> Finally, the plans called for the official adoption of the platform on Sunday, July 25, 1948.

By July 21, a tentative draft of the platform was reported by Chairman Tugwell, and its title, "Peace, Freedom, and Abundance," announced. While the platform hearings were continuing through night and day, Tugwell announced a foreign plank, committed to dropping the Marshall Plan and advocating a negotiated settlement with the Soviet. Also, during the Committee meetings, Edgar Brown, a Washington Negro leader urged that the Convention be moved to Washington to march on the forthcoming session of Congress in order to pressure it into enacting a Civil Rights program.

On July 22, the platform became involved in an angry

---

<sup>71</sup>Departing from the customary procedure, the plans called for an admission charge ranging from sixty cents to two dollars and sixty cents, which would be used to defray campaign and convention expenses.

debate. Groups of independent New Dealers "wanted the platform (1) to demonstrate its independence of Communism and totalitarianism, (2) to support the European Program, and (3) to condemn all police states whether they were found in Mississippi or Russia. James Loeb, Jr., an Americans for Democratic Action leader, charged that "Communists and their collaborators guide the major policies and word the major pronouncements of the party."<sup>72</sup> The New York Times reported that Dr. Tugwell said in reply that,

The Americans for Democratic Action had resorted to 'unscrupulous and demagogic denunciation' and appeared to be getting ready to endorse Governor E. Dewey since it already had denounced both President Truman and Mr. Wallace and had failed to persuade General Dwight D. Eisenhower to seek the Presidency.<sup>73</sup>

Any disavowal of the Communist support and influence by the Progressives could not be obtained. Wallace, arriving in Philadelphia on July 24, "repeated his assertion that he would not repudiate any support which came to him on the basis of interest in peace, including Communist support."<sup>74</sup> Wallace admitted that: "I am getting a lot [Communist support] and there is no question that this is a liability."<sup>75</sup> Clarifying his position further, Wallace was quoted by The

---

<sup>72</sup>The New York Times, July 23, 1948.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., July 24, 1948.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

New York Times as follows:

I will not repudiate any support which comes to me on the basis of interest in peace. The Communists are interested in peace because they want a successful Socialist experiment in Russia.

I am interested in peace because I want our American system to demonstrate the enormous vitality of which it is capable, that vitality which is being wasted in preparations for war. If, during the war, we had accepted the idea that you can't work with Communists, we might not have succeeded in our joint effort to stop Hitler.

If you accept the idea that Communists have no right to express their opinions, then you don't believe in democracy, and if you accept the notion that it is impossible to live in a world with sharply differing ideas, then you accept the inevitability of war. I don't believe in the inevitability of war, I do believe in democracy.<sup>76</sup>

Regarding the indictment of the top Reds, Wallace censured the Truman Administration for using it as an effort to create fear in order to remain in power. Consequently, he felt that Americans had more fear from the suppression of political freedom than from the teaching of Communism. He accused the Administration of timing its Red scares to silence opposition to the bipartisan get-tough foreign policy. Wallace regarded the defense of civil rights of Communists as the first line in the defense of the liberties of democratic people. Finally, Wallace believed that the Courts would eventually find the Smith Act, under which the

---

<sup>76</sup>The New York Times, July 24, 1948.

Communists were indicted, unconstitutional.<sup>77</sup>

As the platform Committee in their stormy session completed their work, the Convention opened with Elmer A. Benson, the former Governor of Minnesota, calling the meeting to order. After Josiah W. Gitt, Pennsylvania, welcomed the delegates, he was followed by a symposium of nine speakers evaluating the founding of the new party.<sup>78</sup> Katharine Van Orden, New Jersey, who spoke for women, attacked the ending of price controls. Shirley Graham, New York, who spoke for the Negroes, attacked the abuses of Jim Crowism. Philip Morrison, Cornell University atomic physicist, spoke for science, and presented the dangers of a world where the small military minds and the atom would try to co-exist. Olin Downes, music critic for The New York Times, who spoke for the Arts, criticized the conspiracy in high places and the blacklisting of the artists. Walter Johnson, who spoke for the farmers, feared that the security, enjoyed by the farmers under Wallace and the New Deal, might disappear. Miles Pennybacker, Connecticut, who spoke for business,

---

<sup>77</sup>According to Baldwin, Recent American History, p. 716, this act made it a crime (1) to advocate the forcible seizure, overthrow, or destruction of any government in the United States; (2) to engage in the dissemination of such doctrines in printed form; and (3) to organize or belong to any society which advocated such doctrines.

<sup>78</sup>The New York Times, July 24, 1948.

thought the interests of big businessmen were opposed to little businessmen. Harold Horn, New Hampshire, portrayed the veterans' disillusionment that they did not find peace, but a cold war. Archie O'Neill, West Virginia, who spoke for youth, criticized the old parties for fooling the public too long.

The regular order of the convention was interrupted to secure the most favorable radio time for the keynote address. Hence, this address followed Mr. Downes' remarks to the convention. The honor of making the keynote address went to Charles P. Howard, a Des Moines Negro lawyer, who felt that he had achieved human dignity for the first time in being chosen to make the address. Howard's address emphasized that the voter's choice in the 1948 election was either "Wallace or War."<sup>79</sup>

Leo Isacson, who represented the party's first victory in the New York Bronx by-election, made a plea for the Jewish vote. "I charge that Great Britain and the United States," said Isacson, "have to extend the United Nations' truce in order to gain time, for the Truman Administration does not want to commit itself to an open anti-Jewish policy at this time, at least not until election day."<sup>80</sup> Isacson thought

---

<sup>79</sup>The New York Times, July 24, 1947.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.



that once the election was over they "would commence the affair of making Israel submit to Anglo-American tutelage," and "this would happen whether Truman or his Republican counterpart wins."<sup>81</sup>

In the afternoon session, the Convention proceeded to the business of nominating the Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates. Fred Stover, the head of the Iowa Farmers' Union, nominated Wallace. This was seconded by Mrs. Elinor Gimbel and all State delegations except South Dakota, whose delegation was at home getting signatures for placing the new party on the ballot. On the motion of Mrs. Charlotte Bass, California, Wallace was nominated for President by acclamation. On the roll call for nomination of a candidate for Vice-President, Alabama yielded to Georgia. Larkin Marshall, a Macon newspaper publisher, placed the name of Senator Taylor in nomination. The temper of the afternoon session of the Convention seemed against hearing many additional speeches; hence, Taylor as Wallace was nominated by acclamation.

Wallace's acceptance address was given at ten o'clock, P.M., in Shibe Park on Saturday, July 24, 1948. It reiterated many of the ideas Wallace had presented in his pre-convention addresses: the nostalgic New Deal days of

---

<sup>81</sup>The New York Times, July 24, 1947.

Roosevelt, the ability of Roosevelt and Wallace to keep the peace--when others failed, criticism of bipartisan foreign and domestic policies, and censure of Truman for abandoning the New Deal policies. Wallace compared the Progressives of 1948 to the party led by Lincoln in 1860, saying:

But we here tonight--we of the Progressive party--we here dedicate ourselves to the complete fulfillment of Lincoln's promise; we consecrate ourselves to a second emancipation; an emancipation that will achieve for the Negro and all Americans of every race, creed, and national origin a full, free, and complete citizenship everywhere here in these United States.<sup>82</sup>

He compared himself to Jefferson saying, that Communist slander charge was similar to French Revolutionists' slander charge of Jefferson's day. Wallace dealt with the Berlin crisis saying:

In all earnestness, I assure you that if I were president, there would be no crisis in Berlin today. I assure you that without sacrificing a single American principle of public interest, we would have found agreement long before now with the Soviet Government, and with other wartime allies.<sup>83</sup>

As the address continued, Wallace stated:

Germany will be the core of every world crisis until we have come to an agreement with the Soviet Union. We have been manoeuvred into a policy whose specific purpose had been this, and only this: namely, to revive the power of the industrialists and cartelists who heiled Hitler and financed his fascism, and who were the well-spring of his war chest.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup>The New York Times, July 25, 1948.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid.

Wallace accepted the nomination "with pride" and committed himself to place human rights above property rights, to negotiate with Russia; to select men for Cabinet posts whose private interests do not conflict with public interests; to build and strengthen the United Nations; to use power to help backward peoples--not exploit them; to plan production for peace; to fight injunctions against labor; to lick inflation by stopping the cold war; to lift fear from the citizens; to advance the programs for agriculture; and to use science for all men to enjoy.

In the final session held Sunday, July 25, 1948, attempts made by Vermont and Pennsylvania delegates to put the Convention on record as being unwilling to give a blanket endorsement of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, was shouted down.<sup>85</sup> Such efforts were denounced as an "insinuation against a friendly ally of the United States" and a "compromise with the 'smear campaign of red baiting'" attributed to the current anti-Soviet hysteria.<sup>86</sup> The New York Times reported the following action of the convention:

So sensitive were the delegates to every change in

---

<sup>85</sup>In addressing the Progressive Convention of 1950, Wallace said he regretted the failure to support the delegates from Vermont and Pennsylvania. Other Progressives censured Wallace for his failure to wrest control of the convention from the Communists.

<sup>86</sup>The New York Times, July 26, 1948.

the Communist line that it took one action today [July 26] which served to put it on the side of the Communist Information Bureau in its conflict with Marshall Tito, leader of the Yugoslav state.

As made public yesterday, the proposed platform favored a 'unified homeland' for the Macedonian peoples, now dispersed in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania and that part of Greece now under the control of General Markos' rebel army. That is a plan favored by Marshall Tito, whose country includes the majority of Macedonians.

There was a sudden flurry when this platform text was released, and today the committee secretary, Lee Pressman, went before convention to announce that the group had eliminated its own reference to Macedonia.<sup>87</sup>

Pressure within the Convention to disavow the Communists failed in many instances; however, it was able to change the foreign policy plank to read as follows:

Beyond an effective United Nations lies the further responsibility of genuine world government. Responsibility for ending the tragic prospect of war is the joint responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States.<sup>88</sup>

Thus the plank made the Soviet share the responsibility for peace rather than United States alone as in the original plank.

This last session was characterized by frequent attempts by the permanent Chairman Albert J. Fitzgerald to

---

<sup>87</sup>The New York Times, July 26, 1948.

<sup>88</sup>Progressive Platform Committee, Peace, Freedom, and Abundance, The Platform of the Progressive Party as Adopted at the Founding Convention, Philadelphia, July 23-25, 1948 (New York: Progressive Platform Committee, 1948), p. 6.

limit debate. These failed and the delegates seemingly spent a great amount of time giving their approval to policies embodied in a platform--already agreed upon by their leaders.

Communists and platform adoption. The Progressive Platform, issued by the Platform Committee caused The New York Times to comment:

It was possible today to compare the new Progressive platform with the proposed text of the Communist platform as it was published May 30 in The New York Daily Worker and it was found that every specific point recommended by Mr. Foster and his associates won approval in this convention.<sup>89</sup>

The Platform<sup>90</sup> of the Progressives as approved by the Founding Convention attacked the old parties in the following manner:

The American people want peace. But the old parties, obedient to the dictates of monopoly and the military, prepare for war in the name of peace.

They refuse to negotiate a settlement of differences with the Soviet Union.

They reject the United Nations as an instrument for promoting world peace and reconstruction.

They use the Marshall Plan to rebuild Nazi Germany as a war base and to subjugate the economies of other European countries to American Big Business.

They finance and arm corrupt, fascists governments in China, Greece, Turkey and elsewhere, through the Truman Doctrine, wasting billions in American resources

---

<sup>90</sup>Progressive Platform Committee, Peace, Freedom, and Abundance, pp. 1-4.

and squandering America's heritage as the enemy of despotism.

They encircle the globe with military bases which other peoples cannot but view as threats to their freedom and security.

They protect the war-making industrial and financial barons of Nazi Germany and imperial Japan, and restore them to power.

They stockpile atomic bombs.

They pass legislation to admit displaced persons, discriminating against Catholics, Jews, and other victims of Hitler.

They impose a peacetime draft and move toward Universal Military training.

They fill policy-making positions in government with generals and Wall Street bankers.

Peace cannot be won--but profits can--by spending ever-increasing billions of the people's money in war preparations.

Yet these are the policies of the two old parties--policies profaning the name of peace.

Next, the Progressive Party declared its principles to be:

The Progressive Party is born in the deep conviction that the national wealth and natural resources of our country belong to the people who inhabit it and must be employed in their behalf; that freedom and opportunity must be secured equally to all; that the brotherhood of man can be achieved and the scourge of war ended.

The Progressive Party holds that basic to the organization of world peace is a return to the purpose of Franklin Roosevelt to seek areas of international agreement rather than disagreement. It was his conviction that within the framework of the United Nations different social and economic systems can and must live together. If peace is to be achieved capitalistic United States and communistic Russia must establish good relations and work together.

.....

The Progressive Party believes that only through peaceful understanding can the world make progress toward reconstruction and higher standards of living; that peace is the essential condition for safeguarding and extending our traditional freedoms; that only by preserving liberty and by planning abundant life for all can we eliminate the sources of world conflict. Peace, freedom, and abundance--the goals of the Progressive Party--are indivisible.<sup>91</sup>

Many planks of the comprehensive platform of the Progressives seemed to follow rather closely both the Communist Party line and the addresses as delivered by Wallace. The following comparison is made on the basis of material available at the present time in The New York Times<sup>92</sup> and The Platform pamphlet as issued by the Progressive Party:

Progressive Plank

End the drive for war.  
We demand the repudiation of the Truman Doctrine and an end to military and economic intervention in support of reactionary and fascist regimes in China, Greece, Turkey, the Middle East, and Latin America. We demand that the United States completely sever diplomatic and economic relations with Franco Spain.

Communist Plank

Withdrawal of all American military aid and personnel from Greece, China, and Turkey, and for an end to American military and naval pressure in the Mediterranean area, as well as halt to militarization of Latin America.

---

<sup>91</sup>Progressive Platform Committee, Peace, Freedom, and Abundance, pp. 4-5.

<sup>92</sup>The New York Times, July 28, 1948.

We call for the repudiation of the Marshall Plan.

American-Soviet Agreement. Henry Wallace in his open letter suggested and Premier Stalin in his reply accepted, a basis for sincere peace discussions. The exchange showed that specific areas of agreement can be found if the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations and acceptance of the right of people to choose their own form of government and economic system are mutually respected.

The Progressive Party therefore demands negotiation and discussion with the Soviet Union to find areas of agreement to win the peace.

United Nations. We call for the establishment of a United Nations Reconstruction and Development Fund to promote international recovery by providing assistance to the needy nations of Europe, Africa, and Asia, without political conditions and with priorities to those peoples that suffered most from Axis aggression.

We call for the continuous strengthening of the United Nations as a foundation for eventual world government.

Disarmament. The Progressive Party will work

Fight for peace by checking and defeating the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

Press for a return to the Roosevelt policy of a friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union.

Fight for the adoption of the Wallace plan for economic aid through the United Nations.

Fight for a policy of general disarmament, includ-



through the United Nations for a world disarmament agreement to outlaw the atomic bomb, bacteriological warfare, and all other instruments of mass destruction; to destroy existing stockpiles of atomic bombs and to establish United Nations controls, including inspection, over the production of atomic energy; and to reduce conventional armaments drastically in accordance with resolutions already passed by the United Nations General Assembly.

Germany and Japan. The Progressive Party calls for co-operation with our wartime allies to conclude peace treaties promptly with a unified Germany and with Japan. The essentials for a German settlement are denatzification and democratization, punishment of war criminals, land reform, decartelization, nationalization of heavy industry, Big-Four control of the Ruhr, reparations to the victims of Nazi aggression, and definitive recognition of the Oder-Neisse line as the Western boundary of Poland. On this basis, we advocate the speedy conclusion of the peace treaty and a simultaneous withdrawal of all occupation troops.

Similar principles should govern a settlement with Japan.

State of Israel. The Progressive Party demands the

ing a halt to the production of atom bombs, destruction of existing stockpiles, and establishment of true international control of atomic energy.

Fulfillment of the Potsdam agreements to guarantee a united, democratic and peaceful Germany and Japan.

immediate de jure recognition of the State of Israel.

We call for a Presidential proclamation lifting the arms embargo in favor of the State of Israel.

Lift the embargo on and extend full recognition to Israel.

The Far East. We call for the immediate withdrawal of American troops and abandonment of bases in China

We support the efforts of the people of Korea to establish the national unity and the kind of government they desire. We demand an early joint withdrawal of occupation troops.

Colonial and dependent people. We believe that people everywhere in the world have the right to self-determination. The people of Puerto Rico have the right to independence.

Grant immediate independence to Puerto Rico.

End discrimination. The Progressive Party condemns segregation and discrimination in all its forms and in all places.

We demand fully equality for the Negro people, the Jewish people, Japanese Americans, Italian Americans and all other nationality groups.

We call for a Presidential proclamation ending segregation and all forms of discrimination in the armed services and Federal employment.

To fight for the equal rights for the Negro people; for the outlawing of Jim Crow, and the passage of the anti-lynching and anti-poll tax legislation, for the abolition of all forms of discrimination against the Negro people in Army and civilian life; for democratic agrarian reforms in the South, satisfying the needs of the Negro people for land, freedom and equality; and for the right to self-determination of the Negro people in those Southern areas where they form a majority.

We demand Federal anti-lynch, anti-discrimination, and fair-employment-practices legislation, and legislation abolishing segregation in interstate travel.

We support the enactment of legislation making it a Federal crime to disseminate anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and all racial propaganda by mail, radio, motion picture, or other means of Communication.

The right of political association and expression.  
The Progressive Party will fight for the constitutional rights of Communists and all other political groups to express their views as the first line in the defense of the liberties of a democratic people.

We pledge an all-out fight against the Mundt-Nixon Bill and all similar legislation designed to impose thought control, restrict freedom of opinion, and establish a police state in America.

We demand the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and similar State Committees, and we mean to right the wrongs which these committees have perpetrated upon thousands of loyal Americans working for the realization of democratic ideals.

We pledge to eliminate the current "Loyalty" purge program and to reestablish standards for government

To fight for an effective FEPC to outlaw all forms of discrimination against the Negro people, the Jewish people, the Mexican-Americans, and all other national groups, and the foreign born.

Demand the prosecution and punishment of all Fascists, anti-Semitic and anti-Negro Acts and groupings, and to fight for legislation making such activities a criminal offense.

Resist the reactionary offensive at home and the mounting attacks on the rights of labor and the civil liberties of the people

Defeat the Mundt Bill and all other efforts to outlaw or persecute the Communist party.

Dissolve the House Un-American Committee.

Cancel Truman's "Loyalty" decrees.

service that respect the rights of Federal employees to freedom of association and opinion and to engage in political activity.

We demand an end to the present campaign of deportation against foreign-born trade unionists and political leaders, and will actively protect the civil rights of naturalized citizens and the foreign born.

We demand that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other Government agencies desist from investigating, or interfering with, the political beliefs and lawful activities of Americans.

Abundance. The Progressive Party calls for legislation which will impose controls that will reduce and keep down the price of food, shelter, clothing, other essentials of life, and basic materials. Such controls should squeeze out excessive profits, provide for payment of subsidies to farmers wherever necessary to maintain fair agricultural prices, and allocate materials and goods in short supply.

We support the legitimate demands of all wage and salary earners, including Federal employees, for wage and salary increases and improved working conditions. We demand the enactment of a

Halt all forms of political discrimination and persecution of labor, progressive and Communist organizations; stop the deportation drive and other forms of persecution and discrimination against the foreign born.

To combat the high cost-of-living, monopoly profiteering, and inflation; to fight for substantial wage increases and better working conditions to protect the masses from rapacious crisis-policies of the monopolies; to fight for raising the minimum hourly wage level to \$1; to demand a roll-back of prices to OPA days and to fight for such price controls as will insure the democratic supervision of the people's progressive mass organizations over the price-fixing agencies; to fight for a people's tax and housing program, for a capital levy on large fortunes to retire the national debt on a graduated

minimum wage of \$1 an hour . . .

We demand a Federal emergency housing program to build within the next two years four million low-rent and low-cost dwellings for homeless and doubled-up families, with priority to veterans.

We pledge an attack on the chronic housing shortage and the slums through a long-range program to build twenty-five million new homes during the next ten years. This program will include public subsidized housing for low-income families.

The Progressive Party demands the extension of social security protection to every man, woman and child in the United States.

We pledge our active support for a national old-age pension of \$100 a month to all persons at 60 years of age, based on right and not on a pauperizing need basis.

The Progressive Party demands the overhaul of the tax structure according to the democratic principle of ability to pay. We propose to employ taxation as a flexible instrument to promote full employment and economic stability.

The Progressive Party proposes to guarantee, free from segregation and discrimination, the inalienable

basis; for widening and strengthening all Social Security laws; for adequate immediate aid to all unemployed and partially employed; for an adequate and non-discriminatory people's health and educational program; for effective measures to safeguard the economic well-being of the farmers, the Negro people, the aged, the youth, veterans, women and small business men.

right to a good education to every man, woman, and child in America. Essential to good education are the recognized principles of academic freedom --in particular, the principle of free inquiry into and discussion of controversial issues by teachers and students.

We support the right of every American to good health through a national system of health insurance, giving freedom of choice to patient and practitioner, and providing adequate medical and dental care.

We demand the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the reinstatement of the principles of the Wagner and Norris-LaGuardia Acts. These measures are essential to restore labor's equality in collective bargaining and to prevent business from using government to establish a dictatorship over labor by injunction.

We stand for the family-type farm as the basic unit of American agriculture. The Farmers' Home Administration, (formerly Farm Security Administration) must be expanded to provide ample low-cost credit to assist tenants, sharecroppers, and returned veterans to become farm owners. Marginal farmers must be assisted to become efficient producers. Where farming is incapable of yielding an adequate family income, supplementary employment on needed conservation

To press for a Federal farm program, including extension and strengthening of wartime price guarantees which will guarantee a decent minimum annual income to every family-size farm; promote soil conservation, make Federal credit available at low interest rates, encourage independent ownership, establish cooperative machinery pools, check the inflationary increase in farm indebtedness, and defend the cooperatives against big business-inspired

and public work projects must be provided. attacks.

We propose as a major goal of Federal farm programs that all farm families be enabled to earn an income of not less than \$3,000 a year. We repudiate the program of Big Business which would eliminate as many as two-thirds of the nation's farmers.

We call for a five-year program of price-supported for all major crops at not less than 90 per cent of parity--parity to be calculated according to an up-to-date formula. Dairy products and certain specialties should be supported at higher rates than 90 per cent.

We call for a long-range national land policy designed to discourage the growth of corporation farms and absentee ownership. This policy is especially important in the South to promote the proper development of its resources and to provide land for the landless. Priority in the purchase of land made available by river valley projects must be given to tenants, sharecroppers, and small farmers.<sup>93</sup>

On the basis of the preceding comparison, the Pro-

---

<sup>93</sup>Information used in the comparison was taken from The Progressives' Platform and The New York Times of July 28, 1948.

gressive Platform seemed to embody all specific recommendations made by the Communists. At times, it seemed to be more aggressive than the publicly-announced Communists' policy. An example of this might be found in the following plank:

The Progressive Party will initiate such measures of public ownership as may be necessary to put into the hands of the people's representatives the levers of control essential to the operation of the economy of abundance. As a first step, the largest banks, the railroads, the Merchant Marine, the electric power and gas industry, and industries primarily dependent on Government purchases must be placed under public ownership.<sup>94</sup>

Political comment. The convention whose Saturday meeting netted seventy-five thousand dollars in admission fees was made up of a younger group than its counterparts of the Democratic and Republican parties. Some sixty per cent of the group was made up of men and women under forty years of age. Thirty per cent was made up of women, many of whom brought their children. Thirty-five per cent was made up of trade union members; twenty per cent was made up of veterans; twenty-one per cent was made up of professional men; nine per cent was made up of business men; and four per cent was made up of farmers.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup>Progressive Platform Committee, Peace, Freedom, and Abundance, p. 12.

<sup>95</sup>The New York Times, July 25, 1948.



The New York Times commented on the Progressive Con -  
vention as follows:

The majority of his followers are sincere non-Communist Americans drawn to Mr. Wallace by the belief that he alone can bring peace with the Soviet Union, or attracted by his economic theories of a planned and plentiful economy.

.....

The professional Communists and 'fellow travelers,' who constitute a minority, are tough and well-trained and know how they wish to utilize his candidacy and party platform further to weaken confidence in the American system.

.....

Mr. Wallace would like to be the candidate of 'labor,' which fought for his renomination as Vice-President in 1944. . . . But in 1948 neither AFL nor CIO will support him. There are, however, a minority of CIO international unions, led by Left-wingers such as Harry Bridges who have bolted the national leadership to back Mr. Wallace. There is also a scattering of local labor leaders from the AFL and the railroad unions.<sup>96</sup>

Herbert L. Matthews of The New York Times wrote the following from London:

Henry A. Wallace may be making a dent in the American body politic during the Presidential campaign, but in Europe he is regarded as either a champion of the Communists and fellow-travelers or a candidate not to be taken seriously.

.....

Their interest in him resembles that of spectators watching a bull cavorting around a china shop; they wonder how much he is going to break.

---

<sup>96</sup>The New York Times, July 25, 1948.

.....

For instance, The Manchester Guardian, Britain's famed liberal daily, [described] Wallace's election platform as one 'which will appeal to a great many well-meaning people with no knowledge of public affairs.'

When to Wallace's 'pro-Communist' leanings there was added this week the note of appeasement regarding Berlin, still more Europeans were alienated. At the same time, in Europe as in the United States, Wallace appeals to those, who desperately fear another war and are willing to try to avoid it by any means.

.....

However, in Paris, as elsewhere, Wallace is looked upon as a stalking horse for Stalin in the United States, and from that angle he is feared.

.....

Communist newspapers and magazines in France and Italy have large circulations, and they print numerous encomiums of Wallace. In Italy, for instance, they build Wallace up as the only true Democratic candidate who is a sincere friend of peace, as compared to those 'imperialist warmongers,' President Truman and Governor Dewey.<sup>97</sup>

The Soviet press and the Moscow radio frequently praised Wallace for his support of peace and the thought that there would be no crisis in Berlin if Roosevelt or he were in the White House.

The Nation commented as follows:

The New Party's Platform and the speeches of Mr. Wallace and Senator Taylor echoed the party line closely enough to dispel any idea that a break with the Communists is likely. Most non-Communist progressives will agree with much that was said and written in Philadelphia,

---

<sup>97</sup>The New York Times, August 1, 1948.

but the refusal of the Wallace leadership to qualify its attack on American foreign policy with any consideration of the effect of Russian policies, or to find any virtue whatsoever in the European Recovery Program, for example, is sure to alienate independent voters who are looking for a political rallying ground outside the old parties.<sup>98</sup>

Wallace in his attempt to lead a third party seemed not to be motivated by any great agrarian or labor protest. It seemed that the cheers of the appreciative crowd had charms which Wallace could not deny. He was willing to sacrifice many other worthwhile liberals on the altar of his own personal success to follow a dream of peace, a dream which led him to disavow defense measures--but not Communists.

---

<sup>98</sup>The Nation, CLXVII (July 31, 1948), 113.

CHAPTER V

THE CAMPAIGN OF 1948

Wallace's early announcement of his candidacy on December 29, 1947, seemed to cause earlier political activity on the part of all political parties in the campaign of 1948. Among the early contenders for the Republican nominations were Governor Thomas E. Dewey, New York; Harold Stassen, Minnesota; Robert Taft, Ohio; Arthur Vandenberg, Michigan; General Douglas MacArthur, Wisconsin; and Earl Warren, California.

Dewey vs. Wallace. Early Republic contenders had varied opinions on Wallace as a Presidential candidate. After Wallace had declared his candidacy, Dewey was asked by reporters if he had any thoughts on the Wallace candidacy. Dewey replied, "I suppose every one has. . . . Mine are my own and they are not high."<sup>1</sup> When asked to express himself on the third party, Dewey said, "I am pretty busy working for the State of New York sixteen hours a day."<sup>2</sup> Stassen, believed that the third party threat was a danger to his candidacy in that it made the selection of a conservative

---

<sup>1</sup>The New York Times, January 6, 1948.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

candidate more likely. Senator Taft thought that President Truman's State of the Union speech promised the people so much that Wallace "will have a hard time to find anything to promise the people of this country that is not promised in this message."<sup>3</sup>

Governor Dewey followed in pre-convention campaign as well as in post-convention campaign the strategy of ignoring his opponents. This policy of refusing to join the fray proved disconcerting to Stassen and Taft in the pre-convention period as well as to President Truman in the post-convention period. However, while Dewey remained silent, other Republicans were more voluble.

In March of 1948, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, headed by J. Parnell Thomas, a Republican from New Jersey, tried to link Wallace with an appointee, Dr. Edward V. Condon, whom Wallace had appointed to the Bureau of Standards in the Commerce Department. Thomas attacked Dr. Condon for alleged Un-American activities, calling him "one of the weakest links in our atomic security."<sup>4</sup> Subsequent investigation proved the attack unwarranted, motivated by the desire to expedite the granting of an

---

<sup>3</sup>The New York Times, January 9, 1948.

<sup>4</sup>Robert K. Carr and Joel Barker, The House Committee on Un-American Activities (New York: The Cornell University Press, 1955), pp. 131-132.

appropriation to the Committee as well as to smear Wallace. However, at the time, the Republicans attempted to link Condon to Wallace. The Thomas report said:

In this country [the Communists] haven't gotten as far as they have in Czechoslovakia, but they got pretty far, because they got a man as Vice President of the United States, and he is now their candidate for President, and he is the same man who recommended Dr. Condon as Director of the Bureau of Standards.<sup>5</sup>

In a recent book, The House Committee on American Activities, written by Rober K. Carr and Joel Barker, appears the following excerpt:

Entirely apart from the implication of this passage that Vice-President Wallace was a Communist or an agent of the Communists, the committee's report fails to tell that Wallace did not know Condon until the time of the appointment and that the recommendation was made on the basis of the findings of a departmental committee which had been directed to find the best-qualified man for the job.<sup>6</sup>

An article, written by Marquis Childs, appeared in the Congressional Record, which commented on the matter as follows:

To fair minded Americans it would seem clear that Condon is being persecuted because he was appointed head of the Bureau of Standards by Henry Wallace when Wallace was Secretary of Commerce. A second reason is the smear campaign conducted against him in the small section of

---

<sup>5</sup>Carr and Barker, The House Committee on Un-American Activities, p. 136.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

the press.<sup>7</sup>

Wallace answered the attack saying, "We are in serious danger of becoming a police state if this sort of thing continues."<sup>8</sup> He continued, charging as follows:

. . . the game is to create fear in all of you, every last one of you. That is what the game is. So that you don't dare speak out, so we will all be second-class citizens, so that we will willingly serve without asking questions of our betters. That is what the game is. Think it over carefully.<sup>9</sup>

In the meantime, Governor Dewey, the defeated candidate of 1944, worked effectively to establish himself as the titular head of the Republican Party. However, Stassen's early primary successes in New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Pennsylvania forced Dewey to make a fight for the primary victory in Oregon, if he meant to stay in the race as a contender for the Republican nomination. Advice from Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon brought Dewey to stump that state. This he accomplished in traveling 1,950 miles in three weeks speaking to 100,000 people. Stassen, who had campaigned in Oregon and regarded it as "safe" for him,

---

<sup>7</sup>Marquis Child, "Smear against Condon," Washington Evening Star, Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 80th Congress, 2d Session, Volume 94, Part 2, February 20-March 15, 1948 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948), p. 2411.

<sup>8</sup>The New York Times, March 3, 1948.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

returned to challenge Dewey to a debate on Communism. In the subsequent radio debate on the question of outlawing of Communists as a subversive group, Stassen took the position that their continued existence would encourage them to overthrow our Government; Dewey, on the other hand, argued that outlawing them would send them underground. In the primary election that followed, Dewey captured all twelve of the Oregon delegates and reestablished his position as the leading contender.

In May, Dewey, feeling jubilant over his primary victory in Oregon, took occasion on May 22, at Powning Park, Reno, Nevada, to declare "that people who sell communism either here or abroad are 'stupid or ignorant.'"<sup>10</sup> Adding the following statement, Dewey continued:

What makes the United States different from Russia and Africa, both of which have vast natural resources, are the Bill of Rights and the country's unity. . . .

The Bill of Rights permits us to hold such meetings as this and to discuss politics and to listen to any other Republican or to a Democrat or to Henry Wallace or to any other crackpot.<sup>11</sup>

Dewey promised that if he were "elected President he would have 'the best house cleaning this country has had in seventy years.'"<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>The New York Times, March 23, 1948.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.



When Dewey was asked what effect he thought Wallace would have on the campaign, he replied, "He'll be a nuisance."<sup>13</sup> To the question, would Wallace be nuisance enough to elect a Republican as President? Dewey answered, "The Republicans will elect a President on their own feet," and, "they will elect one because the country wants--and needs--a Republican Administration."<sup>14</sup>

Following the victory in the Oregon primary, Dewey continued as a leading aspirant for the Republican nomination. As the Republican Convention opened June 21, Taft and Stassen formed a stop-Dewey coalition which failed because neither would relinquish his first position on the proposed ticket. Governor Kim Sigler of Michigan joined the opposition to Dewey to support Senator Vandenberg, Michigan's favorite son. Warren remained neutral, probably thereby earning the second place on the Dewey ticket. On the first ballot, Dewey showed strength but lacked a majority because many delegations supported their favorite sons. After the first ballot, the Dewey forces<sup>15</sup> let it be known that Representative Halleck of Indiana would be Dewey's choice as Vice-Presidential

---

<sup>13</sup>The New York Times, May 24, 1948.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>In the light of subsequent events, it appears that the Dewey men started the rumor with no intentions of carrying it out.

candidate. This led Halleck to join the Dewey forces on the second ballot. He was followed by Martin of Pennsylvania and Driscoll of New Jersey. On the third ballot, Warren and the California delegation joined the Dewey forces as did Sigler and the Michigan delegation. Other delegations and favorite sons followed. Taft and Stassen withdrew, leaving the field to Dewey.

The contenders for the second place were Stassen, Halleck, and Warren. Warren seemed to be the compromise candidate between Halleck and Stassen; besides, Warren appeared to be Dewey's choice. As a result, Warren was nominated by acclamation.

In the second address of the Convention, Clare Boothe Luce, as reported by Time, attacked Wallace as well as President Truman. The Time commented as follows;

A roar of applause was punctuated by waves of laughter as blonde ex-Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce voiced the thesis of her speech; that Harry Truman is a 'gone goose.' The Democrats, she said, were divided into 'a Jim Crow wing, led by the lynch-loving Bourbons . . . a Moscow wing, masterminded by Stalin's Mortimer Snerd,<sup>16</sup> Henry Wallace . . . and a Pendergast wing run by the wampum and boodle boys . . . who gave us Harry Truman in one of their more pixilated moments.' Harry Truman's term of office, she cracked, was hardly 'the pause that refreshes.'<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>A dummy used by Edgar Bergen in his radio show.

<sup>17</sup>"Republicans," Time, LI (June 28, 1948), 10.

Similar attacks came from other Republicans, but the Republican candidates, Dewey and Warren, followed their agreed-upon strategy not to name or attack their opponents.

Dewey, speaking August 12 in New York City to a group of Young Republican Clubs, criticized the Progressive Party in the following manner:

The word progressive is a fine old American word meaning--before the month of July, 1948--a forward looking point of view, maintaining anchors in the success of our great system. Now it has been despoiled by a group which would like to put our country in chains along with the rest of the world. So I don't use the word progressive. We will again be able to use it after this year's campaign because those who use it will have little or no influence in American public life and after the election of a Republican President they will have not influence in the Government of the United States.<sup>18</sup>

Vice-Presidential candidate Warren followed Dewey's attack on the Progressives with a speech at Albuquerque, New Mexico, on September 18, 1948. In this address, Warren proposed a crusade on "what is right with 'America'" to "combat the influence of the followers of 'false gods' who, he said were 'hiding' in the Presidential campaign under the 'Progressive' banner."<sup>19</sup> Warren, in addition to attacking the Progressives, attacked the Communists in the following manner:

A stealthy appeal, under the guise of showing what is

---

<sup>18</sup>The New York Times, August 12, 1948.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., September 18, 1948.

wrong with America, is being made to the credulous, the cynical, and the weak. . . . Neighbors are poised against neighbors. Races are being inflamed against races. Classes are being created and arrayed against each other.

Every device known to a conspiracy is used to discredit our institutions and divide our people. Unfortunately, even some who were born in this country have become enamored of these false gods and are preaching the doctrine of despair. They can see no good in our country. All of their waking hours are devoted to establishing what is wrong with our nation.

They give no credit to anyone, or to any of our institutions for the great material and spiritual progress. They have infiltrated into many phases of our society. They have made their influences felt in unseen ways. They have even wormed their way into Government.

They have insinuated themselves into this campaign and are hiding under the wholesome name and banner of 'progressives.' They tell us that everything is wrong with America, that it has failed and that it has no future under our system.<sup>20</sup>

Warren climaxed his address by commenting: "Tom Dewey will never have any trouble getting Communists out of Government. He never will take them in."<sup>21</sup> Reaching Tulsa, Oklahoma, on September 20, Warren struck out against all opponents by saying, as reported by Time:

Such a threat [Truman's threat of war against the Republicans] can prove only . . . that the incumbent Administration is a shambles; that it is dispirited, chaotic, quarrelsome and desperate . . . [sic] The Democratic Party, and its splinters, present to the people of the U. S. in this national campaign a sorry spectacle of warring factions, city machines, rebellious elements, pressure minorities, fellow travelers and

---

<sup>20</sup>The New York Times, September 18, 1948.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

left-wingers.<sup>22</sup>

While Warren traveled East, Dewey began a swing through thirteen Western states. It soon became evident on this tour that audiences enjoyed attacks on Communists in the Government and that they gave most applause when Dewey said: "I suggest you elect an administration that simply won't appoint them in the first place."<sup>23</sup> Following this mode of attack, Dewey, according to Time, delivered an attack on Communism in Los Angeles, saying:

The tragic fact is that too often our own Government . . . seems to have so far lost faith in our system of free opportunity as to encourage this Communist advance, not hinder it. . . . [sic] Communists and fellow travelers [have] risen to positions of trust in our Government. . . . [sic] On that very day when a poor distraught school teacher [Okana S. Kosenkina] ventured death to jump to freedom . . . the head of our Government called the exposure of Communists in our Government a 'red herring.'

We must neither ignore the Communists nor outlaw them . . . [sic] If they engage in sabotage or break any other laws, we'll jail them. If our laws aren't adequate we'll get ones which are. But in this country we'll have no thought-police. We will not jail anybody for what he thinks or believes.<sup>24</sup>

Dewey's campaign exuded the confidence of a victor. He chose to ignore his opponents as he campaigned, as disgusted Democrats termed it, against Joe Stalin. Over and

---

<sup>22</sup>Time, LII (September 27, 1948), 22.

<sup>23</sup>The New York Times, September 18, 1948.

<sup>24</sup>Time, LII (October 4, 1948), 20-21.

over again he pled for the unity of the country as he denounced those who played group against group. He promised honest and competent government and defended the record of the eightieth Congress. He, according to Time, criticized the deviating foreign policy and promised:

Nothing will be said or done in this campaign by myself or the Republican Party which will do anything but strengthen our unity . . . [sic] We are pulling together for the good of the country . . . and it would be wise for all of the rulers of the world to know it.<sup>25</sup>

Truman vs. Wallace. Meanwhile, President Truman, after making some overtures in late 1947 and early 1948, attacked Wallace very soon after his December announcement of candidacy for the Presidential race. Many Republicans believed that the January State of the Union Message outbid Henry Wallace for factional support. The first public occasion, used by Truman to denounce Wallace, was his address before the Society of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, delivered in the Grand Ballroom of the Astor Hotel. Truman charged Wallace was an agent of Communism and "declared that under no conditions would he accept the support of Mr. Wallace or his Communist allies."<sup>26</sup> The President persisted:

If joining them or permitting them to join me is the price of victory, I recommend defeat.

---

<sup>25</sup>Time, LII (October 4, 1948), 21.

<sup>26</sup>The New York Times, March 18, 1948.

. . . . .

These are the days of high prices for everything, but any price for Wallace and his Communists is too much for me to pay. . . . I'll not buy it.<sup>27</sup>

Wallace answered by saying that "President Truman appealed to prejudice because he could not answer us with reason."<sup>28</sup> He further accused the President of implying that "it was only the Communists who disapproved of his policies of supporting fascists, kings and reactionaries around the world and his plans to draft our young men and militarize the country."<sup>29</sup> "But," continued Wallace, "millions of Americans, who stand firmly opposed to his policies, know that they are not Communists and they will not be frightened into accepting militarism because someone calls them 'Communists.'"<sup>30</sup>

There was a great amount of pressure exerted to prevent Truman's running for President in 1948. Although he behaved as a candidate on many occasions, his formal announcement came late in March. This seemed a courageous stand in the face of mounting opposition from the Southerners and Wallaceites. To add to Truman's misfortune, the old-line

---

<sup>27</sup>The New York Times, March 18, 1948.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., March 20, 1948.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

New Dealers opposed his candidacy as did the big city bosses. The defection of so many elements left Truman one course of action, namely, to steer to the right of Wallace and to the left of the Republicans. Above all, it was necessary for Truman to regain the support of labor.<sup>31</sup> This he did as he called for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley bill and as he made a decisive stand for the Civil Rights program.

As pressure was still being brought on Truman to withdraw from the 1948 Presidential race, he left on a trans-continental tour of this country. His schedule called for speeches at Chicago, Omaha, Seattle, Berkeley, and Los Angeles. Speaking in Chicago on June 4, the President called for "broadening of the social security program."<sup>32</sup> In Omaha on June 5, he told Nebraskans that "some Republicans were in favor of a farm program when they were in the West, but against it when they got back to Congress."<sup>33</sup> At Pocatello, Idaho, on June 7, President Truman charged "that some power interests with allies in Congress, were seeking to restore

---

<sup>31</sup>Labor had become disgruntled in 1946 and 1947. A. F. Whitney, who headed the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, came January 21, 1948, to make amends and end his hostility that had lasted since 1946.

<sup>32</sup>The World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1949 (New York World Telegram, 1949), p. 722.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.



the abuses of the Samuel Insull era. . . ."34 In Butte, Montana, on June 8, the President "assailed Congress for failing to pass adequate farm and housing programs and for slashing the Labor Department's appropriations."35 At Spokane, Washington, on June 9, Truman declared the Eightieth "Congress was the worst one we've ever had since the first one met."36 In an address, made at the University of California in Berkeley, on June 12, the President "issued a warning to the Soviet Union that it was opposed not by the United States alone but by all the free nations of the world. . . ."37 Speaking in Los Angeles, on June 14, "a demand that Congress should remain in session until it had passed effective price controls and seven other major bills was voiced by President Truman."38 As Truman returned East, he spoke in Maryland and Pennsylvania. On these occasions, he warned that the Republicans were concerned with "special interests" rather than "general Welfare."39 In this fifteen

---

34 The World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1949, p. 722.

35 Ibid.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.

day, 9,505-mile tour, Truman made seventy-three speeches in eighteen states. This tour seemed but a rehearsal for the post-convention tours.

As the convention date approached, there was increased activity on the part of such leaders as James Roosevelt, Jake Arvey, Mayor O'Dwyer, and Millard Tydings to get General Eisenhower or Chief Justice William O. Douglas to become a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President.<sup>40</sup> In addition, the Southerners, alienated by the President's stand on civil rights, planned to demand that the National Committee request that Mr. Truman withdraw from the race. These plans fell by the wayside as Eisenhower and Douglas refused to become candidates and the Southerners dropped their plan.

In the Democratic Convention of July 12-16, important events became political history. The activities of Hubert Humphrey, Mayor of Minneapolis, and Andrew Biemiller, ex-Congressman of Wisconsin, supported by delegations of the North and West, caused the adoption of a Civil Rights plank. This caused part of the Alabama delegation and all of the Mississippi delegation to leave the Convention. The remaining Southern delegations gave their support to Richard Russell, Senator from Georgia. Truman, however, had enough

---

<sup>40</sup>Ray Tucker, "Elections," 1949 Britannica Book of the Year (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1949), p. 261.

votes for nomination on the first ballot. His fighting acceptance speech produced admiration from the Convention members, who were far from enthusiastic. This address, made from an eighteen-page outline and notes prepared by Clark Clifford and Sam Rosenman, struck a new note in political gambling as Truman announced that he was calling back the Eightieth Congress into special session. The Convention completed its work by nominating Alben Barkley as the Vice-Presidential candidate by acclamation, and elected J. Howard McGrath as its Democratic National Chairman.

With the nomination achieved, labor, big city bosses, Americans for Democratic Action, and New Dealers began to fall in line to support Mr. Truman. Labor and city bosses worked diligently for the success of a candidate who alone believed that he could win.

On Labor Day, President Truman spoke to a crowd of over 100,000 people in Cadillac Square, Detroit. He emphasized that the Democratic Party had the welfare of the little man at heart; he continued in the following manner:

The Republicans . . . voted themselves a cut in taxes and voted you a cut in freedom. The 80th Republican Congress failed to crack down on prices. But it cracked down on labor all right.

. . . . .

If you let the Republican reactionaries get complete control of the Government . . . I would fear not only for the wages and living standards of the American workingman,

but even for our democratic institutions of free labor and free enterprise.<sup>41</sup>

In late September, Truman traveled West again.

Speaking in the Midwest, Truman attacked the Republicans as being in the hands of reactionaries and Wall Street gluttons, who were putting up fabulous sums to elect a Republican Administration. In Salt Lake City, Utah, Truman warned that the Republicans, who, he claimed, had choked power development in that part of the country, would strangle the New Deal--inaugurated irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric programs. On September 22, the President attacked the House Committee on Un-American Activities, saying that it was more Un-American that the activities it was investigating; in addition he called on the voters to fire the Republican "mossbacks" in Congress. On September 24, President Truman made a major address in Los Angeles, appealing to the liberal voters to return to the Democratic Party. Los Angeles, a political strategic spot with its concentrated population, was estimated to have from 250,000 to 500,000 Progressives. President Truman, cognizant of the liberal voters who sought the third party as a solution for chaotic world conditions, appealed to them to rejoin the Democratic Party. Truman continued in the following statements:

---

<sup>41</sup>"Rough and Ready," Time, LII (September 20, 1948), 24-25.

To these liberals, I would say in all sincerity, think again. . . . The fact the Communists are guiding and using the third party shows that this party does not represent American ideals.

But there is another and very practical reason why it is folly for any liberal to put his hope in this third party.

The third party has no power in the Government and no chance of achieving power. The simple fact is that the third party cannot achieve peace because it is powerless. It cannot achieve better conditions here at home because it is powerless.

. . . . .

A vote for the third party can only weaken the efforts of the Democratic Party to build a healthy nation and a peaceful world. . . . A vote for the third party plays into the hands of the Republican forces of reaction, whose aims are directly opposed to the aims of American liberalism. A vote for the third party will not promote the cause of American liberalism, but will injure it.<sup>42</sup>

President Truman asserted that his own Administration was doing everything possible for world peace and was eager to put an end to the reactionary policy inaugurated since the Republicans had gained control of Congress. Wallace, in reply, assailed Truman as being insincere, saying: "If he is sincere, he will call for the defeat of Congressmen who overrode his veto on the Taft-Hartley Law and the defeat of those who voted against continuance of the [House] Un-American Activities Committee."<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>The New York Times, September 24, 1948.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., September 25, 1948.

President Truman, speaking at a private dinner in San Antonio, Texas, said that peace was the best policy for the world, but we must keep our bullets in order and our powder dry. In addition to this, Truman said that world peace was more important than whether or not he was elected President of the United States. In an address delivered in Charleston, West Virginia, he warned that to elect a Republican President to match a Republican Congress would mean a headlong dash toward another depression. After returning to Washington on October 2, the President said after his 8,300-mile trip that he had just begun to fight.

Contrary to Republican claims that victory was in their hands, President Truman's crowds were increasing. This was particularly noticeable on his trip to Philadelphia and Camden, New Jersey, where crowds of 500,000 people were estimated by the police to have greeted him on the tour. Speaking in Convention Hall, Philadelphia, before a crowd of 11,000 people, he denounced the Republican promises of "unity" as "quackery." Similar crowds continued throughout the remaining campaign as Truman continued his speaking tour. At Buffalo, Truman warned that the election of a Republican President would threaten the country's prosperity. The major issue to be decided at the poll was, said President Truman, "Hard times or prosperity?" At Raleigh, the President appealed to Southern Democrats to vote the

straight Democratic ticket instead of supporting the States Rights Party. In Chicago, Truman told an audience that a,

. . . Republican victory would bring a totalitarian threat to American freedom, and would place in power . . . men who wanted unbridled inflation would give control of the nation to a small group, and would foment racial and religious strife.<sup>44</sup>

As the campaign ended, Truman declared that he had "cracked the Republican East" and that "North, South, and West [were] falling in line."<sup>45</sup> In his last pre-election address, Truman said that the voter must make the choice between the party of the people, the Democratic Party, and the party of privilege, the Republican Party.<sup>46</sup>

Wallace against the major parties. As the strategy of the Democrats was to establish a course between the Republicans on the Right and the Progressives on the Left, the Progressives tried to prove that both of the older parties were reactionary. The bi-partisan foreign policy provided a stepping stone for such an approach. From this, the Progressives charged the old parties were also alike in domestic issues; consequently, the Progressive leaders believed that the new party provided the only hope for liberal voters.

---

<sup>44</sup>The World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1949,  
p. 743.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 748.

Consequently, the Wallace strategy against Dewey and Truman was to consider them as equal representatives of reaction. However, the early part of 1948 was characterized by Wallace's criticism of Truman rather than Dewey. The avowed purpose appeared to be to defeat Truman and the Democrats. Wallace attacked Truman on innumerable occasions at home and abroad after his dismissal from the Cabinet. On his announcement of candidacy on the third party ticket, Wallace charged that the Democratic Party was "a party of 'war and depression,' and asserted that the time had come for 'a new party to fight these war-makers.'"<sup>47</sup> On the occasion of Mayor O'Dwyer's inviting him to rejoin the Democratic Party, Wallace charged that the "Democratic high command in Washington is scared to death."<sup>48</sup> On February 12, 1948, Wallace censured the Truman Administration's unwillingness to press for an effective action to carry out the United Nation's decision to partition Palestine; meanwhile, he accused Truman of talking Jewish and acting Arab to serve the oil interests of the country.

The Truman Administration was again under attack by Wallace as he testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on February 25. Wallace assailed the Administration

---

<sup>47</sup>The New York Times, December 30, 1948.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., February 16, 1948.



for "'laying the foundations' for war with Russia" and charged "that the original European recovery concept had been 'poisoned' by the Truman Doctrine of world communism containment. . . ."49 On February 26, Wallace severely criticized the United States policy on Palestine and denounced Warren Austin's United States delegate to the United Nations consultation proposals "as a complete sellout of the people of Palestine and a serious blow at the United Nations."<sup>50</sup> Making a more grievous criticism, Wallace said as follows:

The United States' position is dictated by oil imperialism and oil politics. A second Munich is under way. Unless an outraged public opinion forces the Truman Administration to keep its word, that Munich can have the same consequences as the historic session of Chamberlain, Daladier, and Hitler.<sup>51</sup>

One of the early events that seemed to present a good omen for the new party was the successful candidacy of Leo Isacson, the American Labor Party candidate. Although he was a known critic of the late FDR, whom Isacson considered to be a warmonger, Wallace supported him. Isacson was opposed in the contest by Karl Proper, a Democrat; Di Nigris, a Republican; and Dean Alfrange, a liberal. During the campaign, Mayor William O'Dwyer, a former member of the American

---

<sup>49</sup>The New York Times, February 25, 1948.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., February 26, 1948.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid.

Labor Party, appealed to Wallace to abandon his third party attempt, saying:

I am against the Wallace third party because it tends to break up a combination which has been responsible for an expanding democracy, because it cannot possibly achieve its own avowed purposes, and were it to succeed in drawing liberals away from the Democratic ranks in large numbers, its only success would be the defeat of its own program.<sup>52</sup>

Adolf Berle, the former assistant Secretary of State, who spoke for the liberal candidate Dean A. Acheson also condemned Wallace as follows: "Henry Wallace is not an American candidate but a front for international intrigue whose policies would lead the United States into war."<sup>53</sup>

As a result of the campaign, Isacson won, polling 22,697 votes cast from a district of 96,000 eligible voters. Commenting on his victory, Isacson said: "this is a victory for Henry A. Wallace and the third party--the people's party," and "a 'resounding repudiation' of the policies of the Truman administration, which he declared was leading the nation down the road to war."<sup>54</sup> This victory led the New York Democratic leader, Edward Flynn, to comment as follows:

The Communist menace in this country is much greater than most people thought. This election brings home forcibly that those who are opposed to Communism do

---

<sup>52</sup>The New York Times, February 13, 1948.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., February 16, 1948.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., February 18, 1948.

not exercise their franchise. This is a deplorable situation. Regimented Communists vote, while those opposed to communism do not take the trouble to do so. I hope this election will serve as a warning.<sup>55</sup>

The important factors in the victory were: (1) the Jewish voters who had answered the Isacson's pro-Palestine appeal, (2) the Democrats who were unimpressed by the Truman Administration and failed in their campaign job, (3) the active Communists who had promoted a house to house campaign in many areas, and (4) the Negroes and Puerto Ricans who had voted their dissatisfaction of the Democratic record on Civil Rights.<sup>56</sup>

On March 7, Wallace spoke in York, Pennsylvania. Here, he advocated that "strong action must be taken now to break the grip of the steel monopoly on the American economy;" while, he charged that "aided by big business men in the Administration and Congress, a steel monopoly was heading the 'current attempt' to hamstring world recovery in order to increase already fantastic profits."<sup>57</sup>

It appeared that not all of Wallace's attacks were justified by facts. Wallace attacked Laurence Steinhardt, the American Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, for provoking

---

<sup>55</sup>The New York Times, February 18, 1948.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., March 8, 1948.

the Communist coup by lending himself to the cause of the Rightists who were planning a similar coup. Subsequently, it was learned that Steinhardt was out of Czechoslovakia at the time. It seemed that Wallace had aided the Communists in their strategy of defending the February, 1948, coup in Czechoslovakia.

On March 17, the day following his attack on Ambassador Steinhardt, Wallace charged that "the crisis in the international affairs [resulted] from the complete failure of the Truman Doctrine throughout the world."<sup>58</sup> After Truman's disavowal, Wallace charged that "Truman had expanded the Truman Doctrine to a point where it threatens the life of every human being in the world."<sup>59</sup> On this occasion, he blamed Winston Churchill for laying down in his Fulton, Missouri, speech on March 5, 1947, the policy followed by the Truman Administration.

In late March, Wallace charged the President with lending himself to a "reign of terror," which, "blots out reason and unleashes dangerous forces of hate that threaten the freedom and livelihood of all Americans."<sup>60</sup> This

---

<sup>58</sup>The New York Times, March 17, 1948.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., March 19, 1948.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., March 27, 1948.

attack followed the annoyances "to which the supporters of the third party have been subjected."<sup>61</sup>

On the last day of March, Wallace appeared before the Senate Armed Forces Committee for the purpose of attacking the Universal Military Training and stop-gap selective service draft bills. These, said Wallace, were "war-breeding programs that . . . were founded on a non-existent crisis;" and that "they led to 'death and taxes for the many and very handsome profits for the few.'"<sup>62</sup> Wallace stated that he thought the measure had been created to stave off depression; similarly, he felt that "our country [was] in danger," but that the "danger [came] from our own policies which will bring war--unnecessary war--upon our country."<sup>63</sup>

A threat to cut our Italian aid if the country went Communist brought the comment from Wallace on April 1, that "it just isn't American. It is coercion. It is force. It is intimidation."<sup>64</sup> Wallace said further that "Americans knew too little about the 'profits from aid' being made by a few giant corporations that have won concessions from the

---

<sup>61</sup>The New York Times, March 27, 1948.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., March 31, 1948.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., April 1, 1948.

Italian Government with State Department aid."<sup>65</sup> Wallace named oil, automobile, air transportation, elevator, and hydro-electric interests as "having moved into Italy at the expense of the American taxpayer and the Italian people."<sup>66</sup>

In April, Wallace continued his speaking tour by moving to the Midwest. Newsmen, Howard Norton of the Baltimore Sun and James Weschler of the New York Post, who remained with Henry Wallace's tour throughout this pre-convention tour, "were quickly shushed at press conferences whenever they tried to challenge Wallace's ideas or facts," while, "sometimes Wallace hid from them in hotel rooms."<sup>67</sup> They reported that "Wallace has become a bitter, dour man with a developing persecution complex," and "he would like to succeed to the mantle of Roosevelt but he does not know how to meet the common man whom he champions."<sup>68</sup>

The meetings held for the twenty-three addresses of Wallaces in nine states were characterized by varying success. Weschler described them as follows:

At virtually every stop the local left-wing stalwarts run the arrangements. It is the biggest show they have ever staged. But the political complexion of the

---

<sup>65</sup>The New York Times, April 1, 1948.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid.

<sup>67</sup>"Third Parties," Time, LI (April 19, 1948), 25.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., May 10, 1948, p. 23.

audiences is definitely broader. It is a cross section of American discontent and insecurity.<sup>69</sup>

In Evansville, Indiana, the CIO picketed the Memorial Coliseum where Wallace was to speak. The pickets were joined by some two thousand citizens who stormed the Coliseum's doors and injured the Progressive campaign manager, C. B. Baldwin. Wallace censured the press, saying: "The blame for this violence lies with the press for giving misinformation."<sup>70</sup> Meetings in the Midwest as well as in other sections proved profitable ventures. Examples of this might be seen as in Evansville, Indiana, where the audience contributed \$1,000; the Chicago businessmen's luncheon meeting, \$15,000; and the Chicago Stadium meeting, \$39,000.

Moving to the Far West in May, Wallace broke his journey at Iowa City and demanded a meeting between the next President and Stalin, adding the Roosevelt always said that he could do business with Stalin. In Cedar Rapids, Iowa, a large minority of Czechs had been established. Speaking here as he continued his tour westward, Wallace seemed the apologist for the Communists. According to the report in Time magazine, Wallace's defense was as follows:

The utterly insane and suicidal foreign policy of our

---

<sup>69</sup>"Third Parties," Time, LI (April 19, 1948), 25.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

country contributed greatly to these developments. The Russians, [said Wallace], have no necessity to expand their borders, nor will they for many decades to come, except as external threats and pressures, compel them to seek military security.<sup>71</sup>

In speaking to an audience of some 8,500 people at the Cow Palace in San Francisco, Wallace charged "that the real instigators of the cold war were international big business, monopolists and 'hugely rich' American corporations. It [had] been less of a war against Russia," he said, "than a war against the American people; less of a war against communism than a war against democracy."<sup>72</sup>

An extremely important event of the Wallace pre-Con-vention campaign was the acceptance by Stalin of Wallace's program for settling the differences between the United States and the Soviet. Wallace had written Premier Stalin in May of 1948 listing his program:

. . . a general reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons; conclusion of peace treaties with Germany and Japan and [the settlement of] the question of evacuation of troops from these countries; evacuation of troops from China and Korea; respect for the sovereignty of individual countries and non-interference in their domestic affairs; the inadmissibility of military bases in member countries of the United Nations; world development of international trade excluding any sort of discrimination; in the framework of the United Nations, assistance to and economic restoration of the countries which suffered from the war; defense of democracy and

---

<sup>71</sup>"Third Parties," Time, LI (May 10, 1948), 24.

<sup>72</sup>The New York Times, May 19, 1948.



the insuring of civil rights in all countries. . . .<sup>73</sup>

Stalin chose to present his acceptance by radio address from Moscow, presented May 18, 1948. To Wallace's objectives, Stalin stated, according to The New York Times:

There is no statesman caring for peace and cooperation among the peoples who can ignore this program, since it reflects the hopes and strivings of the peoples toward consolidation of peace and it doubtless will have the support of many millions of ordinary people.<sup>74</sup>

This statement encouraged the hope of Wallace for the best interests of peace since he regarded the response of Premier Stalin as "a real offer by Russia 'to sit down' and find a way to end the 'cold war.'"<sup>75</sup> Wallace said further:

I am humble and grateful to be an instrument in this crisis, in having been able to bring about this offer for a settlement of our differences. . . . As far as I am concerned, there is only one thing in which I am interested in this world--doing all I can to bring about a peaceful world.

. . . . .

If I have done anything to further the cause of peace<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup>The New York Times, May 18, 1948.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

<sup>76</sup>According to The New York Times, May 19, 1948, the State Department tended to be more cautious about the exchange; they felt that it was "encouraging" that the Russo-American differences could be solved, but it rejected the "specific issues" that Wallace listed as "they are not bilateral issues between this country and the Soviet Union." The State Department regarded the issues as concerning many countries and they were hesitant to open new talks on the basis of broken, earlier agreements which the Soviet had made.

in the world . . . I shall have felt my whole campaign a tremendous success.<sup>77</sup>

In speaking in Cleveland, Ohio, on June 20, 1948, Wallace again attacked Truman in the following statements:

It is interesting that Mr. Truman in his Western travels put all the blame for the reactionary course of domestic policies on Congress. . . . That's one kind of speech Mr. Truman has learned how to deliver-- speeches blaming the other guy for everything that goes wrong.

And he wasn't very far from Washington before his head got too big for his halo. The self-annointed angel blames all domestic ills on the Republicans in Congress and all the ills beyond our borders from Bogota to Athens are Joe Salin's [sic] fault.<sup>78</sup>

Wallace charged further that Mr. Truman was not the "fighting liberal he pretends to be" but actually "a partner in the move to curtail civil rights."<sup>79</sup> Wallace said he believed, "It is always a safe bet that Harry Truman will be right 50 per cent of the time," because, "he is both sides of everything."<sup>80</sup>

In June, Wallace, speaking before a group of New York businessmen, took the opportunity to charge "'the Truman-Forrestal clique' of spending hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' money in Greece and Turkey to protect 'the

---

<sup>77</sup>The New York Times, May 18, 1948.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., June 21, 1948.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.

flanks of the Standard Oil's arabian empire.'"<sup>81</sup> Wallace's campaign manager, C. B. Baldwin, attacked Dewey and Warren as being the same "old Hoover crowd," the "Republican machine fronters," who were "bent on giving the people the same type of enlightened government Herbert Hoover administered from 1928 to 1932 [sic] ." <sup>82</sup> Strangely enough, Baldwin predicted that Dewey would be defeated as in 1944. This reasoning was contradictory to Progressive strategy which aimed to place the Republican Party in control by dividing the Democratic Party.

Wallace, speaking July 12, before the Progressive Party of West Virginia, predicted the "death knell" of the Democrats, as Baldwin had forecast the defeat of the Republicans. He said the Democratic party could not be reformed "because a Democratic Party that was more than half Hague offers no home for the progressives," just as "a Democratic party that was 'more than half Taft-Hartley [offered] no place for labor," and a "Democratic Party" that was "more than half monopoly, more under the Forrestals and the Harrimans offered no hope for the average American plagued by high

---

<sup>81</sup>The New York Times, June 23, 1948.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., June 26, 1948.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., July 12, 1948.

prices."<sup>83</sup> Wallace continued as follows:

The futility of attempting to remake the Democratic party is being proved by some nice liberal people who have learned the facts of life in the last few weeks. . . . In Alliance with corrupt machine politicians they have tried to dump Truman. They have performed a great service. They are making it clear that the Democratic party has outlived its usefulness.<sup>84</sup>

Wallace turned to the Republican Party saying that the "voters who wanted to support fascism abroad, to see "our resources wasted in arms," to see "the draft law" passed, and to see "our civil liberties" curtailed, would "vote for Tom Dewey."<sup>85</sup>

The month of July brought the scheduled Progressive Convention, in which Manager Baldwin announced to the assembled followers that a vote for the Democratic Party in November was a wasted vote. As he made no claim of victory for the Progressives, this statement seemed to forecast a Republican victory. Other orators of the Convention reflected their feeling of disillusionment with both of the old parties as did the Platform adopted by the Party Convention (see Appendix, p.259). The feeling was evident throughout the Convention that the Party stood little chance for the victory in the election of 1948 but looked forward to more success in

---

<sup>83</sup>The New York Times, July 12, 1948.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid.

1950 and 1952.

The post-Convention plan of action seemed to call for Wallace to go South to gain votes in the North. The Communists hoped that Southern reaction against Wallace would arouse sympathy in the North to win more Progressive votes. Wallace, traveling with Negroes in his party, insisted upon unsegregated audiences and frequently was entertained by Negroes in their homes. All of these factors combined to make his cause unpopular in the South, already agitated by the Civil Rights Program. In an initial address of the tour, Wallace attacked his political opponents in the following statement:

Mr. Truman and Governor Dewey, the Democratic and Republican Presidential nominees, are only more sophisticated versions of their more articulate brother, the candidate of the Dixiecrat party. . . . Mr. Truman's silence has been the eulogy over the graves of Negroes, some in the United States army uniform, lynched in the South under his Administration. Mr. Dewey has had a number of lynchings in his state. He has carefully and brazenly whitewashed lynching and attacks on citizens of his state.

The Truman-Dewey-Dulles combine directed the United Nations to reject the appeal from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to the UN. They directed that the United States delegation vote against the petition of South Africans for equality.<sup>86</sup>

In speaking to the National Convention of the Grand Lodge of Negro Elks, Wallace compared his party to "the abolitionists

---

<sup>86</sup>The New York Times, August 25, 1948.

of earlier years," and "said that 'Jim Crow [sic] has passed a sentence of death against 15,000,000 Americans and that is why we must say they are fighting for their very lives.'"<sup>87</sup> As Wallace continued South, he frequently became the target of eggs and tomatoes and the victim of hoodlum attacks. President Truman denounced the egging activity as "'highly Un-American business' and as 'violating the national spirit of fair play.'"<sup>88</sup> Curiously, no record is available that Dewey ever expressed himself on the matter. Governor Fielding Wright, the Dixiecrat candidate for Vice President, urged his fellow-Mississippians to behave themselves. "At week's end," said Time, "Tass's New York Bureau gleefully cabled Moscow that an organized reign of terror conducted by 'fascist hooligans' was under way against Wallace and his Progressives."<sup>89</sup> Later, as he spoke before a New York City audience, Wallace based the success of his Southern tour on the twenty unsegregated meetings that he was able to hold.<sup>90</sup>

On September 13, Wallace challenged Truman "to oppose for re-election those Democratic Representatives who [had

---

<sup>87</sup>The New York Times, August 25, 1948.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., September 1, 1948.

<sup>89</sup>Time, LII (September 13, 1948), 23.

<sup>90</sup>The New York Times, September 1, 1948.

voted] to override his veto of the Taft-Hartley Act."<sup>91</sup> Wallace thought if the President was sincere in his attack on the Republicans for the Taft-Hartley Law then he should disavow and work against Democrats who chose to vote with Republican leaders to override the Presidential veto. Wallace regarded the President's attack on the Eightieth Congress as a means of covering "his own disservices to the causes of peace, labor, and social gains for the greatest number of people."<sup>92</sup> Wallace, predicting further Truman attacks on Congress, said: "He will continue his demagogic proclamations in favor of measures to protect the people from inflation, to build houses, to harness rivers and valleys, to help the working man and farmer."<sup>93</sup> "His work," said Wallace, "will give the impression of great sincerity, but it will take actions to convince the people of any sincerity."<sup>94</sup> On September 17, Wallace attacked Truman's spending for war, as follows:

It is to hide the Truman of the fear-breeding Truman Doctrine, and the Truman who breaks strikes, and the Truman who incites witch-hunts behind a Truman who embraces the program of Roosevelt, a Truman who speaks of peace, a Truman who proclaims his devotion to the cause of labor,

---

<sup>91</sup>The New York Times, September 13, 1948.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., September 17, 1948.

a Truman who suddenly champions civil rights--a Truman, in short, who is running once again on the platform of Roosevelt.<sup>95</sup>

Wallace, who prior to September had seemed more vicious in his attacks on President Truman, attacked Governor Dewey on September 17. Wallace charged "that Mr. Dewey was keeping in the background those 'Roosevelt haters' who had been active in his unsuccessful 1944 campaign against President Roosevelt;" Wallace taunted, "Governor Dewey as being 'still afraid of the ghost' or Mr. Roosevelt;" thus, Wallace described the New York Governor as "the man who does not want to be remembered."<sup>96</sup> Wallace pointed out that,

Dewey [did] not want the people to remember, that he had the support of the oil men and the big bankers, the trust makers and the minition makers, the high tariff [sic] men and the corrupt machine men, the newspaper titans, and the preachers of hate, the labor-baiters and the racists.<sup>97</sup>

Wallace pointed out that because the,

. . . spirit of Roosevelt is so strong in the hearts of America, Dewey must keep these men in the background. If they were to show their faces and expose their views openly as they did in 1944, the wrath of the American people would smite them again as they did four years ago.<sup>98</sup>

As the campaign of 1948 came to an end, Wallace spoke

---

<sup>95</sup>The New York Times, September 17, 1948.

<sup>96</sup>Ibid.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid.

<sup>98</sup>Ibid.



throughout election day and evening, at numerous Progressive rallies in New York City. He told audiences "that their votes today would determine whether there would be 'one world at peace or two worlds in conflict.'"<sup>99</sup> In his last campaign address, delivered in the Bronx, Wallace declared "that votes cast for President Truman would be wasted because 'Truman [was] going to lose.'"<sup>100</sup> Wallace conceded the victory to Dewey; yet, he felt that only a vote for the Progressive Party "could register a protest against 'the war and anti-labor policies of Wall Street.'"<sup>101</sup> Wallace made a final protest against the old parties saying: (1) that "a vote for Governor Dewey would be a 'vote for policies that will temporarily increase Wall Street's super-profits while leading us straight to war and depression;" (2) that Mr. Truman would lose "because he abandoned the Roosevelt policies immediately after taking office and turned the Administration over to Wall Street;" and (3) that "both President Truman and Governor Dewey had 'tried to take the foreign policy out of the campaign' but that 'the Progressive Party made peace a major issue.'"<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup>The New York Times, November 2, 1948.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid.

<sup>101</sup>Ibid.

<sup>102</sup>Ibid.

The campaign of 1948 came to an end; reporters saw in Wallace an embittered man who seemed to follow the Communist line. It was charged and never denied that his speeches were written by Lew Frank, Jr., a one-time New Republic writer.<sup>103</sup> Everything in his campaign was done in the name of peace.

Political comment. Political comment was predominantly; in favor of the Republicans as pollsters, newspapers, periodicals, and experts joined predicting a Dewey victory. The New York Times predicted 345 electoral votes for Dewey; 105 for Truman; 28 for Thurmond; and none for Wallace.

Arthur Krock dealt with Mr. Truman in the following manner:

Even if Mr. Truman had adopted and pursued his current strategy [an appeal to group support in states of large electoral votes] from the outset they [political experts] do not think it would have been successful. In this opinion, his defeat was pre-ordained by the President's own record of shifts and errors; the party split he inherited and then widened; the tremendous problems that faced him on his succession, which came by law and not by the expressed will of the voters; and, above all, by the national wish for a change in the Government.

.....

On the other hand, if the event shows that Mr. Truman has surmounted the heavy odds against him he did not create and also those of his own creation, he will take rank as the miracle man in the history of American politics whom many hostile members of Congress will not venture strongly to challenge for a year or more.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup>Time, LI (May 10, 1948), 23.

<sup>104</sup>The New York Times, October 31, 1948.

Barron's, a financial magazine, commented on the election campaign in the following statement:

The closing days of the political campaign will witness an all-out dash by the Republican High Command to retain G.O.P. control of the Senate. Republican headquarters is convinced that Gov. Dewey is now a cinch, hence the effort can be spared [from the Dewey campaign] on seeing that he doesn't have an opposition Senate.

.....

Governor Dewey's pledges to the West on reclamation and water power developments are causing raised eyebrows among Congressional economizers of his own party. If elected, he may find himself in difficulty with some of his own Republican leaders in making good on his pledges.<sup>105</sup>

The Canadian Forum commented on the pre-convention saying: "Tweedledee--Stassen, Tweedledum--Truman, and Wallace-in-Wonderland present an unhappy picture as the leaders of American public opinion."<sup>106</sup> In August, it appraised the situation as:

The renomination of Thomas E. Dewey as the Republican candidate for the president, and the apparently certain selection by the Democrats of Harry S. Truman as his major campaign rival, set the stage for the most meaningless election in the United States since the beginning of the Roosevelt era.<sup>107</sup>

On the third party attempt, The Canadian Forum said:

---

<sup>105</sup>Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, XXVIII (October 4, 1948), 11.

<sup>106</sup>Martin Lipset, "Under the Big Top," The Canadian Forum, XXVII (May, 1948), 26.

<sup>107</sup>Ibid., XXVIII (August, 1948), 99.

The situation would seem ripe for the long-awaited 'third party' in the United States, but in this area things are worse than ever. The unnamed Wallace Party is a pure Communist front and as such can claim no support from real progressives.<sup>108</sup>

As the campaign came to a close, all parties claimed a victory. Dewey was confident of winning; certainly, many Democratic leaders were willing to concede his victory. Of all Democratic leaders, Truman himself seemed to be the most confident of a Democratic victory. A game candidate, an average American--"one of the boys" came from behind to overtake and win the race.

---

<sup>108</sup>Martin Lipset, "Under the Big Top," The Canadian Forum, XXVIII (August, 1948), 99.

CHAPTER VI

THE ELECTION RESULTS EXAMINED

The election of 1948 brought the astounding results of a Democratic victory apparently to confound and amaze everyone but the President. President Truman received a popular vote of 24,179,623,<sup>1</sup> a majority in twenty-eight states with an electoral vote of 303; among the losers, Dewey received a popular vote of 21,991,290, a majority in sixteen states with an electoral vote of 189; Thurmond received a popular vote of 1,176,154, a majority in four states with an electoral vote of 39, and Wallace received a popular vote of 1,157,326, a majority in no states and no electoral votes. The Democrats gained fourteen seats in the Senate and seventy-seven in the House. Of thirty-four states electing governors, twenty-one elected Democratic governors; thirteen elected Republican governors

Among the most amazed might well be listed the pollsters, Gallup, Roper, Crossley, whose predictions were so out of line with the outcome of the national election. The pollsters'<sup>2</sup> forecasts have been widely publicized and were

---

<sup>1</sup>George Gallup, The Political Almanac of 1952 (New York: B. C. Forbes and Sons, 1952), pp. 16, 20, 21.

<sup>2</sup>The New York Times, November 7, 1948.

as is shown in Table 1.

As the newspaper polls forecast Republic victory, their editorials were also pledged to the Republican cause. Nathan Blumberg in his study entitled the One-Party Press revealed the following information on the 1948 election:

Charges of press bias reached a crescendo following the unexpected victory of President Truman in 1948 with only a handful of newspapers supporting him.

The defense of the press during this period of 1932 to 1948 was constructed primarily on the contention that although a majority of newspapers certainly expressed editorial preference for the Republican candidate in each election, the news columns fairly reported the activities of the Democratic candidate. . . . It [the election] was a sad commentary on the ability of newspapers to sway public opinion on their editorial pages, but no finer defense of the press in a democratic society could be made than the news columns were not perverted to serve the ends of editorial preference.<sup>3</sup>

The study pointed out that Governor Dewey had the support of 65.2 per cent of the newspapers, whereas Truman had 15.4 per cent. Thurmond had 3.8 per cent, and Wallace had 0.2 per cent.

Although newspapers threw their editorial support to Governor Dewey, their readers in large cities of 100,000 or more people gave substantial majorities to the Democrats in all sections of the country. According to George Gallup's study, The Political Almanac, 1952, the large cities in New

---

<sup>3</sup>Nathan B. Blumberg, One-Party Press (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1954), pp. 10-11.

TABLE I  
 COMPARISON OF POLLSTERS' PREDICTIONS  
 IN THE ELECTION OF 1948\*

Candidates	TRUMAN	DEWEY	WALLACE	THURMOND
Percentage predicted by Gallup	44.5	49.5	4.0	2.0
Percentage predicted by Roper	37.5	52.8	4.4	5.3
Percentage predicted by Crossley	45.0	50.1	3.3	1.6
Average of pollsters' predictions	42.3	50.8	3.9	3.0
Percentage cast in the election	50.0	45.6	2.4	2.0
Variation between the percentages cast and predicted	18.1	10.1	39.2	33.2

\*The New York Times, November 7, 1948.

England gave 63.7 per cent of their total votes cast to the Democratic Party; whereas; in the Middle Atlantic States, they gave 52.7 per cent; in the East Central States, 57.0 per cent; in the West Central States, 59.4 per cent; in the Mountain States, 52.4 per cent; in the Pacific States, 49.2 per cent; and in the South, 47.7 per cent.<sup>4</sup> On the basis of these figures, it appears the urban vote was important to the success of the Democrats.

In a study of the metropolitan election pluralities, made by Dr. Samuel J. Eldersveld<sup>5</sup> of the University of Michigan, an attempt was made to ascertain the importance of the large city vote in the Presidential elections since 1920.

Dr. Eldersveld stated his findings as follows:

The 1948 election may indeed indicate some recession in Democratic urban strength. Truman lost New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Maryland, primarily because there was a decline in the size of the Democratic pluralities in the large cities of those states. But he was successful in the crucial states of Illinois, Ohio, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and California, due to the Democratic pluralities in the key cities of those states. Finally, although the percentage of the Truman vote produced in urban areas was lower in 1948 than was Roosevelt's in 1944, it was higher than had been Roosevelt's during the entire period 1932-1940. Actually in the past two elections the vote in large urban areas was of crucial importance to the Democratic party, much more than

---

<sup>4</sup>Gallup, The Political Almanac, 1952, p. 32.

<sup>5</sup>Samuel J. Eldersveld, "The Influence of Metropolitan Party Pluralities in Presidential Elections since 1920; A Study of Twelve Key Cities," American Political Science Review, XLIII (December, 1949), 1189-1235.



during the early New Deal period.

. . . . .

In 1940, 1944, and 1948, the Democrats would have lost the presidential election, therefore, without the urban pluralities which they received from these 12 key cities.<sup>6</sup> Roosevelt's 449 Electoral College votes in 1940 would have been reduced to 237; his 432 Electoral College votes in 1944 would have been reduced to 239; and Truman's 303 Electoral College votes in 1948 would have been reduced to 197, without the crucial Democratic majorities produced by the metropolitan electorates. In a sense, this is an overstatement of the case and a reformulation for a special purpose, but it is an essentially valid conclusion; for these metropolitan pluralities were vital and the balancing force in Democratic success.<sup>7</sup>

It would seem established that the readers of the pro-Dewey press gave large majorities to the Democrats in various sections of the country.

Truman victory. The election of 1948 has been called the "Miracle of 1948."<sup>8</sup> There is much evidence to support that theory of the event. Moreover, the election miracle presented a sharp contrast to the situation that President Truman had inherited in 1945. This situation has been

---

<sup>6</sup>The twelve cities used in Dr. Eldersveld study were: New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Cleveland, Baltimore, St. Louis, Boston, Milwaukee, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. All the cities used had a population over 500,000.

<sup>7</sup>Eldersveld, "The Influence of Metropolitan Party Pluralities in Presidential Elections since 1920; A Study of Twelve Key Cities," pp. 1200-1201, 1202.

<sup>8</sup>Jay Franklin, "Inside Strategy of the Campaign," Life, XXV (November 13, 1948), 48.

appraised by Sait in the following manner:

. . . Swollen savings, and large incomes for all except the white-collar workers had built a huge demand for all sorts of goods which had not been produced during the war. Businessmen and farmers opposed the continuation of price control when they saw an opportunity to increase prices. Trade unions, particularly the C.I.O. launched campaigns to maintain their weekly pay checks. A coalition of Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans passed over the President's protest an emasculated price law. Truman was forced to remove many controls after the meat shortages became acute in September, 1946. Prices began to soar for consumer goods. The accumulated stresses and strains aided the Republicans in their sweeping victories in the 1946 elections. For the first time since Roosevelt had assumed office in 1932, they gained control of both the House and the Senate. Scenting the possibility of victory in 1948, Republicans sought to put through tax reduction, and budget reduction.<sup>9</sup>

The country's plight was reflected in the confusion in the Democratic party itself. Many of its leaders were willing to concede that the trend started in the election of 1946 would continue in a Republican victory of 1948. Most leaders in the Democratic party were unwilling that Mr. Truman be nominated as they considered him a "bungler." The exodus of the Progressives and the Dixiecrats seemed to assure the defeat of the Democratic candidate in 1948. It would seem that only the fighting acceptance address made by Truman at two o'clock in the morning of the last day of the July session at the National Democratic Convention augured

---

<sup>9</sup>Edward M. Sait, American Parties and Elections (New York: Appleton Century Company, 1952), p. 220.

a new political fortune for the party. Truman has given his version of the occasion as follows:

It took only a sentence to bring the delegates to their feet. That was when I said, 'Senator Barkley and I will win this election and made these Republicans like it--don't you forget that.' I meant just that, and I said it as if I meant it.

The Democrats had been waiting to hear somebody say positively that we were going to win, and the effect on them was electric. I made them a tough, fighting speech. I recited the benefits that had been won by the Democratic administration for the people. I listed in detail the failure of the Republican-controlled Congress and I did not pull any punches. Then, toward the end of the speech, I played my trump card. I announced: 'On the 26th day of July, which out in Missouri we call 'Turnip Day,' I am going to call Congress back and ask them to pass laws to halt rising prices, to meet the housing crisis--which they are saying they are for in their platform.<sup>10</sup>

Jay Franklin,<sup>11</sup> a columnist and election aide, has revealed varied factors contributing to the inside strategy of the campaign. (1) There were only a few in Truman's immediate circle who felt that he could be elected. (2) Contrary to common opinion, Truman looked upon Wallace's leaving as an asset to the party. (3) Truman felt that Wallace would prevent a general "apathy" and rid the Democrats of the

---

<sup>10</sup>"Fooling the '48 Forecasters," The Truman Memoirs: Part II, Life, XL (January 30, 1956), 73.

<sup>11</sup>Franklin, "Inside Strategy of the Campaign," 48.

"radical embarrassment."<sup>12</sup> (4) The President believed also that the exodus of the Dixiecrats would be beneficial to the party in that their departure would bring increased Northern support. (5) Franklin believed Truman's calling, in the political convention, the 80th Congress back in special session was a master political stroke. (6) That this political move summed up the characteristics of the opposition and forced Governor Dewey to identify himself with the record of the 80th Congress.<sup>13</sup>

As the President's acceptance address proved successful, so did his many addresses made throughout the campaign to varied audiences in all parts of the country. Franklin related that all major speeches went through a series of six drafts starting with Charles Murphy and ending with a group composed of Charles Ross, Matt Connelly, Clark Clifford, and the Truman family. Franklin credited Mrs. Truman with

---

<sup>12</sup>In "Fooling the '48 Forecasters," Truman related that "Wallace himself, who seemed to have been transformed into a mystic with a zeal that verged on fanaticism, was apparently unaware of the purposes to which the Communists were putting his 'progressive' movement. I always felt that he was an honest man and a faithful public servant but that he simply did not understand what was happening." See p. 65.

<sup>13</sup>According to Samuel Lubell, "Shortly after the Republican Convention, Baruch suggested to Truman that he call the Republican-controlled Congress back into special session thus providing an arena in which the Republican-performance could be matched against the newly drafted Republican platform." Samuel Lubell, The Future of American Politics (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), pp. 15-16.

exercising restraint based upon sound and important judgment; and he credited Truman with a word choice that appealed to the average American. Of Truman's addresses in the campaign of 1948, Franklin thought the Chicago speech in which Truman had toned down the prepared version was a mistake. This address compared the Republicans and Dewey to the totalitarian movements of Italy, Germany, and Japan. A speech which undoubtedly called for a fighting response was ignored fortunately by the Republicans, said Franklin. Speeches made on the road tour were prepared just ahead of the stop by George Elsey and Jay Franklin, working from 18 to 20 hours a day. Franklin believed this process gave a freshness that the addresses of the Republicans lacked in their pre-arranged campaign schedule.

Franklin believed that Republican "overconfidence supplied the final ingredient for Truman's David-and-Goliath [sic] victory."<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, Truman's sincere man-to-man humanity, his personal simplicity and deep sincerity appealed to the farmers whom the G.O.P. took for granted. Truman said in his Memoirs:

The technique which I used at the whistle stops was simple and straightforward. There were no special gimmicks or oratorical devices. I refused to be coached. I simply told the people in my own language that they had better wake up to the fact that it was their fight, I

---

<sup>14</sup>Franklin, "Inside Strategy of the Campaign," 48.

emphasized, the Republicans would soon be giving the farmers and the workers the little end of the stick again.

I also clarified the issues which the Republicans were trying to make complex for the voters. I talked to them as human beings with real needs and feelings and fears. I talked to them about their jobs, their homes and the cost of living. I treated them not like crowds of people but like businessmen, tenant farmers, housewives, married veterans, laboring men, teachers--individuals with interests for whom I, as President, had a genuine concern.<sup>15</sup>

All of these, Franklin believed, were the "Truman miracle."

"It wouldn't have happened unless we all had worked together honestly and unselfishly for a cause that we believed far greater than ourselves."<sup>16</sup>

The victory of Truman was characterized by the victor's being established in office without the usual campaign commitments having been made. Mr. Truman had been unencumbered very largely by his Cabinet members. Only Attorney General, Tom Clark, Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan, and Secretary of Labor, Maurice Tobin came to the aid of the President during the campaign. The National Campaign Chairman for the Democrats, Howard J. McGrath, proved ineffectual; hence, he was disregarded during the campaign. This was true of most Democratic leaders who also chose to ignore Mr. Truman. An exception to this trend was Harold Ickes, who

---

<sup>15</sup>"Fooling the '48 Forecasters," p. 76.

<sup>16</sup>Franklin, "Inside Strategy of the Campaign," p. 48.

came to the President's support and delivered the funniest speech of the campaign. The speech, which was called "Love, Love, Love," satirized the so-called Republican campaign of "Sweetness and Light," their 1948 political campaign strategy. Lacking support by Democratic leaders in many instances, Truman was handicapped also by the lack of funds in the National Democratic Treasury and was forced to use his personal savings in the cause that he felt vital. Election brought to him success for which he had worked tirelessly.

Wheeler McMillen, editor of Pathfinder, speaking to a group of NAM after the election said truthfully of Truman:

We have seen the miracle performed. Here was a man whose prospects were discounted long before the conventions, who was declared defeated before and after he was nominated, and whom practically every amateur and professional expert pronounced to be hopelessly defeated not only every day before the election but even after half the returns were in at midnight of election day. How did he accomplish this truly spectacular upset?<sup>17</sup>

McMillen pointed out that Truman had conducted his campaign much in the manner of suggestions found in Industry's Sales Manual: (1) "he defined his political market precisely," (2) "then, he devised a sales talk to appeal especially to the prospects he was after," (3) "his sales talks wasted few words," (4) "he did not hesitate to repeat,"

---

<sup>17</sup>Wheeler McMillen, "The Miracle of 1948," Vital Speeches, XV (January 1, 1949), 181.

and (5) he presented facts.<sup>18</sup> McMillen thought that "his possession of the common touch, his obvious humaneness," was his greatest asset, as he "personally carried his story to the people."<sup>19</sup>

McMillen states that Truman had determined in advance "the people and places where he most wanted to get support," while he had devised a sales talk to appeal to housewives, promising legislation to combat high prices, high rents, and lack of housing.<sup>20</sup> To impress labor, Truman repudiated the Taft-Hartley Act, proposed a higher minimum wage, stood for Civil Rights legislation, and suggested a corporate tax for the benefit of labor. To interest the farmer, the President made a definite promise to support crop subsidies, to encourage reclamation appropriations, to provide more grain storage facilities, and to make available more public power.

McMillen thought Truman had presented his story simply in contrast to the more general terms used by Governor Dewey. McMillen called attention to the fact that the NAM had gone on record as building on "an explicit faith . . . that if the so-called 'man on the street' was given the facts truthfully, dramatically, and repeatedly, he will always arrive

---

<sup>18</sup>McMillen, "The Miracle of 1948," 181-182.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 182.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., pp. 181-182.



at the right decision and what's more, he will always make his opinions felt."<sup>21</sup>

Truman's faith, said McMillen, led him to present facts truthfully [as he believed them] as he forged links of understanding with his electorate. He went as a good salesman to sell his faith to the grass-roots of the country. His reliance was put on "face-to-face selling, in doorbell ringing and human contacts."<sup>22</sup> Finally, McMillen called attention to the fact that "if he had studied your methods; your own explanations of what you do and how you do it, he could not have given you a better demonstration of their soundness and sure success."<sup>23</sup>

Decisive factors. President Truman was inclined to credit his victory to Labor; on the other hand, Labor appeared to exercise a power beyond its own expectations. With the exception of a few leftwing labor groups, Labor had actively supported the Democrats in the campaign. For example, in Chicago, the A.F.L. had 12,000 bell pushers to aid the Democrats in the campaign; the C.I.O. had 5,000.

---

<sup>21</sup>Franklin, "The Miracle of 1948," p. 182.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 181.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 182.

In Boston,<sup>24</sup> the A.F.L., C.I.O., and Railway Brotherhood swung into the Democratic fold, motivated by the Republican State Legislature's attempt to abolish closed and union shops. It is recorded that the Boston printers cheered after the election each time they received orders to throw another quantity of type for the predicted Republican winners in the hellbox where the unused type was dumped.<sup>25</sup> From all parts of the country, Labor's adherence to the Democrats was repeated, intensified by their dislike of the Taft-Hartley Act and the fact that Truman had vetoed it. Labor held the large metropolitan areas in most cases in the Democratic columns.

Truman's belief that Wallace would rid the Democrats of the left-wingers was appreciated by Labor. Before and during election year of 1948, Labor Unions were engaged in ridding their organizations of Communist control of their leadership. In unions where Communist control existed, the rank-and-file members openly opposed and disliked it. After a campaign visit of Wallace to Detroit, union men who never wore campaign buttons were demanding Truman buttons as the aftermath of their union struggle to oust Red control and to

---

<sup>24</sup>These incidents of the election were taken from The New Republic of November 15, 1948, p. 7.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

oppose a party reputed to be Communist controlled.

Truman also gained the support of the farmer. During the 1948 campaign, the Republicans failed to convince the farmers that their benefits under the New Deal would be maintained for them under the Republicans. The 80th Congress aided Truman's cause when the House Banking Committee, headed by Representative Wolcott, a Republican of Michigan, made it more difficult for farmers to get price-support loans. In June, 1948, the same Committee forbade the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire or lease storage facilities in addition to those already held. The current practice had been to store in government-owned steel bins on the farmers' own farms. This practice had enabled the farmer to pay off the loan and use the corn and grain if he so desired as it was available close at hand. Under the June ruling, the farmers often had to use existent storage space in distant large cities to obtain Government loans. In the event no storage space existed, the farmer was forced to sell to private speculators who frequently bought corn at a dollar a bushel.

The farmers were also upset by falling prices in 1948; wheat had fallen below the 1947 level to a dollar a bushel; corn, a dollar-eighty; and soybeans, a dollar sixty-five. This meant the farmers had to put larger amounts of crops under loan to get the price supports. If the price supports were lowered as the farmers feared might happen

under the Republicans then the farmers would lose still more.

Time commented on the price situation in the following manner:

In case any farmers missed the point, Harry Truman blamed the G.O.P. directly when the price of Illinois corn dropped from \$2.29 to 96¢ a bushel in September. Ahead of and behind the President, Agriculture Secretary Charles Brannan also roamed the Midwest, hammering home the same argument. Candidate Dewey, on the other hand, failed to give any specific assurances on the future of price supports. Besides, many farmers just liked the prosperity they had gained in Democratic years.<sup>26</sup>

The U. S. News and World Report pointed out other reasons for the farmers' failure to support the Republicans as follows:

Other actions of Congress, too, played a part in turning farmers against the Republican Party. Some farmers, enthusiastic about rural electric service, were aroused by a cut, later restored, in Rural Electrification Administration funds. Some in Minnesota got up in arms when Congress clamped down on generating plants for REA co-operatives. They took that out on Senator Joseph H. Ball, particularly, helping to defeat him.

Many thought Congress had been unkind to farmers' co-operatives generally, and called the Republican program vague about future policy affecting co-operatives. . . .

In sum the majority of farm voters, if they did not fully accept Mr. Truman's indictment of the Congress as the 'worst or second worst in history,' did conclude that it was no friend of the farmer. That went far to turn voters against Republican candidates.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>"The Election," Time, LII (November 15, 1948), 24.

<sup>27</sup>"Why Farmers Swung to Truman," The U. S. News and World Report, XXV (November 19, 1948), 24.

Stassen, speaking in the primary, blamed the Democrats for the high price of food and the Government for using price supports for maintaining high prices. Meanwhile, at the time Stassen was accepted into the Dewey group during the campaign [July, 1948], nothing was done to allay the farmers' fears that the Republicans were not "sincerely interested in supporting farm prices and farm income."<sup>28</sup> As the price of corn fell two weeks prior to election, The New Republic<sup>29</sup> commented that in "Illinois the price of corn was more important than anything Colonel McCormick had to say."

The Negro vote was also important in the election of 1948. Harlem, the New York Negro District, gave 108,000 votes to Truman, 34,000 to Dewey, and 29,000 to Wallace.<sup>30</sup> Elsewhere the Negro vote was also predominately Democratic. It appeared that President Truman by taking his firm stand on Civil Rights legislation had fathered a loyalty from the Negroes who felt if they failed to support Truman no other leader would dare take such a courageous position. Although Dewey had a good record for appointing a few Negroes to office, this was no longer enough for the colored voter who

---

<sup>28</sup>"Why Farmers Swung to Truman," p. 24.

<sup>29</sup>The New Republic, CXIX (November 15, 1948), 7.

<sup>30</sup>Samuel Lubell, "Who Really Elected Truman?" The Saturday Evening Post, CCXXI (January 22, 1949), 53.

wanted to consolidate his balance of power into real political concessions--usually better housing. The Republicans failed to have a labor program, or, a housing program to relieve the Negro from tenement districts and segregation.

A study made by Ralph Bunche gives the following insight on the Negroes' political demands:

The fact is that the Negro voter in the North is much more thoroughly assimilated politically than he is socially or economically. The Negro voter, like the white, is preyed upon by the political machines. The Negro voter, through his political leaders, who are professional politicians and therefore largely self-seeking, expect a direct return for his vote in the form of jobs, social and municipal services. Whereas in Chicago, New York, Cleveland, Philadelphia, St. Louis and Detroit, his vote is an important factor in determining election results, he does get improved facilities and services, though seldom in proportion to the real importance of his vote. Yet his vote, especially when political lieutenants can control it, is a voice that can command attention, and gives to the Negro of the North an effective lever that is almost entirely foreign to his black brother in the South.<sup>31</sup>

In contributing to large pluralities in metropolitan areas, the Negro takes his place beside Labor in the election of 1948.

Henry Lee Moon in his book, Balance of Power: The Negro Vote shows that the Negroes in many states control a vote larger than the vote needed to shift the election from

---

<sup>31</sup>Ralph Bunche, "The Negro in the Political Life of the United States," Race, Prejudice and Discrimination, edited by Arnold N. Rose, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951), p. 232.

one major party to another. States in this category are Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. In the over-all national vote the Negro percentage, 9.2 per cent of the electorate, is larger than the percentage, 3.7, needed to shift the election from the Democrats to the Republicans. Needless to say that although the Negro to a large degree has been deprived of the right to vote in the South, he was very effective in the election of 1948.<sup>32</sup>

Extremely important factors in the election of 1948 were the influences for and against the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Republican national strategy had been to discount this, particularly after their successful election of 1946. Truman, himself, was thought to have been advised that the sentiment for the New Deal was gone; as a result, the departure of the New Dealers in President Truman's Administration became very evident. Early in the 1948 campaign, Truman revised his position and reasserted New Deal policies, an action which brought the support of the members of the Americans for Democratic Action and other independent voters,

---

<sup>32</sup>Moon, Balance of Power: The Negro Vote, pp. 236-56.

because the Communist influence in the Progressive Party kept them from joining Wallace. There had grown up during the New Deal regime a new generation of voters who tended to be Democratic in their voting. The New Republic commented that Truman had won because "Franklin Delano Roosevelt had worked so well."<sup>33</sup> An English publication, The New Statesman and Nation, expressed the same idea with headlines which read "Roosevelt's Fifth Term."<sup>34</sup> Yet, as Roosevelt's influence was felt to be an asset in many ways, his death became an asset to the Democrats in the Midwestern areas.

Samuel Lubell pointed out in his Saturday Evening Post article, "Who Really Elected Truman?" that although the German-Americans disliked Roosevelt because of World War II, they liked Truman's advocacy of the Marshall Plan.<sup>35</sup> Lubell also pointed out that \$30,000 a month went from German-Americans living in the St. Louis area to help relatives in post-war Germany. Hence, they were staunch supporters of the Marshall Plan. The Midwestern German group liked the New Deal well enough--only their dislike for Roosevelt caused them to oppose the Democratic ticket. This feeling

---

<sup>33</sup>The New Republic, CXIX (November 15, 1948), 6.

<sup>34</sup>The New Statesman and Nation, XXXVI (November 6, 1948), 385.

<sup>35</sup>Samuel Lubell, "Who Really Elected Truman?" The Saturday Evening Post, CCXXI (January 22, 1949), 54.



existed in Wisconsin as well as the St. Louis area; consequently, after the death of Roosevelt, they were willing to support Truman in 1948.

D. W. Brogan wrote for the Spectator an article called "The Doom of the G.O.P.," in which, he commented on the strength of the New Deal as follows:

Yet for the old guard to change would be asking a lot of aged and highly illusioned men. They are still fighting the Civil War and the New Deal. They thought the President was foolish when he attacked Mr. Hoover or recalled the campaign against Al Smith. Mr. Truman knew what he was doing. He rubbed in the sins of a party whose Congressional leaders had not repented of them. And it was the Republicans in their tirades, not Mr. Dewey but the rank-and-file politicians, who could not resist the temptation to dig up a grave and dance on the corpse of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. They should know better now.

'Imperial Caesar thou are mighty yet.'<sup>36</sup>

The factors which led to the "Miracle of 1948" are many. The Republican campaign, carried out on an Olympian and lofty manner, stressed the need for unity, which the G.O.P said the Democrats wouldn't provide. The Republicans, seemingly maneuvered into no other alternative, came to the defense of the 80th Congress, while Truman sold the idea that Republican Congress had legislated against the interests of the people. The pollsters reassured the Republicans of victory while the newspapers confirmed it. The Dewey

---

<sup>36</sup>D. W. Brogan, "The Doom of the G.O.P.," Spectator, CLXXXI (November 12, 1948), 623.

Party failed to convince the man-on-the-street that under the Republicans, he could maintain the prosperity that he then enjoyed, including full employment, high wages, and record farm incomes. The average man tended to interpret the Dewey-Warren generalizations as smugness, while the aloofness of the Republican candidate gave credence to Truman's charge that he [Dewey] alone was the champion of the "well-to-do," the "haves," and the reactionaries. The Wall Street interests who supported Dewey, were dubbed as the "gluttons of privilege" and "fascist followers of Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini," as Truman accused them of attempting to destroy Roosevelt's New Deal. President Truman reaffirmed the desires of the laborers and the farmers, as he offset Wallace with Civil Rights Program and welfare recommendations. He appealed, with some success, to racial groups with his demand for liberalization of the Displaced Persons Act, which he denounced as discriminatory against Catholics and Jews. He endorsed Zionists' demands and was quick in his recognition of the new republic. These factors combined to culminate in the unexpected "Miracle of 1948."

Wallace, a defeated candidate. While Truman emerged victorious, Wallace went down to a defeat far beyond his followers' expectations. The popular vote of 1,157,326

brought him but 2.4 of the total major party vote.<sup>37</sup> Supported by the New York American Labor Party, Wallace polled 509,559 votes in New York, which became the balance of power, swinging the state into the Dewey column. This situation the third party had hoped to duplicate in other states containing large metropolitan areas: the Wallace vote in Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, tended to bring them into the Dewey column. Other states giving Wallace his largest percentages of the votes cast for the major parties were: California with 4.8; North Dakota, 3.8; Washington, 3.6; Oregon, 2.9; Nevada, 2.4; Minnesota, 2.3; Michigan, 2.2; Wisconsin, 2.0; Florida, 2.0; Arizona, 1.9; Massachusetts, 1.8; Maryland, 1.7; Connecticut, 1.6; and Pennsylvania, 1.5.<sup>38</sup> Although the pollsters had estimated that Wallace would receive 4 per cent of the total vote cast, it was only in New York and California that such a percentage was reached. In three states, Illinois, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, Wallace's name did not appear on the ballot. Although in Illinois, his name was authorized to appear on the Cook County ballot, the legal action came too late for his name to appear on the ballot in the election; neverthe-

---

<sup>37</sup>Gallup, The Political Almanac, 1952, pp. 16, 18.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., pp. 18-19.

less, Wallace was said to receive "4,691 write-in votes."<sup>39</sup>

Wallace had tried to command the vote of many groups, but most of his support in the election came from urban sections whose peoples seemed most sensitive on the Civil Rights issue--often Jews, Negroes, or members of other minority groups. Lubell in his study, The Future of American Politics, found the following:

Of the thirty precincts in the whole country which Wallace carried, nearly all fit the description . . . of the new zone of protest developing along the urban frontier.

Wallace carried seven precincts in Tampa, Florida, around Ybor City, which are inhabited by 'Latins' from Cuba, many of them cigar workers. All five precincts which Wallace carried in Los Angeles are declining Jewish neighborhoods, into which Negroes have begun to move; so are eight of the eighteen precincts in New York City which Wallace won. Of the other ten Wallace precincts in New York, eight are in slum-ridden East Harlem, whose population is a mixture of Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Italians, and where former Congressman Vito Marcantonio has a strong American Labor Party machine. The other two are along Bronx Park East, where a workers' co-operative apartment was built in 1927. Intended as a Communist heaven on this capitalistic earth, the project had gone bankrupt twice and is now privately owned.

These two 'Red' precincts, along with the eight Wallace precincts in East Harlem, continued to show an American Labor party majority in the 1950 election. The other Wallace precincts, however, gave the ALP only a small vote in 1950, indicating that their vote for Wallace was not Communist inspired, but primarily a protest against Truman's stand on Palestine.

In the whole country probably three-fourths of Wallace's vote came from Negroes and Jews. New York state,

---

<sup>39</sup>Gallup, The Political Almanac, 1952, p. 141.

alone, gave Wallace almost half of his 1,150,000 votes and another 190,000 came from California. Although Truman's 'shilly-shallying'<sup>40</sup> on Palestine was the immediate cause of the large Jewish protest vote, several additional factors were involved.<sup>41</sup>

With the Jews and Negroes, it was unquestionably true that the bulk tended to vote for Truman. Wallace picked up votes in Harlem after his Southern tour with its accompanying heckling and tomato-egg throwing. This momentary support was nullified by the advent of a major political address, made by President Truman in Harlem--the first of its kind in history.

Early in the campaign, Wallace had tried to become the heir to the remnants of the earlier Progressive movements of 1912 and 1924. However, as the campaign progressed, there were "no Bull Moose connected with the Wallace-Taylor organization; Harold Ickes, the last remaining public figure, who had lived through the Bull Moose, Progressive and New Deal era flatly repudiated it," wrote Russell Nye in his book, Midwestern Progressive Politics. Nye commented further:

---

<sup>40</sup>In October, 1946, Truman announced he could not support the Morrison Plan proposed by the British Government it advocated a scheme of provincial autonomy for Palestine because of the opposition against it developing in both major parties. In March, 1948, the United States asked the Security Council to suspend action on partition of Palestine and to establish a temporary trusteeship. In May, 1948, United States recognized the new state of Israel.

<sup>41</sup>Lubell, The Future of American Politics, pp. 206-207.

The Wisconsin Progressives, the Farmer-Laborites, and other Midwestern groups were not well represented in the later party [Wallace-Taylor group], and the Progressive, the sole remaining organ of the Midwestern progressivism, declared that the 1948 Progressives had no relation whatever to the older tradition. In fact, its editor, Morris Rubin, felt in September, 1948, that ' . . . the Wallace venture sullies the word 'progressive' and damages the prospect for building a genuine progressive party.'

Nor did the Socialist party, the railroad brotherhood, the [A.F.L], the farm groups, or co-operatives (all of whom backed La Follette in 1924) line up behind Wallace. Instead, the 1948 Progressives faced the outspoken hostility of these and other organizations, such as Americans for Democratic Action. Unlike La Follette in 1924, Henry Wallace did not unequivocally disavow Communist support; by refusing to do so, he incurred the antagonism of most progressive groups. 'No truly progressive movement can be built as a popular front,' remarked Rubin of the Progressive in summarizing Midwestern opinion, 'harboring believers in freedom and devotees of dictatorship under the same tent.'<sup>42</sup>

As the Progressives' failure to support Wallace disappointed him, Labor also failed to support him with the exception of a few left-wing organizations. In 1944, Labor had supported Wallace for the Vice-Presidential nomination; consequently, he hoped to receive their support in 1948. But Labor in 1948 was fighting its own battle to oust the Communists from the control of its unions; so that Wallace with his Communist support did not appeal to Labor.<sup>43</sup> As Wallace left the Democratic Party, Democratic laborers could

---

<sup>42</sup>Russell B. Nye, Midwestern Progressive Politics (Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1951), p. 384.

<sup>43</sup>Lubell, "Who Really Elected Truman?" p. 58.

no longer be taunted about the Red influence in their political party or be "Red-baited" as they termed it. In the case of the left-wing labor groups, the rank-and-file laborers refused to follow Communist leadership.<sup>44</sup> One feels that Wallace, although he knew his party was building for the 1952-1956 elections, had illusions that a grand awakening of liberalism would sweep to him laborers, farmers, and independent voters, and bring him victory.

Wallace accepted his defeat with a departure from the customary congratulatory message to the electee. Instead, on November 4, he chose to send a telegram filled with recommendations for Mr. Truman to follow after his inauguration. Wallace's advice was stated as follows:

In honoring you with their confidence, the people have endorsed your declarations that you stand for controls to bring down prices, for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law, for price protection to the farmers, for guarantees for full civil rights to the Negro people, and for full recognition and assistance to the new state of Israel as established by the partition decision of the United Nations in [November] 1947. Workers and Negro people, look to you and to the new Democratic Congress to implement these declarations by enacting the necessary legislation.

These goals can not be realized and the bankruptcy of the American economy avoided so long as the policy of the cold war is continued and we spend increasing billions of American dollars to support reactionary regimes

---

<sup>44</sup>In Pittsburgh, the Communist dominated United Electrical Workers' leadership worked for Wallace. This brought an outpouring of the union's Catholic membership to support Truman. See Lubell, "Who Really Elected Truman?" p. 63.

abroad, arm Western Europe, and militarize America.

A comprehensive program of assistance to farmers, rollback of consumer prices, public housing, social security, conservation, irrigation, and public power development is possible only under a foreign policy of one world at peace, not two hostile worlds arming for war.

Therefore, the Progressive Party calls upon you, as you enter upon your first elected term, to repudiate the bipartisan foreign policy, to remove the military from the civilian branch of Government, and the bankers from the State Department, and to return to the Roosevelt policy of friendship and collaboration among all nations through the United Nations for the establishment of one world at peace. Only in this way can the mandate which you have received from the American people be fulfilled.<sup>45</sup>

Within the same month of November, Wallace declared the Progressive party to be "far more important now than it was," as he spoke to more than two hundred Progressive party officials, including the national committee.<sup>46</sup> Wallace forecast that "very little of the liberal program for which we campaigned will be put into law unless we are organized to keep up the pressure," and he "urged his followers to 'hold' the Democrats" to their campaign promises.<sup>47</sup> "It is not the purpose of the Progressive party," said Wallace, "to apologize for Russia, but rather "our concern is with the United States." "We are as American as Jefferson was at the time

---

<sup>45</sup>The New York Times, November 4, 1948.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., November 14, 1948.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.



of the French Revolution."<sup>48</sup> Wallace charged further:

Peace, not Russia, is the dominant issue in the eyes of us Progressives. But we know there can be no peace without an understanding of the problems of the ordinary people in every nation in the world.

We know that history will demonstrate the tragic wrongness of American big business trying to dominate the world through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.<sup>49</sup>

It would seem that the months following the election found Wallace with the same outlook, one that was to change in the next three years.

Political comment. Political comment varied as with every election that becomes history. Comment of the Daily Worker indicated disappointment with the Wallace vote, which it said "fell below not only the unrealistic quotas assigned to him by certain forces, but even below what his most sober supporters, including this paper, had expected."<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, the Daily Worker credited the Progressives both for "forcing 'vital' issues into the campaign despite the efforts of the Democrats and Republicans to avoid them," and preventing the "two-party plan to stage an election in which

---

<sup>48</sup>The New York Times, November 14, 1948.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., November 5, 1948.

not even the pretense of a debate would have been permitted."<sup>51</sup>

Eugene Dennis, an indicted Communist National Committeeman, gave his explanation of the low Wallace vote: (1) the voters thought President Truman was a lesser evil than Governor Dewey, (2) the voters had an "idea that a vote for Mr. Wallace was a 'wasted vote,'" and (3) "the masses remained confused and misled regarding the Marshall Plan and the bipartisan 'national defense' war program."<sup>52</sup> "It [was] true that the Communists expected Mr. Dewey to win by a close vote," said Dennis, "and 'we worked for and expected Wallace to secure a larger vote.'"<sup>53</sup> "The task of the Progressive party and the left-wing union forces now is to build a coalition 'that can increasingly influence the course of events, including foreign policy,' said [Dennis]."<sup>54</sup>

In an editorial entitled "Mr. Wallace's Tragedy," The New York Times commented as follows:

But the abysmal failure of Henry A. Wallace in Tuesday's election proves once and for all time that this country has no room for a third party allied with those whose roots are in foreign soil.

---

<sup>51</sup>The New York Times, November 5, 1948.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., November 14, 1948.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid.

Mr. Wallace had an opportunity to pull together the honest experimental forces in American society, in labor and on the farm, and to present their desires to the public. Mr. Wallace chose instead what seemed an easier path. He was not content with a slow and legitimate growth. He took the support so eagerly offered him by the spokesmen of a foreign Power. As the campaign proceeded he became more and more outspoken in his defense of policies laid down by an arbitrary government in Moscow, more and more bitter in his denunciation of ideals and purposes now evidently supported by the vast masses of his countryman. . . . Mr. Wallace lost votes steadily during his strenuous and far reaching campaign. He lost them because of his own folly and because of the continual revelations that were being made in Paris, in Berlin, and in Moscow of the true nature of the allies he had accepted.

Now Wallace is fallen from his high estate, if a third party is again to emerge in this country two or four years from now, it will not be led by Mr. Wallace. If he sincerely thought he had a cause, he has now destroyed this cause. That is his tragedy. He will have to live with it.<sup>55</sup>

The Canadian Forum in commenting on the election felt that the "Communists badly overplayed their hand," and that "the defeat of their puppet, Henry Wallace, [was] one of the most cheering features of the election;" furthermore, the "Canadians must feel some satisfaction in knowing that a Democratic administration, stripped of Southern reactionaries and Wallace cranks, is in office."<sup>56</sup>

I. F. Stone, columnist and Wallace supporter, stated his position in supporting Wallace as follows:

---

<sup>55</sup>The New York Times, November 4, 1948.

<sup>56</sup>"The American Elections," Canadian Forum, XXVIII (December, 1948), 195.

I wasn't born yesterday. I'm not a candidate for dogcatcher. Turn off the white lights and lay off the hotfoot. I admit everything. The Communists are doing a major part of the work of the Wallace movement, from ringing doorbells to framing platforms. Okay if you want it that way, so they 'dominate' the party. So what? I'm just a poor dupe who can't take either Dewey or Truman, and is looking for an effective way to cast a protest vote against cold war, high prices, and hysteria. Wallace has had his effect on both parties already, and a big vote for peace in November might have its effect, too. More effect, anyway, than staying home and playing charades [sic].<sup>57</sup>

In an interview for the U. S. News and World Report, Roy A. Roberts, Kansas City Star, gave his version of the change in answer to the question, "When did you observe in the recent campaign any change in the trends?"<sup>58</sup>

I would say about six or seven weeks before the election. The most notable change in the trend was the start of the collapse of the Wallace movement, which kept on collapsing right up to Election Day. Of course that should have been the signal, a great big warning signal, that the election might be close. But we all looked at the polls.<sup>59</sup>

In Fortune appeared an essay entitled, "Our 'Laboristic' President," which commented on the election in the following manner:

Mr. Truman's victory disproved several deeply held political myths. One was that the U. S. is 'normally' Republican, and goes Democratic only when some peerless leader or great issue rouses and unites the dormant

---

<sup>57</sup>I. F. Stone, The Truman Era (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1953), p. 67.

<sup>58</sup>"Truman Victory," U. S. News and World Report, XXV (December 3, 1948), 35.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid.

masses against their traditional aristocracy, the Republican business class. A corollary of that myth has been that a small vote favors the Republicans. The vote was the smallest per capita since 1920, but it didn't favor Dewey. The U. S. if 'normally' anything, is normally New Deal. That part of the Democratic program has ceased to be an issue.<sup>60</sup>

As the "Miracle of 1948" came about, the pollsters and Wallace censured it from the distance corners of the country. It would seem that Wallace had embarked on a course which he must disavow in the light of a changing current world of 1948.

---

<sup>60</sup>"Our 'Laboristic' President," Fortune, XXXVIII (December, 1948), 84.

## CHAPTER VII

## SUMMARY

Wallace has held an important niche in the American life for many years. His service to his country is based upon a varied field of activity. While his development of hybrid corn brought him personal wealth, his editorship of Wallaces' Farmer brought him prominence in the field of agriculture. His association with farm leaders in their fight for legislation to alleviate the farmers' disastrous position also contributed to his influential position among the farm groups.

This position was enhanced with the appointment of Wallace as Secretary of Agriculture in 1933. During his term of 1933 to 1940, Wallace initiated new pathways in the Government's attempt to ameliorate the lot of the farmers, caught in a sorry plight. Under Wallace's leadership, attempts were made to reduce surplus farm production and raise prices. Efforts were made to improve the soil and remove sub-marginal land from cultivation. Wallace inaugurated the Ever-Normal Granary which meant stored surpluses that became available providentially during the Second World War.

In the 1940 campaign President Roosevelt used his influence to have Wallace selected as his running mate. This choice was due largely to the need for support from the

Midwest farmers in the election of 1940. Wallace played an important role during the campaign as he called the Republicans the "party of appeasement."

As Vice-President, Wallace represented the President in missions to Mexico, Central and South America, as well as to Soviet Russia and China. During the Second World War, he served on various Boards such as Economic Defense Board and the Board of Economic Warfare. While on an essential duty of stockpiling rubber, quinine, quartz crystals and other war essentials, Wallace became involved in a quarrel with Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and Chairman of the RFC, who held the purse strings of the Board of Economic Warfare. As the quarrel became widely publicized, Roosevelt removed Wallace as Chairman and stripped Jesse Jones of his RFC duties. The dispute led to the discarding of Wallace as Vice-Presidential candidate in the campaign of 1944.

Wallace's loyalty to Roosevelt during the campaign of 1944 led Roosevelt to give him the post of Secretary of Commerce from which Jesse Jones was asked to resign. Jones's friends in the Senate prevented Wallace's appointment being confirmed until the RFC was separated from the Department of Commerce.

The death of Roosevelt early in the fourth term brought Harry S. Truman to the White House as President. Under a new President, Wallace became an isolated New Deal figure as he

advocated friendship to Russia in the face of the current stiffening policy toward the Soviet Union. An address in Madison Square Garden advocating friendship with the Soviet, contrasted sharply with the get-tough-with-Russia policy of Byrnes, Vandenberg, and Connally at the 1946 Paris Conference. This address, coupled with an earlier July letter, led Truman to ask for Wallace's resignation as Secretary of Commerce.

Wallace, now outside of the immediate Government circle, became an outspoken critic of the Administration which he censured both at home and abroad. His editorship of The New Republic gave him a forum for the expression of disapproval. A trip to England, Scandinavia, France, Palestine, as well as a transcontinental tour of the United States, gave him the opportunity to meet many liberals and to see conditions in many areas at home and abroad.

In late December, 1947, Wallace announced his candidacy for the Presidency in an attempt to inaugurate a third party which would appeal to the liberal and the independent voters who he had felt had little opportunity for expression in the old parties which he looked upon as reactionary. The movement was to be initiated in the election of 1948 and to be built into a real force in the elections of 1952 and 1956. The unfortunate domination of the third party by the Communists and fellow travelers brought it into ill repute



with the forces which it hoped to lead and helped bring about the election of Truman whom the third party hoped to defeat.

Wallace in defeat foresaw the necessity of continuing the third party as a sentinel to guarantee that the campaign promises of the victorious Democrats would be enacted into legislation.

The liberalism of Wallace. On the basis of his career, it can not be disputed that Wallace was unselfish and generous in political outlook. Truly, much of his public career has been devoted to working for the best interests of mankind in the direct pursuit of peace. It appears that in any discussion of the liberalism of Wallace, his belief in what he called progressive capitalism is basic and should be defined first. According to Wallace, a progressive capitalist was one who believed that "the wealth and resources of a country--including the channels of public information-- must serve the whole people and not just a part."<sup>1</sup> Wallace believed that profits should come from abundant production at lower prices and that "profits must be reinvested as rapidly as possible in lower prices, higher wages, experimentation, or plant expansion."<sup>2</sup> In line with New Deal

---

<sup>1</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 78.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

thinking, Wallace believed in "planning in co-operation with government," in being "willing to see government experimentation in the development of natural resources such as soils, our rivers, our forests, and our mines."<sup>3</sup> If the "government does a good job in these fields," Wallace wrote, "the opportunities for private capital are enormously increased."<sup>4</sup> Wallace believed that a progressive capitalist considered that man was fundamentally good and looked with hope toward the future. Hence Wallace urged the development of backward areas "on a non-exploitative basis;" moreover, he advocated that this would "increase business opportunities and employment in the United States."<sup>5</sup> To the progressive capitalist "ordinary folks were the great reservoir of democracy," and he was "therefore eager to see the wisest possible diffusion of education, health service, old-age security, and job insurance."<sup>6</sup> "The progressive capitalist [was] a friend of union labor insofar as union labor is wholeheartedly on the side of higher production."<sup>7</sup> Wallace was willing "to see a considerable amount of government

---

<sup>3</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 78.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 78.

ownership of public utilities provided government [could] demonstrate real efficiency in operation;" in addition, he [was] willing "to see a strong development of the co-operative movement provided that also is conducted efficiently."<sup>8</sup> Finally, Wallace stated that a "progressive capitalist [believed] in a mixed economy where, with co-operation and continuous planning, government, labor, industry, finance, and agriculture operate through whatever mechanisms will produce most and distribute most widely and cheaply without 'boom and bust.'"<sup>9</sup>

From this basic concept of capitalism Wallace developed other theses which appear in his writing. In his book, New Frontiers, Wallace developed in the following statement his concept of the new frontier:

The keynote of the new frontier is cooperation just as that of the old frontier was individualistic competition. The mechanism of progress of the new frontier is social invention, whereas that of the old frontier was mechanical invention and the competitive seizure of opportunities for wealth. Power and wealth were worshiped in the old days. Beauty and justice and joy of spirit must be worshiped in the new.<sup>10</sup>

Using the old capitalist system as a starting point, Wallace pointed out what American could do in the following statement:

---

<sup>8</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 79.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Henry A. Wallace, New Frontiers (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1934), p. 274.

In the meantime working with the capitalistic order as it has come to us out of the past, we can develop policies which will enable the representatives of agriculture, labor, industry, and consumers to meet together more effectively than in the past, and discover just formulae for price and production policies. The government sits in either as a party to the negotiations or a reviewer and enforcer. This mechanism for a concert of interest skillfully worked out, should provide in considerable measure the unwritten constitution which will govern many of our most significant advances toward economic democracy.<sup>11</sup>

In the pamphlet America Must Choose, Wallace considered the problem of nationalism and internationalism and construed them in the following manner:

The nationalist rests his case on the idea that we cannot expect any longer to trade with the world as we used to. He does not expect an adequate natural revival of foreign demand, and believes it would be folly for us to stimulate the demand artificially by loans.

The internationalist position, on the other hand, is less pessimistic about natural foreign trade prospects. The internationalist does not regard loans as the only means of brightening those prospects and enlarging them. He holds that there is no possible way of making loans eventually secure unless we become import-minded. He would rather trust to tariff concessions and other means of developing trade reciprocally. He considers the pains of this course to be less than those of a nationalist program.<sup>12</sup>

Wallace himself embraced the internationalist position as he believed that the world tends to become one world and that all men can look on each other as brothers.

---

<sup>11</sup>Wallace, New Frontiers, p. 287.

<sup>12</sup>Henry A. Wallace, America Must Choose (New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1934), p. 33.

In Democracy Reborn, which appeared in 1944, Wallace looked beyond the war to predict in this statement what America might achieve:

America will be called upon to make a new choice after this war. Our people, if they really want to do so, could raise their standard of living 50 per cent; but in so doing they would violate many of our cherished convictions. The easiest way to avoid violating the prejudices which have come down to us out of the past will be to rely for full employment in considerable measure on a large volume of exports. Moreover by pushing in this direction we help the whole world toward the attainment of peace and prosperity. The limit beyond which we must not go in pushing for large exports is the point where, by increasing exports, we increase unemployment elsewhere in the world. We cannot hope to export out unemployment to other nations without an inevitable backlash. Therefore we must be sure that our exports tend in the main to increase both the productivity and the standard of living of the world.<sup>13</sup>

In his address, "The Price of Free World Victory," delivered May 8, 1942, before the Free World Association in New York, Wallace termed the conflict of the Second World War as a fight between the slave world and the free world. "Just as the United States in 1862 could not remain half slave and half free, so in 1942 the world must make its decision for complete victory one way or another," said Wallace.<sup>14</sup> Wallace believed that the people "are on the march toward even fuller freedom than the most fortunate peoples

---

<sup>13</sup>Wallace, Democracy Reborn, pp. 273-74.

<sup>14</sup>Henry A. Wallace, The Century of the Common Man (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1943), p. 14.

of the earth have hitherto enjoyed," and that the peoples' revolution brought four duties.<sup>15</sup> These duties were: "to produce to the limit;" "to transport as rapidly as possible to the field of battle;" "to fight with all that is in us;" and last, the most important, "to build a peace--just, charitable, and enduring."<sup>16</sup> In the last duty, we failed after World War I, Wallace charged. For a lasting peace, the "century on which we are entering--the century which will come out of this war--can be and must be the century of the common man."<sup>17</sup>

Writing in his book early in 1945, Sixty Million Jobs, Wallace discussed his view point toward the Soviet and world peace as follows:

Just as lasting peace at home cannot thrive in a climate of social tensions, so can there be no lasting peace in the world if our relations with foreign countries are founded on prejudice, ignorance, and suspicion. There can be no question as to the necessity of full participation with the United Nations in helping other countries help themselves toward better living standards, for I believe that this good neighborliness spreads benefits both ways. And I want here to emphasize the necessity of avoiding and removing the defeatist tensions in international relations that are caused by constantly expecting the other fellow to take a poke at us. I have in mind particularly at this juncture our attitude toward Russia.

---

<sup>15</sup>Wallace, The Century of the Common Man, pp. 18-19.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

There is altogether too much irresponsible defeatist talk about the possibility of war with Russia. In my opinion, such talk, at a time when the blood of our boys shed on the fields of Europe has scarcely dried, is criminal. There are certain people--and they are the rankest kind of un-Americans--who are anxious to see the United States and Russia come to blows. I do not deny that in the past Russia has given the United States some provocation--just as the United States has given provocation to Russia. But anyone who has studied the relations of western Europe and Poland with Soviet Russia after World War I--anyone acquainted with the bungling policy of nonrecognition blindly followed by this country until Franklin Roosevelt ended it in 1933--surely can understand the background of Russian suspicions. However, there is no need here to unearth this past. The job for all of us today is to try to understand the basic historical, geographical, political, and economic facts. Then, I am sure, we would all readily understand the basic lack of conflict between the United States and the USSR--then there would need be no question about our doing our part toward developing a co-operative and harmonious relationship with Russia. . . . I firmly believe that the people of Russia have a great admiration and friendship for the people of the United States and that they want to live with us and prosper with us in peace.<sup>18</sup>

Wallace acquired a sympathy for the development of Russia which led him into a pathway that many Americans rejected.

Toward world peace. Wallace's book, Toward World Peace, which appeared in 1948, presented his viewpoint at the time of the campaign. One of the most criticized beliefs of Wallace was his tendency to regard the Soviet with a friendship and sometimes blind attitude. Since this pro-

---

<sup>18</sup>Henry A. Wallace, Sixty Million Jobs (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1945), pp. 6-7.

Soviet belief played such an important role in the campaign, it is interesting to trace its development as Wallace recounted it in his book.

Wallace began with a statement taken from de Tocqueville, the French author of La Democratie en Amerique, written a hundred years ago:

There are at the present time two great nations in the world which seem to tend towards the same end, although they start from different points. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. . . . Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same, yet each of them seems to be marked by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.<sup>19</sup>

From Wallace's Toward World Peace, this study attempts to paraphrase the Wallace version of Russia under the Communists. Wallace related that Communism came into being at a socialist meeting, held in 1898 in Minsk, a city in Western Russia. The meeting split into a mild, minority groups called Mensheviks and a vigorous, majority group called Bolsheviks. The real father of Communism, Lenin, changed easy-going philosophical Marxism into power politics and action. Because of the cruel Czarist regime, Lenin demanded from the Communists--complete and enthusiastic allegiance to the cause of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Out of the grinding poverty of Czarism, Lenin by his genius formed Communism. According to Wallace, it was necessary for Lenin to fight

---

<sup>19</sup>Wallace, The Century of the Common Man, p. 35.



both Czarist absolutism and the incessant attacks of western capitalism.<sup>20</sup>

Wallace was particularly impressed by the fact that only a small percentage of the Russians were Communists who led a hundred and fifty million Russians toward a new freedom. In a single generation, wrote Wallace, they taught a hundred-million people to read and write as they doubled the nation's industrial productivity. Stalin, Wallace believed, was forced by practical considerations to make the Communism of the Soviet intensely nationalistic by purging a number of the revolutionaries.<sup>21</sup>

Wallace believed that Stalin was able to save Russia because he used relentless measures. Had not Stalin driven ahead with the utmost vigor to collectivize the farms and to develop the heavy industries of the Soviet in the early thirties; had not Stalin carried through his ruthless purge of Nazi-Trotskyist conspirators, "Adolf Hitler might have found it possible to conquer the world in the years that followed," said Wallace.<sup>22</sup>

Wallace believed that the opposition of England,

---

<sup>20</sup>Facts and material are to be found on page 48 of Toward World Peace by Henry A. Wallace.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

France, Japan, and the United States in 1918 brought forth increased ruthlessness on the part of the Soviet. Of these powers, England under Churchill was especially active against the Communist Government. In 1919, according to the Wallace version, "the British alone spent nearly half a billion dollars trying to upset the new regime" in order to salvage their investments in Czarist Russia.<sup>23</sup> Wallace wrote that "the blockade and civil war enforced and financed by the Allies" created "disease and famine which killed many millions."<sup>24</sup> Russia was kept from joining the League of Nations (until 1934)--unless she would assume the Czar's debts.<sup>25</sup> Despite these difficulties, said Wallace, Stalin "believed it was possible to make a success of Communism in Russia even though the outside world was capitalist;" because of the self-denial of Soviet people they were able to develop heavy industries.<sup>26</sup> Stalin bought machine tools from Germany, Britain, and the United States. "In the midst of the 1932 slump," said Wallace, Stalin was buying consumer's goods from the United States--more than "were bought by all other

---

<sup>23</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 52.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 53.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 53-54.

countries put together."<sup>27</sup>

Wallace believed that the price of "rapid Russian industrialization during the thirties was high. Czarist secret police methods were adopted and perfected. The opposition was liquidated. Terrorism was common, "as" old Communists and Germans "worked to disrupt the Soviet from within."<sup>28</sup> The Soviet was handicapped by the use of German technicians. Stalin, wrote Wallace, cleaned up the mess so effectively that when the fateful hour came the Soviet "was not betrayed by a Quisling or a Laval."<sup>29</sup> Wallace did not defend Stalin's methods but suggested that if he had failed to apply them, "Hitler might be ruling the world today."<sup>30</sup>

Wallace related that when he joined the Roosevelt Cabinet in 1933, the State Department was more friendly to Italy than to Russia. He found that in the United States, Britain, and France, the foreign offices feared the Soviet more than the Mussolini, Hitler, Hirohito alliance.<sup>31</sup> Wallace recalled that Litvinov had worked for peace during Hitler's rise to power by trying to band the non-aggressor

---

<sup>27</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 54.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 56.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.

nations together "so they could take a decisive stand against any ruthless nation that might be out to loot." Similarly, the Soviet wanted to help Czechoslovakia in 1938, whereas, France and Britain agreed to the betrayal of the helpless country.<sup>32</sup> When Soviet efforts for peace failed, Russia followed the United States' example as she embraced isolationism, which in the light of 1952 was a tragic error.

Wallace recalled that many were delighted in 1941, when the Soviet and Germany were fighting each other. Churchill's pronouncement of June 22, 1941, "that England must go all the way with Russia during the war" occasioned, wrote Wallace, a great surprise in Russia because of Britain's earlier attitude toward Russia.<sup>33</sup> Wallace believed that when Churchill reverted to his earlier position, the anti-Soviet policy as in 1919, he advocated the opening of a second front in the Balkans to increase the post-war bargaining position with Russia, as a formidable force poised on the border of post-war Soviet would be a security against expansion. The Soviet, also, was considering her post-war position, which Wallace believed started the distrust which divided the post-war world into two hostile divisions.

Wallace charged that Churchill's military policy in

---

<sup>32</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 57.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

Greece resulted in brutal methods used against the people.<sup>34</sup> A year later, Churchill made his Fulton, Missouri, speech, which in effect called for an alliance of the English speaking people. Wallace believed that Churchill, more than any leader, had created the conditions which produced the iron curtain: (1) by his anti-Russian actions in 1919; (2) "by his eagerness to have a second front opened through the Balkan States;" and (3) "by his action in Greece."<sup>35</sup>

As Stalin and the Russians were suspicious of the Churchill thrust against them, Wallace believed that the American bipartisan policy tended to confirm the Soviet's fears that America believed fully in the Churchill policy. The fact that President Truman appeared with Churchill at Fulton, Missouri, tended to give official sanction to this thesis. The Truman Doctrine, combined with proposals for universal military service, large appropriations for defense, proposals to restore the industrial power of Germany, seemed to Wallace to confirm the Soviet's fears in a hostile world.<sup>36</sup>

Wallace listed other indications of Anglo-American accord. He believed that American and British representa-

---

<sup>34</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 58.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., pp. 59-60.

tives abroad tended to feel at home with English speaking foreigners--often collaborators; whereas, they tended to regard with suspicion resistance members whom they believed to be Communists. Wallace wrote that the Anglo-American determination to control strategic naval and air bases in the world, as well as their oil policies in the Near East had intensified world separation into two camps. This was termed as the two-world position. This historical version of Wallace seemed to add little to the authenticity of history but it does provide an insight to Wallace's sympathy for a nation he regarded as being unfairly treated in the family of nations.

Wallace saw a similarity between Russia and the United States in that both were "striving for the education, the productivity and the enduring happiness of the common man."<sup>37</sup> However, Wallace objected to Russian emphasis on dialectical materialism; Communist orthodoxy, which prevented criticism and free discussion; the labor camps; and the attempted control of world thought.<sup>38</sup> For both countries, Wallace foresaw a new "democracy, the democracy of the common man."<sup>39</sup>

Wallace believed this new democracy included (1) the

---

<sup>37</sup>Wallace, The Century of the Common Man, p. 36.

<sup>38</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, pp. 62, 63, 64.

<sup>39</sup>The Century of the Common Man, loc. cit.

bill of rights, which if carried to its extreme form would lead to rugged individualism; (2) an economic democracy, which Wallace believed must find a balance between the economic democracy of the United States and the political democracy of the Soviet [sic]; (3) an ethnic democracy, which meant equality of economic opportunity for different races and minority groups; (4) an educational democracy, which had enabled Russia in twenty years to change from an illiterate nation to one in which ninety per cent could read and write; and (5) a democracy in the treatment of the sexes, for women, the Soviet has given both equality in opportunity and pay for the same labor.<sup>40</sup> Since the old democracy had failed to give us peace, Wallace believed that the new democracy must. He continued saying that a "willingness to support world organization to maintain world peace by justice implemented by force was fundamental to the democracy of the common man" in the present world.<sup>41</sup>

World travel convinced Wallace that world peace was vital to the present world. To achieve this end, Wallace felt his destiny to be that he must destroy the feeling "that war between the United States and [the Soviet] was inevitable."<sup>42</sup> "The real peace treaty needed today is one," wrote

---

<sup>40</sup>Wallace, The Century of the Common Man, pp. 36-39.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>42</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 13.

Wallace, "between the United States and Russia."<sup>43</sup> On the other hand, Wallace advocated that the new administration must "let the [Soviet] know it is willing to discuss limits of expansion and intervention in the affairs of other nations. . . ."<sup>44</sup> "The Russians must know the points beyond which we cannot tolerate further Russian expansion--all of them," said Wallace.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, Wallace recommended that American capitalism become progressive and that Communists be allowed to attain a "sufficient feeling of security in Russia so that they were willing to grant democratic civil liberties;" moreover, said Wallace, "the changes on both sides will come slowly but events will force these changes or there will be a perpetuation of two worlds and war."<sup>46</sup>

The Wallace formula for the peace that the world needs was "a proposal from the United States to the U.N. for the establishment of a U.N. Reconstruction Fund, modeled after UNRRA, for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the war-devastated lands in Europe and Asia to the end that their industry and agriculture may be restored and placed on

---

<sup>43</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 68.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., pp. 68-69.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 17.



a self-sustaining basis at the earliest possible moment."<sup>47</sup> According to his plan, funds would be contributed by our Congress and other nations "to be used for peaceful purposes only."<sup>48</sup> The greatest devastation would entitle a nation to the allocation of funds "without" regard to the character of the politics and social institutions of the recipient nations."<sup>49</sup> Finally, Wallace advocated that the Ruhr Valley be placed under the Big Four, "in order, first, that its resources may be made available to aid in the reconstruction of Europe, and second, to guarantee that Germany shall never again be in a position to threaten the security of its neighbors or the peace of the world."<sup>50</sup>

In concluding his book, Wallace revealed his philosophy in the following statements:

I don't agree with the Communists on much of their fundamental philosophy. I believe for example that the doctrine of the brotherhood of man, the fatherhood of God, and the sacredness of the individual human soul is the essence of democracy, of old-fashioned Americanism and of modern progressivism. Religion is a great force even though evil or misguided men have used that force against humanity from time to time.

I believe that the doctrine of the brotherhood of man justifies the concept of ultimate world citizenship

---

<sup>47</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, pp. 37-38.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

and that the various workers of the world will eventually look on themselves as a unit regardless of nationality.

Personally I am trying to rid the United States of economic crises, unemployment, insecurity, poverty, and war by establishing a progressive capitalism which will engage in effective planning to prevent 'boom and bust.'

I see nothing un-American in advocating understanding with Russia and the elimination of the 'business cycle'--that is the polite name for 'boom and bust'--by democratic means.<sup>51</sup>

Although in Toward World Peace as in other Wallace writings, one finds much with which to agree, one also feels the reluctance of Wallace to have the Soviet share the blame for the world's confusion in 1948. Our greatest failure as a nation, said Wallace, "is the inability of our statesman to work out a way to get along with Russia."<sup>52</sup> In the interests of peace, Wallace recommended that we abandon military spending, the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, the Wall Street-military clique, and universal military training. He was disturbed by "the dominance of faith in force as the ultimate arbiter."<sup>53</sup> Hope for the future can be based on the platform of the new party--the program of peace, security, and abundance.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, pp. 109-110.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 112.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. 117.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 120.

Wallace's writings are not without discrepancies. His frequent censure of the British does not include giving credit for the evacuation of India, Burma, Egypt, Greece, and Palestine, or, their steady reduction of their armed forces as well as their empire. Other discrepancies seem to appear, Wallace was against putting political pressure on nations, but he demanded the liquidation of fascism in Greece and China. He was opposed to power politics everywhere, but he acknowledged the Soviet's paramount interest in Eastern Europe or in the Soviet herself. He deplored political loans but recommended that the United States make a loan to Russia as a "part of a general agreement to co-operate on behalf of the common man in rebuilding the world."<sup>55</sup>

Wallace appeared to be the "apologist for Russia" as he justified her 1939 pact with Hitler because of the appeasers' failure to provide collective security in the Munich era. In Wallace's thinking, the United States seemed to be on the offensive with propaganda warfare against the Soviet; whereas, the Soviet tended to be on the defensive. Wallace believed that action of the United States in China had caused the Soviet to move troops to the East rather than to aid the Chinese Communists, who, a friend told him, were very much like the old North Dakota Non-partisan Leaguers. The

---

<sup>55</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 12.

behavior of Russia's neighbors made it impossible of the Soviet "to tolerate unfriendly governments" in the Balkans.<sup>56</sup> A long list of such utterances could be compiled to support the contention that he justified Soviet conduct.

In The Saturday Review of Literature, Frank Altschiel wrote his opinion of Wallace's Toward World Peace as follows:

. . . In his jaundiced view, policy is largely determined by reactionary capitalists eager to send their sons into the holocaust of war. The Administration in Washington is dominated by "the military and the men who operate those larger financial and manufacturing concerns which are vitally interested in profits . . ."--by a 'Wall-Street-military' clique" so obsessed with fear and hatred of Russia that it is certain, sooner or later, to make war. This has a familiar ring. According to the Daily Worker: 'The Wall Street dominated old parties [are] pushing for war . . . because they are afraid of the coming economic crisis. . . . They want guaranteed war profits, not a program to advance the living standard of the people. . . . They want to turn back the clock of history and drown the new People's Democracy, colonial liberation, and Socialism in a sea of blood--American blood.'<sup>57</sup>

Toward World Peace explained the path Wallace took in the campaign of 1948, which led him to a defeat more decisive than his followers had anticipated.

Disavowal of former policy. Immediately after the election, Wallace advocated the role of the Progressives as vigilant sentinels to encourage the Democrats to transfer

---

<sup>56</sup>Wallace, Toward World Peace, p. 112.

<sup>57</sup>Frank Altschiel, "Stroking the Tiger," Saturday Review of Literature, XXXI (April 17, 1948), p. 28.

their campaign promises into legislation. On the other hand, Wallace began to show dissatisfaction with the third party. In subsequent Progressive meetings, Wallace became critical of the Communist control of the Party and demanded their expulsion. His hope for the new party, once based upon his Progressive friends, now began to be based upon the Protestant clergy and farm leaders who obviously would not accept Red leadership.

Wallace began to spend less and less time with the Progressives in 1949 and 1950. His disillusionment seemed to begin as friends brought him reports of the "mounting terror among the people, the businessmen and the farmers in satellite countries" in 1949.<sup>58</sup> Wallace revealed that he had been informed that:

. . . No one could amount to anything in Czechoslovakia who was not outspoken in criticism of the United States and capitalism. Only Moscow-trained communists were allowed in positions of authority. The native communists were eased out as quickly as possible. Not all were liquidated, but their life was made hard. This convinced me that Russia was getting ready for world upheaval.<sup>59</sup>

At a Chicago Progressive Convention held in March of 1950, the party, in order to please Wallace in his anti-Red

---

<sup>58</sup>Henry Agard Wallace, "How I'd Stop the March of Stalin," Coronet, XXIX (November, 1950), p. 105.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid.

approach, passed a resolution declaring that the Soviet Union as well as the United States had made mistakes in foreign policy. Wallace now told the convention that the Progressives had been in error in shouting down an attempt made by the Vermont and Pennsylvania delegates to rid the Progressive Party of the Communists in the founding convention of July, 1948. On the other hand, many liberals tended to hold the Wallace leadership responsible for failure to accomplish this at their previous convention.

Other Progressives were disappointed that Wallace failed to mingle with the delegates at their 1950 convention; furthermore, they found his attitude changed. Wallace in his address appeared pessimistic in discussing the world atomic bomb race; similarly, he seemed disgruntled with the Soviet's foreign policy. Wallace seemed to advocate to the Progressives a course which neither approved of the foreign policies of the United States nor of the Soviet. At this time, he appeared to place reliance upon foreign policies advocated by Churchill, Krock, and Tydings. He seemed more interested in striving for the settlement of issues rather than pressing his former friendship toward Russia.

After the attack of the North Koreans, Wallace on July 16, 1950, gave the Progressives three weeks to reverse their foreign policy and support the Government. When this demand was rejected he resigned, stating his reasons to be

as follows:

In view of actions recently taken by the National Committee of the Progressive party and the various state committees, I am convinced I can more effectively serve the cause of peace by resigning from the national committee and the executive committee of the Progressive Party.<sup>60</sup>

On the same day of the attack, Wallace clarified his position by issuing the following statement to The New York Times:

I want to make it clear that when Russia, the United States and the United Nations appeal to force, I am on the side of the United States and the United Nations. Undoubtedly they could have prevented the attack by the North Koreans and undoubtedly they could now stop the attack at any time they wish.

I hold no brief for the past actions of either the United States or Russia but, when my country is at war and the United Nations sanctions that war, I am on the side of my country and the United Nations.<sup>61</sup>

Likewise, Wallace urged all patriotic Americans to "call on the United Nations to use all possible influence on Russia, 'the New China,' India, Pakistan, England, France, the Netherlands and the United States not only to end the fighting in Korea but to bring about the solution of all the conflicts in Asia and this prevent a third World War."<sup>62</sup>

On November 13, 1950, Wallace was demanding that the

---

<sup>60</sup>The New York Times, August 9, 1950.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., July 16, 1950.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., August 9, 1950.

United States increase its armed strength "'as fast as possible' until the Soviet and Red China gave 'concrete evidence' that they were interested in a specific, and not a propaganda, program for peace."<sup>63</sup> Wallace now "no longer believed that peace could be obtained by meeting Russia 'half way,'" nor did he think it advisable to admit Communist China to the United Nations.<sup>64</sup> Wallace held Russia responsible for the North Korean attack and condemned her for using "other people to heat up the cold war."<sup>65</sup> He thought that Russia never really wanted Red China seated in the United Nations and that Red China's intervention in Korea was not justified, no matter how unwisely United States had acted in condoning the graft and corruption of Kuomintang. Wallace said also that unless we developed the peace in Korea to gain the sympathy of the common man in India and China our real danger had just begun. Rehabilitation of Korea must be accomplished for the sake of the people of Korea and not for an outmoded regime. The Soviet must realize, said Wallace, that millions of Americans "who at one time believed in meeting her half way are no longer in a mood for compromise," and that "peace

---

<sup>63</sup>The New York Times, November 13, 1950.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid.



could not be served by appeasement," said Wallace.<sup>66</sup>

In November of 1950, Wallace wrote in Coronet giving his formula for stopping Stalin. In this article, Wallace supported the thesis: "There is only one firm, guiding star for all of us, and that is peace, full employment, a rising standard of living for all people, and a maximum of freedom for all who are willing to steer by this star. Divine Providence regardless of race or creed."<sup>67</sup> In the Korean conflict, Wallace was concerned with the survival of the United States as a "democratic power with the principle of free initiative left to the farmer, the worker, and the businessman."<sup>68</sup> Wallace wanted overcrowded areas of the world given real assistance through the United Nations and he warned as follows:

Make no mistake about it, the common man will march under the banner of Russian communism to his own ultimate disillusionment if we cannot move with great economic power to serve suffering humanity, not dominate it.

.....

The root of the trouble is that we in the [United States] are blessed far beyond all other people. Even if there were no communism and no aggressive, skillfully led Russia, the problem would still exist.

---

<sup>66</sup>The New York Times, November 13, 1950.

<sup>67</sup>"How I'd Stop the March of Stalin," p. 103.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p. 104.

.....

The American Congress, now that it knows the tremendous cost of fighting the cold war, should be willing to consider a comparable investment in peace as an alternative. I still say that the only road to peace is a really big Point 4 program applied through the U.N. for the purpose of strengthening the U.N., expanding world trade regardless of iron curtains, and perfecting progressive capitalism in the U. S. There is nothing in such a program which is a threat to Russia provided she wants to serve the needs of the common man. But if Russia's purpose is to clamp an ironclad, communistic control on more and more nations, then it is obvious that we must prepare at once to fight because in such case the Stalin menace will be greater than the Hitler menace ever was.<sup>69</sup>

Despite his disavowal of the Communists, Wallace was still carrying on the battle for a peaceful world.

Contribution to American politics. To assess the contribution of Wallace to American political life is a sizable task. Early in life, Wallace fought the battles of the farmers in their attempt to earn a just living and to establish fair prices for the farmers' produce. As Secretary of Agriculture, he developed a new program to facilitate crop reduction, drought control, soil conservation, food storage, school lunch programs, tenant farmer programs and to alleviate many emergencies. A program that in all events, brought

---

<sup>69</sup>Wallace, "How I'd Stop the March of Stalin," pp. 104, 106, 107, 108.

basic gains for the farmer.<sup>70</sup>

As Vice-President, he led stockpiling of vital war needs and performed important missions--such as the Soviet Asia mission. A rejected leader in the campaign of 1944, he narrowly missed becoming President upon the death of Roosevelt in the following April. He remained as Secretary of Commerce in the Administration of President Truman and became its critic as the Administration deviated from the New Deal and stiffened its policy toward the Soviet Union. His critical address, in Madison Square Garden, protesting against the Administration's policy toward the Soviet Union, brought a request from President Truman for his resignation from the Cabinet.

Subsequent travels at home and abroad brought a viewpoint developed as an eye-witness to current world conditions. These experiences encouraged him to enter a new adventure in his search for peace. As a candidate for the Presidency in 1948, Wallace tried to lead a new party in the interests of a better world based on Peace, Freedom, and Abundance. He became embittered as independents, laborers, farmers, Negroes, and New Dealers, deserted him largely to the apparent

---

<sup>70</sup>In 1956, many unsolved problems remain in agriculture; John Oates, in the New York Times, February 5, 1956, said that President Eisenhower's soil bank plan is "generally reminiscent of one advanced about twenty years ago by former Secretary of Agriculture Wallace."

Communist control of his party.

In the years 1948-49, Wallace became disillusioned with Soviet behavior in Czechoslovakia and joined the support of his country as the North Koreans struck against Southern Korea. Wallace disavowed his earlier position, censured the Soviet foreign policy, and became reconciled to the conservative leadership of this country. He did not abandon his hopes for an enlarged Point 4 program for the betterment of the common man.

Max Lerner, a political scientist and essayist, credits Wallace as being both motivated and limited by three symbols: insurgency, hybrid corn, and Christianity.<sup>71</sup> Insurgency is the symbol of the Midwest Populist tradition which "glorifies rebellion and dissent."<sup>72</sup> Hybrid corn is the symbol of an agronomist that approaches "politics experimentally, with the practical purpose of improving the breed of political man and social institutions."<sup>73</sup> Christianity is a symbol of a "profoundly religious man for whom the teachings of Christian ethics have a living meaning. . . ." and "he takes the teachings of Christianity seriously--on

---

<sup>71</sup>Max Lerner, "Henry Wallace: A Portrait in Symbols," Actions and Passions (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1949), pp. 225-228.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 225.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 226.

social justice, on racial discrimination, on peace--so seriously that he insists on applying them," stated Lerner.<sup>74</sup> Such an appraisal seems on the basis of this study much fairer than criticism which classify Wallace simply as a demagogue, a visionary, and a tool of the Communists. Lerner ranked him as "a great political figure of our time and a profoundly moving democrat with a small d."<sup>75</sup> On the other hand, Lerner regarded him as a poor tactician, "from the plowing-under program, to the ill-fated Madison Square Garden Speech, and the European trip that left him vulnerable to attack."<sup>76</sup> "He is a poor judge of men," wrote Lerner, and "he is the easy victim of a clique."<sup>77</sup> "The most tragic fact about him since 1944 has been the way he has allowed himself to become isolated from the main currents of the labor movement, farm organizations, the middle-of-the-road liberalism."<sup>78</sup>

Any one of many public acts entitled Wallace to great consideration in the American scene. As a prominent, political figure, he has been the subject of many critical

---

<sup>74</sup>Lerner, Actions and Passions, p. 227.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 228.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid.

attacks. Among these, it was charged that he failed to provide a practical program for many of his "world betterment ideals." He did not bring to the world a new philosophy judged from the realm of time.<sup>79</sup> At times, he seemed to suffer from a Messianic complex which manifested itself in his letters to Stalin, Truman, and Mao Tse-Tung as well as his attempts to lead a third party as a candidate for the Presidency. There was a naiveté about him that led him to credit political leaders such as Roosevelt and Stalin with traits they did not actually possess.<sup>80</sup> There was too, a prejudice against other leaders, which led Wallace to overlook their public service and to discredit their motives, such as: Churchill, Truman, Baruch, Hoover, Byrnes, Jones, and Vandenberg. In his enthusiasm for peace, he was not always accurate--frequently confusing. That he had influence cannot be denied as it was confirmed by the wide newspaper, magazine, and radio coverage that was afforded him. That he had a following was self-evident, as thousands paid

---

<sup>79</sup>Wallace's ideas seem to reflect theories of (1) Thorstein Veblen, the author of The Theory of the Leisure Class, and (2) John Maynard Keynes, the author of the Economic Consequences of the Peace, and (3) the early Populist ideals.

<sup>80</sup>Wallace credited Roosevelt with the ability to keep the peace with Russia. In retrospect this seems a little doubtful. Figures close to Roosevelt relate his distrust of the Russians. In the light of recent events in 1956, few people see in Stalin the qualities Wallace admired.

admissions to hear him speak before and during the campaign of 1948. That he made many worthwhile contributions to American politics in the past is undisputable. Here was a man who has helped to shape the destinies of many as he went about the task of maintaining peace for the world and of bringing about the betterment of the living conditions of mankind. Here was a pioneer who pointed the way for the Century of the Common Man.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**



LIST OF BOOKS CONSULTED

A. BOOKS

Baldwin, Leland D. Recent American History. New York: The American Book Company, 1954. 812 pp.

Barck, Oscar Theodore, and Nelson Manfred Blake. Since 1900. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952. 930 pp.

Beard, Charles A. President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War 1941. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948. 614 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, and Mary R. Beard. The Beards' Basic History of the United States. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1944. 554 pp.

Binkley, Wilfred E. American Political Parties. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951. 420 pp.

Blackett, P. M. S. Fear, War, and the Bomb. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949. 244 pp.

Blumberg, Nathan B. One-Party Press. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1954. 91 pp.

Bone, Hugh A. American Politics and the Party System. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949. 777 pp.

Budenz, Louis Francis. Men Without Faces. New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1948. 305 pp.

Byrnes, James F. Speaking Frankly. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947. 324 pp.

Carr, Robert K., and Joel Barker. The House Committee on Un-American Activities. New York: The Cornell University Press, 1955. 489 pp.

Chamberlain, Lawrence H., and Richard C. Snyder. American Foreign Policy. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc. 826 pp.

Chase, Stuart. Democracy Under Pressure. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1945. 142 pp.

- Coffin, Tris. Missouri Compromise. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1947. 315 pp.
- Cooke, Alastair. A Generation on Trial. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951. 366 pp.
- Daniels, Jonathan. The Man of Independence. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1950. 384 pp.
- Dimock, Marshall Edward and Gladys Ogden Dimock. American Government in Action. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1951. 1004 pp.
- Evans, Lawrence B. Cases on American Law. Chicago: Callaghan and Company, 1952. 942 pp.
- Farley, James E. Jim Farley's Story. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1948. 388 pp.
- Fite, Gilbert C. George Peek and the Fight for Farm Parity. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954. 314 pp.
- Flynn, Edward J. You're the Boss. New York: The Viking Press, 1947. 243 pp.
- Forster, G. W., and Marc C. Leager. Elements of Agricultural Economics. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950. 441 pp.
- Gallup, George. The Political Almanac 1952. New York: B. C. Forbes and Sons Publishing Company, Inc., 1952. 317 pp.
- Hesseltine, William B. The Rise and Fall of Third Parties. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1948. 119 pp.
- Hicks, John D. The American Nation. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949. 792 pp.
- Hillman, William, and Alfred Wagg. Mr. President. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Young, 1952. 253 pp.
- Hull, Cordell. The Memoirs of Cordell Hull. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. 1804 pp.
- Ickes, Harold L. The Secret Diary of Harold L. Ickes. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953. 695 pp.

- Josephson, Matthew. Sidney Hillman: Statesman of Labor. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1952. 701 pp.
- Kingdom, Frank. An Uncommon Man: Or Henry Wallace and Sixty Million Jobs. New York: Readers Press, 1945. 189 pp.
- Leighton, Isabel. The Aspirin Age. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1949. 476 pp.
- Lerner, Max. Actions and Passions. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1949. 367 pp.
- Link, Arthur S. American Epoch. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955. 924 pp.
- Lorant, Stefan. The Presidency. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. 775 pp.
- Lord, Russell. The Wallaces of Iowa. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947. 615 pp.
- Lubell, Samuel. The Future of American Politics. New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1951. 285 pp.
- MacDonald, Dwight. Henry Wallace: The Man and the Myth. New York: The Vanguard Press, Inc., 1947. 187 pp.
- McKean, D. D. Party and Pressure Politics. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949. 712 pp.
- McNaughton, Frank, and Walter Hehmeyer. Harry Truman, President. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948. 294 pp.
- Millis, Walter. The Forrestal Diaries. New York: The Viking Press, 1951. 581 pp.
- Moon, Henry Lee. Balance of Power: The Negro Vote. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1948. 256 pp.
- Moos, Malcolm. Politics, Presidents and Coattails. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1952. 237 pp.
- Morris, Richard B. Encyclopedia of American History. New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1953. 776 pp.
- Mowrer, Edgar Ansel. The Nightmare of American Foreign Policy. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948. 283 pp.

- Nourse, Edwin G., Joseph S. Davis, et al. Three Years of the Agriculture Adjustment. Washington: Brookings, 1937. 350 pp.
- Nye, Russell B. Midwestern Progressive Politics. Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1951. 422 pp.
- Palmer, Edward E. The Communist Problem in America. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1951. 946 pp.
- Rauch, Basil. The History of the New Deal, 1933-38. New York: Creative Age, 1944. 368 pp.
- Roosevelt, Eleanor. This I Remember. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949. 387 pp.
- Roosevelt, Elliott. F. D. R. and His Personal Letters 1928-1945. 4 vols. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1950. 1615 pp.
- Rose, Arnold M. Race Prejudice and Discrimination. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951. 605 pp.
- Rosenbloom, Morris Victor. Peace through Strength: Bernard Baruch and a Blueprint for Security. New York: American Surveys, Washington, D. C.: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1953. 325 pp.
- Rosenman, Samuel I. Working with Roosevelt. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 560 pp.
- Sait, Edward M. American Parties and Elections. New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1942. 790 pp.
- Schmidt, Carl T. American Farmers in the World Crisis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1941. 345 pp.
- Sherwood, Robert E. Roosevelt and Hopkins. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948. 979 pp.
- Stedman, M. S., and S. W. Discontent at the Polls. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. 190 pp.
- Stone, I. F. The Truman Era. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1953. 226 pp.
- Tansill, Charles C. Back Door to War. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953. 690 pp.

- Taylor, Henry C., and Anne Dewees. The Story of Agricultural Economics. 1 vol. Ames: The Iowa College Press, 1952. 1121 pp.
- Truman, Harry S. Years of Decision. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955. 596 pp.
- Turner, Henry A. The Nation and the States: Readings in Political Parties and Pressure Groups. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955. 435 pp.
- Vandenberg, Arthur Hendricks, and Joe A. Morris. The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952. 599 pp.
- Wallace, Henry A. America Must Choose. New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1934. 33 pp.
- . Democracy Reborn. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1944. 280 pp.
- . New Frontiers. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1934. 314 pp.
- . Sixty Million Jobs. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1946. 216 pp.
- . Soviet Asia Mission. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1946. 254 pp.
- . The Century of the Common Man. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1943. 96 pp.
- . Toward World Peace. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1948. 121 pp.
- Wecter, Dixon. The Age of Great Depression 1929-1941. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. 362 pp.
- Wise, J. W. Meet Henry Wallace. New York: Boni, 1948. 91 pp.

#### B. BOOKS: PARTS OF SERIES

- Britannica Book of the Year 1949. ed. Walter Yust. London: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1949. 810 pp.

Ten Eventful Years. ed. Walter Yust. Vol. IV of Encyclopaedia Britannica Series. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1947. 862 pp.

The World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1949. The New York World Telegram, 1949. 912 pp.

The World Book Encyclopedia 1949 Annual Supplement. Chicago: The Quarrie Corporation, 1949. 224 pp.

#### C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Child Marquis. "Smear Against Condon," Congressional Record. House Proceedings and Debates of the 80th Congress, 2d Session, Volume 94, Part 2, February 20-March 15, 1948. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948.

Dennett, Raymond, and Robert K. Turner. Documents on American Foreign Relations. Volume VIII, July 1, 1945-December 31, 1946. Princeton: The World Peace Foundation by Princeton University Press, 1948. 962 pp.

United States Relations with China. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949. 1054 pp.

#### D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

"Peace, Freedom, and Abundance," the platform of the Progressive Party, as adopted at the Founding Convention, Philadelphia, July 23-25, 1948. New York, 1948.

#### E. PERIODICALS

Angoff, Charles. "Wallace's Communist-Front Party," The American Mercury, October, 1948, 413-21.

Altschiel, Frank. "Stroking the Tiger," Saturday Review of Literature, XXXI (April 17, 1948), 28-29.

Arnall, Ellis G. "Democrats Can Win," The Atlantic Monthly, CLXXXII (October, 1948), 33-38.

- "As the World Sees It," Newsweek, XXXII (November 15, 1948), 33.
- Bendiner, Robert. "It Had To Be Roosevelt," The Nation, XXXII (July 27, 1940), 67.
- Brogan, D. W. "The Doom of the G.O.P.," The Spectator, CLXXXI (November 12, 1948), 623
- Churchill, Winston. "Alliance of English Speaking People," Vital Speeches, XII (March 15, 1946), 239-242.
- Davis, Elmer. "President Dewey's Strange Bedfellows," Harpers Magazine, CXC VII (September, 1948), 25-33.
- "Dogi Cligin and the West," Time, LII (October 4, 1948), 20-21.
- Eldersveld. "The Influence of Metropolitan Party Pluralities in Presidential Elections Since 1920: A Study of Twelve Key Cities," American Political Science Review, XLIII (December, 1949), 1189-1206.
- "Fooling the '48 Forecasters," Life, XL (January 30, 1956), 63-83.
- Franklin, Jay. "Inside Strategy of the Campaign," Life, XXV (November 13, 1948), 48.
- Hale, William Harlen. "What Makes Wallace Run," Harpers Magazine, CXC VI (March, 1948), 241-249.
- Hatch, Alden. "The Men Around Dewey," Harpers Magazine, CXC VII (October, 1948), 38-47.
- "It Was Not Magic That Won," The New Republic, CXIX (November 15, 1948), 7.
- Jackson, Gardner. "Wallace: A Divided Mind," The Atlantic Monthly, CLXXXII (August, 1948), 27-34.
- Lipset, Martin. "Under the Big Top," The Canadian Forum, XXVII (May, 1948), 26.
- Lubell, Samuel. "Who Really Elected Truman?" The Saturday Evening Post, CCXXI (January 22, 1949), 15.
- "Our 'Laboristic' President," Fortune, XXXVIII (December, 1948), 26.

- McMillen, Wheeler. "The Miracle of 1948," Vital Speeches, XV (January 1, 1949), 181-183.
- Montgomery, Edward. "The Miracle of Truman," Spectator, CLXXXI (November 12, 1948), 631.
- Stone, I. F. "Plot Against Wallace," The Nation, CLIX (July 1, 1944), 7-8.
- "The American Election," The Canadian Forum, XXVIII (December, 1948), 23.
- "The Election," Time, LII (November 15, 1948), 24.
- Wallace, Henry A. "Churchill's Crusade," The New Republic, CXVI (January 13, 1947), 22-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "How I'd Stop the March of Stalin," Coronet, XIX (November, 1950), 103-108.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "I Shall Run in 1948," Vital Speeches, XIX (January 1, 1948), 172-174.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "My First Impressions of Palestine," The New Republic, CXVIII (November 3, 1947), 12-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "New England Today," The New Republic, CXVII (October 20, 1947), 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Palestine: The U N 's Task," The New Republic, CXVII (December 15, 1947), 15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report from Britain," The New Republic, CXVI (April 28, 1947), 12-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report from California," The New Republic, CXVI (June 9, 1947), 11-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report from Iowa," The New Republic, CXVI (July 2, 1947), 15, 25-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report from the Middle West," The New Republic, CXVI (May 26, 1947), 11-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report from the Southwest," The New Republic, CXVI (June 2, 1947), 11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report from Texas," The New Republic, CXVI (June 2, 1947), 11.



- Wallace, Henry A. "Report on the Farmers," The New Republic, CXVI (June 30, 1947), 12-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report on France," The New Republic, CXVI (May 12, 1947), 12-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report on the South," The New Republic, CXVII (July 14, 1947), 14-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scandinavia--between Two Worlds," The New Republic, CXVI (May 5, 1946), 14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Conqueror of the Negev," The New Republic, CXVII (November 10, 1947), 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Enemy Is Not Each Other," The New Republic, CXVI (January 27, 1947), 22-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Fight for Peace Begins," The New Republic, CXVI (March 24, 1947), 12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Truman Doctrine," The New Republic, CXVII (March 31, 1947), 13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Way to Peace," Vital Speeches, XII (October 1, 1946), 738-741.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Trip to Palestine," The New Republic, CXVII (October 13, 1947), 11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Whose Atomic Secret," The New Republic, CXVI (February 17, 1947), 27.
- "Why the Farmers Swung to Truman," U. S. News and World Report, XXV (November 19, 1948), 24.

#### F. NEWSPAPERS

Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, October 4, 1948.

Chicago Sun, December 29, 1947.

Reston, James. "Henry Agard Wallace Sets Down His Formula for World Peace," The New York Times Book Review, April 18, 1948, p. 3.

The Chicago Daily News, December 30, 1947.

The Chicago Daily Tribune, December 31, 1947.

The Manchester Guardian, April 17, 1947.

The New York Times, July 16, 1943–November 13, 1950.

The Times, April 30, 1947.

APPENDIX

PEACE, FREEDOM, AND ABUNDANCE

THE PLATFORM

OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY

AS ADOPTED AT THE FOUNDING CONVENTION,

PHILADELPHIA, JULY 23-25, 1948

PREAMBLE

Three years after the end of the second world war, the drums are beating for the third. Civil liberties are being destroyed. Millions cry out for relief from unbearably high prices. The American way of life is in danger.

The root cause of this crisis is Big Business' control of our economy and government.

With toil and enterprise the American people have created from their rich resources the world's greatest productive machine. This machine no longer belongs to the people. Its ownership is concentrated in the hands of the few and its product used for their enrichment.

Never before have so few owned so much at the expense of so many. Ten years ago Franklin Delano Roosevelt warned: "The liberty of democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than their democratic state. That, in essence, is fascism."

Today that private power has constituted itself an invisible government which pulls the strings of its puppet Republican and Democratic parties. Two sets of candidates compete for votes under the outworn emblems of the old parties. But both represent a single program--a program of monopoly profits through war preparations, lower living standards, and

suppression of dissent.

For generations the common man of America has resisted this concentration of economic and political power in the hands of the few. The greatest of America's political leaders have led the people into battle against the money power, the railroads, the trusts, the economic royalists.

We of the Progressive Party are the present-day descendants of these people's movements and fighting leaders. We are the political heirs of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln--of Frederick Douglass, Altgeld and Debs--of "Fighting Bob" LaFollette, George Norris, and Franklin Roosevelt.

Throughout our history new parties have arisen when the old parties have betrayed the people. As Jefferson headed a new party to victory over the slave-owners, so today the people, inspired and led by Henry Wallace, have created a new party to secure peace, freedom, and abundance.

With the firm conviction that the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States set forth all fundamental freedoms for all people and secure the safety and well being of our country, the Progressive Party pledges itself to safeguard these principles to the American people.

## BETRAYAL BY THE OLD PARTIES

The American people want peace. But the old parties, obedient to the dictates of monopoly and military, prepare for war in the name of peace.

They refuse to negotiate a settlement of differences with the Soviet Union.

They reject the United Nations as an instrument for promoting world peace and reconstruction.

They use the Marshall Plan to rebuild Nazi Germany as a war base and to subjugate the economies of other European countries to American Big Business.

They finance and arm corrupt, fascist governments in China, Greece, Turkey and elsewhere, through the Truman Doctrine, wasting billions in American resources and squandering America's heritage as the enemy of despotism.

They encircle the globe with military bases which other peoples cannot but view as threats to their freedom and security.

They protect the war-making industrial and financial barons of Nazi Germany and imperial Japan, and restore them to power.

They stockpile atomic bombs.

They pass legislation to admit displaced persons, discriminating against Catholics, Jews, and other victims of

Hitler.

They impose a peacetime draft and move toward Universal Military training.

They fill policy-making positions in government with generals and Wall Street bankers.

Peace cannot be won--but profits can--by spending ever-increasing billions of the people's money in war preparations.

Yet these are the policies of the two old parties--policies profaning the name of peace.

The American people cherish freedom.

But the old parties, acting for the forces of special privilege, conspire to destroy traditional American freedoms.

They deny the Negro people the rights of citizenship. They impose a universal policy of Jim Crow and enforce it with every weapon of terror. They refuse to outlaw its most bestial expression--the crime of lynching.

They abolish the poll tax, and year after year they deny the right to vote to Negroes and millions of white people in the South.

They aim to reduce nationality groups to a position of social, economic, and political inferiority.

They connive to bar the Progressive Party on the ballot.

They move to outlaw the Communist Party as a decisive step in their assault on the democratic rights of labor, of



national, racial, and political minorities, and all of those who oppose their drive to war. In this they repeat the history of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Franco Spain.

They support the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its villification and persecution of citizens in total disregard of all the Bill of Rights.

They build the Federal Bureau of Investigation into a political police with secret dossiers on millions of Americans.

They seek to regiment the thinking of the American people and to suppress political dissent.

They strive to enact such measures as Mundt-Nixon Bill which are as destructive of democracy as were the Alien and Sedition Laws against which Jefferson fought.

They concoct a spurious "loyalty" program to create an atmosphere of fear and hysteria in government and industry.

They shackle American labor with the Taft-Hartley Act at the express command of Big Business, while encouraging exorbitant profits through uncontrolled inflation.

They restore the labor injunction as a weapon for breaking strikes and smashing unions.

This is the record of two old parties--a record profaning the American ideal of freedom.

The American people want abundance.

But the old parties refuse to enact effective price

and rent controls, making the people victims of disastrous inflation which dissipates the savings of millions of families and depresses their living standards.

They ignore the housing problem, although more than half the nation's families, including millions of veterans, are homeless or living in rural and urban slums.

They refuse social security protection to millions and allow only meager benefits to the rest.

They block health legislation even though millions of men, women, and children are without adequate medical care.

They foster the concentration of private economic power.

They replace progressive government officials, the supporters of Franklin Roosevelt, with the spokesmen of Big Business.

They pass legislation for the greedy, giving only insignificant reductions to the needy.

These are the acts of the old parties--acts profaning the American dream of abundance.

No glittering party platforms or election promises of the Democratic and Republican parties can hide their betrayal of the needs of the American people.

Nor can they act otherwise. For both parties, as the record of the 80th Congress makes clear, are the champions of Big Business.

The Republican platform admits it.

The Democratic platform attempts to conceal it.

But the very composition of the Democratic leadership exposes the demagogy of its platform. It is the party of machine politicians and Southern Bourbons who veto in Congress the liberal planks "won" in the convention.

Such platforms, conceived in hypocrisy and lack of principle deserve nothing but contempt.

#### PRINCIPLES OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY

The Progressive Party is born in the deep conviction that the national wealth and natural resources of our country belong to the people who inhabit it and must be employed in their behalf; that freedom and opportunity must be secured equally to all; that the brotherhood of man can be achieved and the scourge of war ended.

The Progressive Party holds that basic to the organization of world peace is a return to the purpose of Franklin Roosevelt to seek areas of international agreement rather than disagreement. It was his conviction that within the framework of the United Nations different social and economic systems can and must live together. If peace is to be achieved capitalist United States and communist Russia must establish good relations and work together.

The Progressive Party holds that it is the first duty

of a just government to secure for all people, regardless of race, creed, color, sex, national background, political belief, or station in life, the inalienable rights proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. The government must actively protect these rights against the encroachment of public and private agencies.

The Progressive Party holds that a just government must use its powers to promote an abundant life for its people. This is the basic idea of Franklin Roosevelt's Economic Bill of Rights. Heretofore every attempt to give effect to this principle has failed because Big Business dominates the key sectors of economy. Anti-trust laws and government regulations cannot break this domination. Therefore the people, through their democratically elected representatives, must take control of the main levers of the economic system. Public ownership of these levers will enable the people to plan the use of their productive resources so as to develop the limitless potential of modern technology and to create a true American-Commonwealth free from poverty and insecurity.

The Progressive Party believes that only through peaceful understanding can the world make progress toward reconstruction and higher standards of living; that peace is the essential condition for safeguarding and extending our traditional freedoms; that only by preserving liberty and by

planning abundant life for all can we eliminate the sources of world conflict. Peace, freedom, and abundance--the goals of the Progressive Party--are indivisible.

Only the Progressive Party can destroy the power of private monopoly and restore the government to the American people. For ours is a party uncorrupted by privilege, committed to no special interests, free from machine control, and open to all Americans of all races, colors, and creeds.

The Progressive Party is a party of action. We seek through the democratic process and through day-by-day activity to lead the American people toward the fulfillment of these principles.

We ask support for the following Program:

## PEACE

### AMERICAN-SOVIET AGREEMENT

Henry Wallace in his open letter suggested, and Premier Stalin in his reply accepted, a basis for sincere peace discussions. The exchange showed that specific areas of agreement can be found if the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations and acceptance of the right of people to choose their own form of government and economic system are mutually respected.

The Progressive Party therefore demands negotiations

and discussion with the Soviet Union to find areas of agreement to win the peace.

The Progressive Party believes that enduring peace among the peoples of the world community is possible only through world law. Continued anarchy among nations in the atomic age threatens our civilization and humanity itself with annihilation. The only ultimate alternative to war is the abandonment of the principle of the just enforcement upon the individuals of the world federal legislature with limited but adequate powers to safeguard the common defense and the general welfare of all mankind.

Such a structure of peace through government can be evolved by making of the United Nations an effective agency of cooperation among nations. This can be done by restoring the unity of the Great Powers as they work together for common purposes. Since the death of Franklin Roosevelt, this principle has been betrayed to a degree which not only paralyzes the United Nations but threatens the world with another war in which there can be no victors and few survivors.

Beyond an effective United Nations lies the further possibility of genuine world government. Responsibility for ending the tragic prospect of war is the joint responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States. We hope for more political liberty and economic democracy throughout the world. We believe that war between East and West will mean fascism

and death for all. We insist that peace is the prerequisite of survival.

We believe with Henry Wallace that "there is no misunderstanding or difficulty between the USA and USSR which can be settled by force or fear and there is no difference which cannot be settled by peaceful, hopeful negotiation. There is no American principle or public interest, and there is no Russian principle or public interest, which would have to be sacrificed to end the cold war and open up the Century of Peace which the Century of the Common Man demands."

We denounce anti-Soviet hysteria as a mask for monopoly, militarism, and reaction. We demand that a new leadership of the peace-seeking people of our nation--which has vastly greater responsibility for peace than Russia because it has a vastly greater power for war--undertake in good faith and carry to an honorable conclusion, without appeasement or sabre-rattling on either side, a determined effort to settle current controversies and enable men and women everywhere to look forward with confidence to the common task of building a creative and lasting peace for all the world.

#### END THE DRIVE FOR WAR

The Progressive Party calls for the repeal of the peacetime draft and the rejection of Universal Military

Training.

We call for the immediate cessation of the piling up of armament expenditures beyond reasonable peacetime requirements for national defense.

We demand the repudiation of the Truman Doctrine and an end to military and economic intervention in support of reactionary and fascist regimes in China, Greece, Turkey, the Middle East, and Latin America. We demand that the United States completely sever diplomatic and economic relations with Franco Spain.

We call for the abandonment of military bases designed to encircle and intimidate other nations.

We demand the repeal of the provisions of the National Security Act which are mobilizing the nations for war, preparing a labor draft, and organizing a monopoly-militarist dictatorship.

These measures will express the American people's determination to avoid provocation and aggression. They will be our contribution to the reduction of mistrust and the creation of a general atmosphere in which peace can be established.

#### UNITED NATIONS

The Progressive Party will work to realize Franklin Roosevelt's ideal of the United Nations as a world family of



Nations, by defending its charter and seeking to prevent its transformation into the diplomatic or military instrument of any one power or groups of powers.

We call for the establishment of a United Nations Reconstruction and Development Fund to promote international recovery by providing assistance to the needy nations of Europe, Africa, and Asia, without political conditions and with priorities to those peoples that suffered most from Axis aggression.

We call for the repudiation of the Marshall Plan.

We urge the full use of the Economic and Social Council and other agencies of the United Nations to wipe out disease and starvation, to promote the development of culture and science, and to develop the peaceful application of the atomic energy.

We demand that the United States delegation to the United Nations stop protecting fascist Spain and press for effective economic and diplomatic sanctions against Franco's dictatorship.

#### DISARMAMENT

The Progressive Party will work through the United Nations for a world disarmament agreement to outlaw the atomic bomb, bacteriological warfare, and all other instruments of mass destruction; to destroy existing stockpiles

of atomic bombs and to establish United Nations controls, including inspection, over the production of atomic energy; and to reduce conventional armaments drastically in accordance with resolutions already passed by the United Nations General Assembly.

#### GERMANY AND JAPAN

The Progressive Party calls for cooperation with our wartime allies to conclude peace treaties promptly with a unified Germany and with Japan. The essentials for a German settlement are denazification and democratization, punishment of war criminals, land reform, decartelization, nationalization of heavy industry, Big-Four control of the Ruhr, reparations to the victims of Nazi aggression, and definitive recognition of the Oder-Niesse line as the Western boundary of Poland. On this basis, we advocate the speedy conclusion of the peace treaty and a simultaneous withdrawal of all occupation troops.

Similar principles should govern a settlement with Japan.

#### STATE OF ISRAEL

The Progressive Party demands the immediate de jure recognition of the State of Israel.

We call for the admission of Israel to the United Nations.

We call for a Presidential proclamation lifting the arms embargo in favor of the State of Israel.

We pledge our support for and call upon the Government of the United States to safeguard the sovereignty, autonomy, political independence, and territorial integrity of the State of Israel in accordance with the boundaries laid down by the Resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of November 29, 1947.

We support the prompt extension of generous financial assistance without political conditions.

We oppose any attempt to interfere with Israel in its sovereign right to control its immigration policy.

We call upon the United States Government to provide immediate shipping and other facilities for the transportation of Jewish displaced persons in Europe who desire to emigrate to Israel.

We support, within the framework of the United Nations, the internationalization of Jerusalem and the protection of Holy Places.

We appeal to the Arab workers, farmers and small merchants to accept the United Nations decision for a Jewish and Arab state as being in their best interest. We urge them not to permit themselves to be used as tools in a war against Israel on behalf of British and American monopolies, for the latter are the enemies of both Arabs and Jews.

## THE FAR EAST

The Progressive Party supports the struggle of the peoples of Asia to achieve independence and to move from feudalism into the modern era. We condemn the bipartisan policy of military and economic intervention to crush these people's movements. World peace and prosperity cannot be attained unless the people of China, Indonesia, Indo-China, Malaya and other Asian lands win their struggle for independence and take their place as equals in the family of nations.

We call for the immediate withdrawal of American troops and abandonment of bases in China.

We demand the cessation of financial and military aid to Chiang Kai-shek dictatorship.

We follow the policy of Franklin Roosevelt in encouraging the creation of a democratic coalition government in China. We urge support for and the granting of large scale economic assistance to such a government.

We support the efforts of the people of Korea to establish national unity and the kind of government they desire. We demand an early joint withdrawal of occupation troops.

## COLONIAL AND DEPENDENT PEOPLES

We believe that people everywhere in the world have

the right to self-determination. The people everywhere in the world have the right to self-determination. The people of Puerto Rico have the right to independence. The people of the United States have an obligation toward the people of Puerto Rico to see that they are started on the road toward economic security and prosperity.

We demand the repeal of the Bell Trade Act relating to the Philippines and the abrogation of other unequal trade treaties with economically weaker peoples.

We urge actions by the people of the United States and cooperation with other countries in the United Nations to abolish the colonial system in all its forms and to realize the principles of self-determination for the peoples of Africa, Asia, the West Indies, and other colonial areas.

We support the aspirations for unified homelands, of traditionally oppressed and dispersed people such as the Irish and Armenians.

#### LATIN AMERICA

The Progressive Party urges a return to, and the strengthening of, Franklin Roosevelt's good neighbor policy in our relations with republics to the South.

We demand the abandonment of the inter-American military program.

We call for economic assistance without political con-

ditions to further the independent economic development of the Latin American and Caribbean countries.

#### DISPLACED PERSONS

The Progressive Party calls for the repeal of the anti-Catholic, anti-Semitic Displaced Persons Act of 1948 which permits the entry into the United States of fascists and collaborators. We call for the enactment of legislation to open our doors in the true American tradition to the victims of fascist persecution.

#### FREEDOM

#### END DISCRIMINATION

The Progressive Party condemns segregation and discrimination in all its forms and in all places.

We demand full equality for the Negro people, the Jewish people, Spanish-speaking Americans, Japanese Americans, Italian Americans, and all other nationality groups.

We call for a Presidential proclamation ending segregation and all forms of discrimination in the armed services and Federal employment.

We demand Federal anti-lynch, anti-discrimination, and fair-employment-practices legislation, and legislation abolish-segregation in interstate travel.

We call for immediate passage of anti-poll tax legislation, enactment of universal suffrage law to permit all citizens to vote in Federal elections, and the full use of Federal enforcement powers to assure free exercise of the right of franchise.

We call for a Civil Rights Act for the District of Columbia to eliminate racial segregation and discrimination in the nation's capital.

We demand the ending of segregation and discrimination in the Panama Canal Zone and all territories, possessions and trusteeships.

We demand the Indians, the earliest Americans, be given full citizenship rights without reservation rights and be permitted to administer their own affairs.

We will develop special programs to raise the low standards of health, housing, and educational facilities for Negroes, Indians, and nationality groups, and will deny Federal funds to any state or local authority which withholds opportunities or benefits for reasons of race, creed, color, sex or national origin.

We will initiate a Federal program of education, in cooperation with state, local, and private agencies to combat racial and religious prejudice.

We support the enactment of legislation making it a Federal crime to disseminate anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and

all racial propoganda by mail, radio, motion picture, or other means of communication.

We call for a Constitutional amendment which will effectively prohibit every form of discrimination against women-- economic, educational, legal, and political.

We pledge to respect the freedom of conscience of sincere conscientious objectors imprisoned in World War II.

#### THE RIGHT OF POLITICAL ASSOCIATION AND EXPRESSION

The Progressive Party will fight for the constitutional rights of Communists and all other political groups to express their views as the first line in the defense of the liberties of a democratic people.

We oppose the use of violence or intimidation, under cover of law or otherwise, by any individual or group, including the violence and intimidation now being committed by those who are attempting to suppress political dissent.

We pledge an all-out fight against the Mundt-Nixon Bill and all similar legislation designed to impose thought control restrict freedom of opinion, and establish a police state in America.

We demand the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and similar State Committees, and we mean to right the wrongs which these committees have perpetrated upon thousands of loyal Americans working for the realization of



democratic ideals.

We pledge to eliminate the current "Loyalty" purge program and to reestablish standards for government service that respect the rights of Federal employees to freedom of association and opinion and to engage in political activity.

We demand the full right of teachers and students to participate in the social, civic, and political life of the nation and of the local community.

We demand that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other Government agencies desist from investigating, or interfering with, the political beliefs and lawful activities of Americans.

We demand an end to the present practices of Congressional Committees--such as the House Labor Committee--in persecuting trade unionists and political leaders at the behest of Big Business.

We demand an end to the present campaign of deportation against foreign-born trade unionists and political leaders, and will actively protect the civil rights of naturalized citizens and the foreign born.

#### NATIONALITY GROUPS

The Progressive Party recognizes the varied contributions of all nationality groups to American cultural, economic, and social life, and considers them a source of strength

for the development of our country.

We advocate the right of the foreign born to obtain citizenship without discrimination.

We advocate the repeal of discriminatory immigration laws based upon race, national origin, religion, or political belief.

We recognize the just claims of the Japanese Americans for indemnity for the losses suffered during their wartime internment, which was an outrageous violation of our fundamental concepts of justice.

We support legislation facilitating naturalization of Filipinos, Koreans, Japanese, Chinese, and other national groups now discriminated against by law.

We support legislation facilitating naturalization of merchant seamen with a record of war service.

#### DEMOCRACY IN THE ARMED FORCES

The Progressive Party demands abolition of Jim Crow in the armed forces.

We demand abolition of social inequalities between officers and enlisted personnel.

We call for the basic revision in the procedure of military justice, including the more adequate participation of enlisted men in courts-martial.

We urge that admission to West Point and Annapolis be

based on the candidates' qualifications, determined by open examinations, and that an increased percentage of young men admitted be drawn from the ranks.

#### REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

The Progressive Party proposes a constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of the President and Vice-President by popular vote.

We call for Home Rule and the granting of full suffrage to the disfranchised citizens of the District of Columbia.

We favor the immediate admission of Hawaii and Alaska as the 49th and 50th states of the Union.

We urge that all general and primary elections days be declared holidays to enable all citizens to vote.

#### SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

The Progressive Party intends to maintain the traditional American separation of church and state and protect the freedom of secular education.

#### ABUNDANCE

#### HIGH COST OF LIVING

The living standards of the American people are under bipartisan attack through uncontrolled inflation. The only

effective method of combating inflation is to take the profits out of inflation.

The Progressive Party calls for legislation which will impose controls that will reduce and keep down the prices of food, shelter, clothing, other essentials of life, and basic materials. Such controls should squeeze out excessive profits, provide for payments of subsidies to farmers wherever necessary to maintain fair agricultural prices, and allocate materials and goods in short supply.

We call for the removal by the President of the Housing expediter who is administering rent control in the interests of the real estate lobby.

We call for strengthening rent control, providing protection against evictions, and eliminating the present "hardship" regulations, which are a bananza for the large realty interests.

#### ECONOMIC PLANNING

The Progressive Party believes in the principle of democratic economic planning to develop plans for assuming high production, full employment, and a rising standard of living.

We mean to develop, on the TVA pattern, regional planning authorities in the major river-valleys the country over to achieve power, rural electrification, soil conservation,

flood control and reforestration, and to accelerate the growth of undeveloped areas, particularly in the South and West.

We mean to promote, through public ownership and long-range planning, the peaceful use of atomic energy to realize its great potential as a source of power and as a tool in science, medicine, and technology.

Only through the planned development of all our resources will the full benefit of the nation's wealth and productivity be secured for the people.

#### BREAKING THE GRIP OF MONOPOLY

Monopoly's grip on the economy must be broken if democracy is to survive and economic planning become possible. Experience has shown that anti-trust laws and government regulation are not themselves sufficient to halt the growth of monopoly. The only solution is public ownership of key areas of the economy.

The Progressive Party will initiate such measures of public ownership as may be necessary to put into the hands of the people's representatives the levers of control essential to the operation of an economy of abundance. As a first step, the largest banks, the railroads, the merchant marine, the electric power and gas industry, and industries primarily dependent on government funds or government purchases such as aircraft, the synthetic rubber and synthetic oil industries

must be planned under public ownership.

We mean to strengthen and vigorously enforce the anti-trust laws to curb monopoly in the rest of the economy.

We call for the immediate abolition of discriminatory freight rates, which help to keep the South and West in bondage to Wall Street.

Tideland oil resources belong to the people, and we fight the efforts of the oil companies to steal them. We support Federal control of such resources.

We demand the repeal of the Bulwinkle law which exempts the railroad from anti-trust prosecution.

We call for the repeal of the Miller-Tydings legislation which eliminated retail competition in branded goods, excluding these from the coverage of the Anti-trust laws.

## LABOR

The Progressive Party recognizes that from the earliest period of its history the organized labor movement has taken the leadership in the struggle for democratic and humanitarian objectives. Organized labor remains the main-spring of America's democratic striving, and the just needs of labor are special concern to the Progressive Party.

We hold that every American who works for a living has an inalienable right to an income sufficient to provide him

and his family with a high standard of living. Unless the rights of labor to organize, to bargain collectively, and to strike are secure, a rising standard of living cannot be realized.

We demand the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the reinstatement of the principles of the Wagner and Norris-LaGuardia acts. These measures are essential to restore labor's equality in collective bargaining and to prevent business from using government to establish a dictatorship over labor by injunction.

We will demand the right for employees in publicly owned industries to organize, the bargain collectively, and to strike.

We call for the establishment of collective bargaining machinery for Federal employees.

We support the legitimate demands of all wage and salary earners, including Federal employees, for wage and salary increases and improved working conditions. We demand the enactment of a minimum wage of \$1 an hour, extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to cover all workers, enforcement of equal pay for equal work regardless of age or sex, and the elimination of any regional wage differential.

We oppose governmental strike-breaking through seizure of struck industries under the pretext of Federal operation, while the profits continue to go to private employers.

We urge the enactment and stringent enforcement of Federal and State Laws establishing adequate safety and health standards for miners, longshoremen, railroad workers, merchant seamen, and all other workers in hazardous industries.

We pledge drastic amendment of the Railway Labor Act to make certain that the railroad workers enjoy genuine collective bargaining and the right to strike. We call for amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act to grant railroad workers pensions of \$100 minimum after 30 years' service or when they become 60 years old.

We call for Federal legislation to improve railroad working conditions by establishing a 40-hour, 5-day week for non-operating and terminal employees, a six-hour day for roadmen, and train limit and full crew provisions.

We actively support measures to repair and improve the living standards of 12 million white collar and professional employees, who have suffered particularly under the inflation.

We call for an end to the second-class citizenship of our nation's two and a half million agricultural wage workers, and the thousands of food-processing workers who are excluded from the protection of social and labor legislation. We stand for legislation to protect the right of agricultural to bargain collectively. We call for extension of social



security and fair labor standards coverage to all agricultural and food-processing workers.

We demand an immediate end to the arbitrary security orders issued by the Department of National Defense which black-list employees in private industries under government contracts.

#### AGRICULTURE

The Progressive Party recognizes that the welfare of farmers is closely tied to the living standards of consumers. We reject the "eat-less" policy of the old parties and proclaim our intention to develop within the framework of an economy of planned abundance, a long-range program of full agricultural production, combined with necessary safeguards for the security of farmers and for the conservation of our natural resources.

We stand for the family-type farm as the basic unit of American agriculture. The Farmers' Home Administration, (formerly Farm Security Administration) must be expanded to provide ample low-cost credit to assist tenants, sharecroppers, and returned veterans to become farm-owners. Marginal farmers must be assisted to become efficient producers. Where farming is incapable of yielding an adequate family income, supplementary employment on needed conservation and public works projects must be provided.

We propose as a major goal of Federal farm programs that all farm families be enabled to earn an income of not less than \$3000 a year. We repudiate the program of Big Business which would eliminate as many as two-thirds of the nation's farmers.

We call for a five-year program of price-supports for all major crops at not less than 90 per cent of parity-- parity to be calculated according to an up-to-date formula. Dairy products and certain specialities should be supported at higher rates than 90 per cent.

We demand that all essential crops be insured against hazards which are beyond the control of the individual farmer.

We support the principle of compensating payments and production subsidies when needed to encourage a high level of consumption without jeopardizing farm income. We also call for assistance to low income consumers through such programs as the food stamp plan and the school hot-lunch program.

We favor international commodity agreements and a World Food Board under the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization to stabilize world markets and to move farm surpluses to deficient areas.

We call for a long-range national land policy designed to discourage the growth of corporation farms and absentee ownership. This policy is especially important in the South to promote the proper development of its resources and to

provide land for the landless. Priority in the purchase of land made available by river valley projects must be given to tenants, sharecroppers, and small farmers.

We regard it as of utmost importance that programs of conservation production, marketing, and price-support be administered by democratically elected farmer committeemen, as in the Triple-A program.

We stand for the principle of a graduated land tax and for the 160-acre limitation in the use of public irrigation.

We support farmer and consumer cooperatives as a highly important answer to the problem of monopoly control over markets and supplies. We oppose the tax drive being staged by Big Business against cooperatives.

We favor immediate flood control projects and universal electrification of all farms. REA lines and generating facilities should be rapidly expended, and river-valley projects for power and irrigation should be undertaken as promptly as possible.

#### INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

The Progressive Party believes that independent businessmen can survive only in an economy free from monopoly domination, where workers and farmers receive incomes sufficient to permit them to purchase the goods they need.

We propose to encourage and safeguard independent business by providing adequate working capital and development loans at low interest rates, granting tax relief, and giving independent and small business a fair share of government contracts. We propose to make available to independent business, through an expanded government research program, the know-how essential to efficient operation.

#### HOUSING

The Progressive Party charges that private enterprise, under monopoly control, has failed to house the American people. It is the responsibility of democratic government to guarantee the right of every family to a decent home at a price it can afford to pay.

We demand a Federal emergency housing program to build within the next two years four million low-rent and low-cost dwellings for homeless and doubled-up families, with priority to veterans.

We recognize that to accomplish this objective it will be necessary to curb non-essential construction, to allocate scarce materials, and to reduce the cost of land, money, and building materials.

We pledge an attack on the chronic housing shortage and the slums through a long-range program to build 25 million new homes during the next ten years. This program will

include public subsidized housing for low-income families.

We pledge an attack on the chronic housing shortage and the slums through a long-range program to build 25 million new homes during the next ten years. This program will include public subsidized housing for low-income families.

We pledge that as a part of our general program of economic planning the building industry will be reorganized and rationalized, capacity to produce presently scarce materials will be expanded, and year-round employment will be guaranteed to workers in the building trades.

Government--Federal, state, and local--has the responsibility to insure that communities are well-planned, with homes conveniently located near places of employment and with adequate provision for health, education, recreation, and culture.

We pledge the abolition of discrimination and segregation in housing.

#### SECURITY AND HEALTH

The Progressive Party demands the extension of social security protection to every man, woman, and child in the United States.

We recognize the service which the Townshend Plan has performed in bringing to national attention the tragic plight of the senior citizens of America, and we condemn the bi-

partisan conspiracy in Congress over the past ten years against providing adequate old-age pensions.

We pledge our active support for a national old-age pension of \$100 a month to all persons at 60 years of age, on right and not on a pauperizing need basis.

We call for a Federal program of adequate disability and sickness benefits and increased unemployment benefits, protecting all workers and their standards of living.

We call for a Federal program of adequate disability and sickness benefits and increased unemployment benefits, protecting all workers and their standards of living.

We call for maternity benefits for working mothers for thirteen weeks, including the period before and after childbirth, and the granting of children's allowances to families with children under 18.

We favor adequate public assistance for all persons in need, with Federal grants-in-aid proportionate to the needs and financial ability of the states, pending the enactment of a comprehensive Federal Social Security program.

We support the right of every American to good health through a national system of health insurance, giving freedom of choice to patient and practitioner, and providing adequate medical and dental care for all.

We favor the expenditure of Federal funds in support of an effective program for public health and preventive

medicine and a program of dental care.

We favor the expenditure of Federal funds for the promotion of medical and dental education and research.

We look forward to the eventual transfer of the entire cost of the security and health program to the government as an essential public service.

#### WOMEN

The Progressive Party proposes to secure the rights of women and children and to guarantee the security of the American family as a happy and democratic unit and as the mainstay of our nation.

We propose to raise women to first-class citizens by removing all restrictions--social, economic, and political--without jeopardizing the existing protective legislation vital to women as mothers of future mothers.

We propose to extend fair labor standards for women, to guarantee them healthful working conditions, equal job security with men, and their jobs back after the birth of children.

We propose to guarantee medical care for mother and child prior to, during and after birth, through a national system of health insurance.

We propose a program of Federal assistance for the establishment of day care centers for all children.

## YOUNG PEOPLE

The Progressive Party believes young people are the nation's most valuable asset; their full potentialities can be realized only by implementing our complete program for peace, freedom, and abundance. We challenge the failure of the old parties to meet the special problems of youth.

We call for the right to vote at eighteen.

We call for the enforcement and extension of child labor laws.

We call for Federal and state expenditures for recreational facilities, particularly in needy rural communities.

## VETERANS

The Progressive Party recognizes the veterans' special sacrifices and contributions in the nation's most critical period.

We demand priority for veterans in obtaining homes.

We call for a Federal bonus to veterans based on length of service.

We demand the expansion of the Veterans Administration program and increased G. I. benefits and allowances and the elimination of discrimination.

We demand that the coverage of the G. I. Bill of Rights and other servicemen's benefits to be extended to war widows and to merchant seamen with war service.



We call for the prompt refund of the overcharges collected from veterans by National Service Life Insurance.

We demand that the government enforce the right of Negro veterans in the South to file terminal leave applications and to collect their benefits.

We call for increased benefits for disabled veterans and a program to guarantee them jobs at decent wages.

#### TAXATION

The Progressive Party demands the overhaul of the tax structure according to the democratic principle of ability to pay. We propose to employ taxation as a flexible instrument to promote full employment and economic stability.

We propose to exempt from personal income taxes all families and individuals whose incomes falls below the minimum required for a decent standard of living. We propose that income from capital gains, be taxed at the same graduated rate as ordinary income.

We propose to enact effective excess profits and undistributed profits taxation.

We propose to curb tax-dodging by closing existing loopholes.

We propose to work towards the progressive elimination of Federal excise taxes on the basic necessities of life.

We oppose all state and local sales taxes.

We propose to close existing loopholes in estate and gift taxes and establish an integrated system of estate and gift taxation.

#### EDUCATION

The Progressive Party proposes to guarantee, free from segregation and discrimination, the inalienable right to a good education to every man, woman, and child in America. Essential to good education are the recognized principles of academic freedom--in particular, the principle of free inquiry into and discussion of controversial issues by teachers and students.

We call for the establishment of an integrated Federal grant-in-aid program to build new schools, libraries, raise teachers' and librarians' salaries, improve primary and secondary schools, and assist municipalities and states to establish free colleges.

We call for a system of Federal scholarships, fellowships, and cost-of-living grants, free from limitations or quotas based on race, creed, color, sex, or national origin, in order to enable all those with necessary qualifications but without adequate means of support to obtain higher education in institutions of their own choice.

We call for a national program of adult education in cooperation with state and local authorities.

We oppose segregation in education and support legal action on behalf of Negro students and other minorities aimed at securing their admission to state-supported graduate and professional schools which now exclude them by law.

We call for Department of Education with a Secretary of Education with a Secretary of Cabinet rank.

#### CULTURE

The Progressive Party recognizes culture as potentially powerful force in the moral and spiritual life of a people and, through the people, in the moral and spiritual life of a people and, through the people, in the growth of democracy and the preservation of peace, and realizes that the culture of a democracy must, like its government, be of, by, and for the people.

We pledge ourselves to establish a department of government that shall be known as the Department of Culture, whose function shall be the promotion of all the arts as an expression of the spirit of the American people, and toward the enrichment of the people's lives, to make the arts available to all.

#### PROMOTION OF SCIENCE

The Progressive Party calls for the enactment of legislation to promote science, including human and social

sciences so that scientific knowledge may be enlarged and used for the benefit of all people.

#### A REAL CHOICE IN 1948

The Progressive Party has not taken root as the party of the common man. It has arisen in response to, and draws growing strength from, the demand of millions of men and women for the simple democratic right to vote for a candidate and a program which satisfy their needs. It gives voters a real choice.

Purposeful and deeply meant, the program of the Progressive Party carries forward the policies of Franklin Roosevelt and the aspirations of Wendell Willkie and holds forth the promise of a reborn democracy ready to play its part in one world. The American people want such a program. They will support it.

Under the leadership of Henry A. Wallace and Glen H. Taylor, a great new people's movement is on the march. Under the guidance of Divine Providence, the Progressive Party, with strong and active faith, moves forward to peace, freedom and abundance.

An Abstract of  
HENRY AGARD WALLACE IN THE  
ELECTION OF 1948

Margaret J. Stevenson Miller

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree  
of Master of Liberal Arts

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, OHIO

August, 1956

MILLER, MARGARET J., M. A., August, 1956. History.

Henry Agard Wallace in the Election of 1948. (300 pp.) No.

Faculty Advisor: R. Stanley McCordock.

This thesis deals with the campaign of Henry Agard Wallace for the Presidency in 1948 and the events leading up to it.

Prior to the campaign, Wallace led an active role in the American scene. Following the traditional pattern of the Wallace family, Wallace identified himself with the Agricultural interests of his country. As the originator of hybrid corn, he built a personal fortune. The editorship of Wallaces' Farmer enabled him to advocate bold measures for the relief of the farmers. Reflecting the farmers' discontent with Republican policies, Wallace supported the cause of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic nominee. Because of his qualifications, Wallace was offered the Secretaryship of Agriculture. Subsequently he became Vice-President and Secretary of Commerce.

After the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Wallace became critical of the Governmental policies. His censure of the American bipartisan policy toward the Soviet led to his resignation as Secretary of Commerce. Next he assumed the editorship of the liberal publication The New Republic. Trips abroad gave Wallace an opportunity to enunciate his

thesis of world peace.

Invited to lead a third party, Wallace became the Progressive nominee of 1948. The Communist-dominated third party, which attacked the old parties as being reactionary, went down to defeat. With the outbreak of the Korean War, Wallace came to the support of his country and disavowed his former allies--the Communists.

Finally the study attempts to summarize and evaluate the role of Wallace in the service of his country.