We disagree with the theory that the Democratic Party is hopelessly splintered by the Dixiecrats, and that the liberal elements will move over into and work through a labor party. It will take a lot more than this one issue to compel that. We should like to cite the following reasons.

1) The Southern Democrats know, on the plain basis of mathematics, that they can never hope to control the country by themselves, and they're equally sure that the Republicans aren't going to help them to power. It is a moral certainty that they've got to keep the national Democratic Party in power, with themselves as a nucleus and the root power, if they ever expect to gain back the national government with the power, prestige, patronage, and all that goes with it.

2) The liberal Democrats in the North and West can gain nothing by splitting off and going after a labor party. If they do, they're giving up the South's electoral college votes. The strongest labor movement in many years was the farmer-laborites in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Dakotas. At one time (in the mid-1930s) it actually held the balance
OF POWER BETWEEN LIBERALS AND REACTIONARIES OF BOTH PARTIES IN THE HOUSE. THIS WAS IN THE DAYS WHEN JERRY BOILEAU OF WISCONSIN WAS EXERTING A POWERFUL INFLUENCE. BUT THIS MOVEMENT NEVER APPROACHED NATIONAL POLITICAL SIZE. THE SAME CAN BE SAID OF LATER MOVEMENTS -- AMERICAN-LABOR, AMERICAN-LIBERAL IN NEW YORK. OLD DOC TOWNSEND, WHO WAS A POLITICAL POWER AT ONE TIME, WAS SMART ENOUGH NOT TO TRY TO ORGANIZE A NEW PARTY, BUT TO WORK ON THE EXISTING MAJOR PARTIES. AND EVEN THEN HE COULDN'T CARRY HIS PENSION PLAN INTO LEGISLATION. THE LIBERAL DEMOCRATS KNOW THAT ONCE THEY GIVE UP THE DEMOCRATIC LABEL, THEY ARE CHUCKING A BIG CHUNK OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE VOTES, AND SECOND THAT THEY'RE PUTTING POLITICS PRETTY MUCH ON AN "EACH MAN FOR HIMSELF" BASIS. THEY'VE GOT TO RUN WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF A PARTY, AND A PARTY TO EXIST LONG, HAS TO WIN AN OCCASIONAL ELECTION.

3) ULTIMATELY, LEGISLATION WILL BE ENACTED TO CARRY OUT THE VERY CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM (OR NEAR TO IT) THAT MADE THE SOUTHERN DEMOCRATS SO SICK AT HARRY TRUMAN. IT PROBABLY WILL BE ENACTED BY A
Republican administration, possibly revives. This will have two possible effects: (a) it will be accepted, and thus eliminate the elements of discord within the Democratic Party; (b) it will deepen the resentment of the South against the GOP, and thus pull the Democrats closer together.

4) Already there is plenty of evidence that liberal stirrings are afoot in the South, that would tend to minimize, in time, the chances of a permanent split. The fact that Alabama elects men like Hill and Sparkman, Texas men like Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn, Florida men like Pepper and (years ago) Henry P. Fletcher show that Richards like the Milords and Rankins and their ilk are having an increasingly difficult time. All this testifies that liberalism is growing in the South. Need we cite Judge Varner's decision at Charleston on Negro voting? It takes years to wash out prejudices and re-educate a politically stultified section. But it is being done. The statistics on lynching prove it. This is why we believe that time and the elimination of controversial issues which are bogging the Democrats will work to restore party unity. Adversity, it
ANY, UNDER COMING ADMINISTRATIONS, WILL ASSIST.

3) WHILE THE THEORY ABOUT ECONOMIC GROWTH OF THE SOUTH DOES BEAR SOME WEIGHT, WE DO NOT BELIEVE IT IS COMPELLING. TAKE NEW YORK, FOR EXAMPLE. IT HAS BEEN "ASTOUNDINGLY WEALTHY" FOR A HUNDRED YEARS, COMPARETIVELY SPEAKING, YET THAT HAS HAD NO GREAT EFFECT POLITICALLY. NEW YORK HAS SPRUNG FROM ONE TICKET TO ANOTHER. TEXAS, UP AND COMING ECONOMICALLY, CAN FIND NO REASON TO DECLINE TO WORK WITH NEW YORK DEMOCRATS, ONCE THESE CONTROVERSIAL RACIAL ISSUES ARE SETTLED. WE DON'T BELIEVE THE SOUTH IS NEARLY AS PROSPEROUS, OR ON THE BRINK OF PROSPERITY, AS THE THEORY WOULD INDICATE. TO BE SURE, IT IS MORE PROSPEROUS THAN BEFORE, BUT FOR HOW LONG, WHEN PRICES START FALLING, AS ULTIMATELY THEY WILL? IT IS OUR BELIEF THAT POLITICS IN THE SOUTH IS ONE OF LONG HABIT, TRAINING, CUSTOM, ALMOST OF FOLKLORE, BACKGROUNDED AGAINST THE BITTERNESS OF THE CIVIL WAR, AND THE STILL DEEPER BACKGROUND OF AGRARIAN VERSUS INDUSTRIAL ECONOMIC (LOANS, FREIGHT RATES, TAXES, ETC.) THINKING.
It all adds up to about one thing, for the Democrats: either they get together, or they all get sacked together. The South, to win, must have a program and leaders that will appeal to the North. The North, to win, must have the support of the South. It is our opinion that this lesson will be driven home in this election. You can even hear Democrats predicting now that if the Senate does Democratic, there will be a Democratic victory in 1952 with a Democrat in the White House. You haven't heard one Democrat argue that the South should split off from the party for economic reasons; it is the civil rights issue, and that will be settled for the Democrats rather sooner than later.

Southern and farm Democrats have pretty much always dictated control of the party in Congress, through committee chairmanships, and votes on economic issues. You will find, surprisingly, that Northern city Democrats went along with a great deal of regularity on reclamation, farm funds, conversation, even shelter belt expenditures in the West.

Summarizing: we can not reach the conclusion that the Democratic Party is shot to smithereens. We reach the opposite conclusion. We believe that a few years of minority existence, without patronage, without power, without prestige, plus having to swallow the civil
RIGHTS PROGRAM ANYWAY (AND WE BELIEVE IT WILL BE FAIRLY REASONABLY
ACCEPTED INSPITE OF ALL THE THREATS OF REBELLION) WILL TEACH THE
DEMOCRATS A LASTING LESSON.
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-- THE END --