April 27, 1948

Dear Sen. Chapman

Under Secretary
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C.

We are attaching a copy of the 22,600-word analysis of the first three months of the Wallace campaign. The document is based on the best part of extensive quotes from Wallace which seemed to us to demonstrate most clearly the shifts and fallacies in his position. You may have seen the publicity on it in the New York papers this morning.

As far as we know, this is the first time any one has attempted this kind of a job on Wallace. We expect to issue supplementary material as the campaign progresses.

If you have an opportunity, we would like very much to have you give us your reactions to the document.

Sincerely yours,

Elizabeth B. Donahue

William W. Day
Publicity Department

ED-WB/6
Enc.
April 27, 1948

FROM: Elizabeth Donahue and William Dufty
Publicity Department

There is nothing final about the enclosed source-book on the Henry Wallace campaign.

The main uncompleted section of the study will deal with the people in Wallace's present inner circle, their backgrounds, and their role in his campaign. Other sections will surely be amended as Wallace temper or tempers his views in subsequent speeches.

This account for the form of this publication and our plans for supplementing and revising it regularly. It is more valuable as a ready reference source during the coming campaign if it is kept current. All intend to do that.

As new sections are completed, or as additions are made to existing sections, we shall attempt to service holders of the document by individual mail.

This involves certain physical and financial problems in which we ask your cooperation.

We find it difficult to issue the document widely to interested individuals except at some slight cost.

We can supply copies of this original document to be supplemented by mail with one additional section which is now in the works for $1.00. Beyond that we cannot forecast the amount of addenda which will result from the rest of the campaign or what the additional cost will be.

Since this document will have to be serviced from a special mailing list, we ask you to help in filling out the attached address form and sending it in with your remittance.

Enclosed is a form. Please send _______ copies of HENRY WALLACE: THE FIRST DEMOCRAT.

Remit with the following supplements to the following

NAME ___________________________
ADDRESS _______________________
CITY ___________________________
HENRY A. WALLACE

THE FIRST THREE MONTHS

(These results of the first three months of the Wallace campaign are presented by Youths for Integration, Please credit 212 in using this interpretation and assembly of the Wallace record.)

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION
PUBLICITY BUREAU

1700 E. Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.
INTRODUCTION

IT ALL GOES BACK TO FRENCH JACOBINS....A brief outline of the origins of the Third Party

GERMANISM: "MIGHTY CUCKOO"........Reactions of Henry Wallace and Glenn Taylor to the Czechoslovakia crisis and the death of Jan Masaryk.

DOUBLE BANK OF BRITAIN..................Henry Wallace in U.S. condemns British "imperialism", Henry Wallace in Britain condemns U.S. "imperialism"....Jennie Lee, MP says "this is a lie" to Wallace charge of U.S. pressure or British to abandon nationalization.

WALLACE: CONQUERER-IN-CHIEF............Third Party candidate: larcenous nature of Communist operations, against U.S. cold war draft; for relying on U.S.S.R. for II victories and "perhaps" a million-man army.

"DISHONESTY" AND "DECEPTION"............Mrs. Roosevelt, daughter and three sons say Wallace has no claim to mantle of the late President.

POLITICAL INELLOWられ.............Third Party opposes liberal candidates in key elections.

WALLACE--CIVIL LIBERAL...His record on civil liberties.

"HEIMDIES" AGAIN......................Henry Wallace and the Italian elections.

"FRIEND OF LABOR"......................Record in Agriculture Department and opposition to strikes in key Government-owned industries.

SON OF GERMAN'S ANGELS..................A partial list of early contributors to Wallace campaign.
Americans for Democratic Action has consistently and unreservedly condemned the Third Party as led by Henry A. Wallace. ADA has assumed the prime responsibility for challenging his and his spokesmen whenever it appeared that their utterances threatened the welfare or objectives of democratic peoples here and abroad.

It is clear, however, that as the campaign progresses the task of sorting and documenting irresponsible and often dangerous statements made by Wallace and Third Party leaders will become increasingly difficult.

The Third Party candidate has embarked on a barnstorming campaign which carries him into remote areas, uncharted by other national campaigners. By early April he had made over 28 major speeches since announcing his candidacy and had personally addressed more than 75,000 people in addition to radio audiences. He had appeared on the platform in nine states. Wallace, according to any reasonable estimate, will have conducted the equivalent of nearly two full Presidential campaigns by the time the major parties and the third party hold their conventions. It is quite natural that only Wallace’s major pronouncements will be widely reported.

Another serious difficulty relates to the increasing unpredictability of the Wallace position as his campaign gears itself more and more directly to the fluctuations of Soviet policy.

Wallace makes “tough” statements which are apparently prepared for him by the well disciplined operatives around him.

After the statements have been reported in the press and elsewhere, Wallace is apt to qualify, evade or “explain” in such a way as to make it virtually impossible to determine which position is really his own.

When Wallace announced his candidacy, large numbers of his former supporters disavowed or quietly deserted him. New reinforcements—Communist-dominated
unions and individuals well-known as CP apologists — took their place at the front.

Virtually every major non-Communist CIO union had opposed Wallace even before President Philip Murray made such opposition a matter of formal CIO policy. Lee Pressman, Murray’s chief counsel in the CIO and Steelworkers left to work for Wallace for President. John Ait resigned his post as counsel to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers to stand at Pressman’s side when the Amalgamated refused to support Wallace. Both Pressman and Ait were long-standing left-wing operators in CIO.

President William Green of the AFL also openly denounced the Third Party and its candidate.

It is fair to say that the core of the Wallace’s supporters is composed chiefly of those individuals and unions which in the period of the Nazi-Soviet pact were the spearhead of the Wallace opposition the only other time he ran for public office — on the vice-presidential ticket with Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Some outstanding examples of the shifts and fallacies appearing in Wallace’s campaign record are cited here against the background of the formation of the Third Party.
IT ALL GOES BACK
TO FRANK BROWDER

The American Communist Party's campaign to promote and control a Third Party in the United States is revealed in CP documents published over the past three years.

The third party objective figured in the abrupt disintegration of Mr. Browder in the summer of 1945. Jacques Duclos, the French Communist leader who broke Browder and put the new line for the CPUSA, said in his manifesto that a major objection to the Browder policies was that they would end "in liquidation of the Independent political party of the working class in the U. S." (POLITICAL AFFAIRS, July 1946, the CPUSA's official magazine)

In the same article which spelled the end of Browder's leadership of the CPUSA, Duclos generously and perhaps significantly quoted from Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace,

Six months later, in a command performance before his Party local in Yonkers, Browder confirmed the fact that differing views on the third party were crucial in his ouster,

"The only charge that might be against me in relation to the convention decisions is that I failed...to withdraw from the Roosevelt-labor Democratic coalition and break up the Truman Administration." (Quoted from Browder's statement, THE NATION, May 11, 1946.)

Browder was reported to have bitterly attacked William Z. Foster, the new CPUSA leader for having "allowed upon Wallace and those to resign from Truman's Cabinet."

The report of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U. S., meeting in special plenum in the summer of 1946, continued the Foster line on the third party,

"Recent political developments make it incumbent upon...the Communists more effectively to promote the movement for a new people's party..., it is necessary to build the Political action Committee, the National Citizen's Political action Committee, and the Independent Citizen's Committee...to organize in the course of the 1946 election and immediately afterwards, a grass roots political machinery and foundations for the new people's alignment and party which are new in the making..."
The report abstracted regretfully that Henry Wallace, characterized as "honest though confused," was "taking sharp issue with the trend toward a third party." (They doubtless had reference to such statements as he made before a dinner tendered him in New York, January 1946 by the Union for Democratic Action.

"The strategy of the enemy," he said, "is to break the Democratic Party in two. They went to push you and me into the futility of a third party."

The need of party underlings who sought to correct Wallace's benchmarks and confusion on the Third Party issue is accounted for the Daily Worker's failure to recognize the "true" significance of Wallace's first Easter Square Garden speech (Sept. 1946).

Eugene Dennis soon corrected the hasty conclusions drawn by the Worker. He characterized the editorial as "incorrect and harmful."

Reporting on the meeting of the National Committee (CPUSA), Dennis, in the January, 1947 Political Affairs said:

"...neither the National Board nor the Secretariat discussed or read in advance either the speech of Wallace or the Daily Worker editorial... the first editorial in the Daily Worker on the Wallace speech adopted such a completely negative attitude... (They) were dissipated by the unjust and harmful remarks by Wallace on the Soviet Union and the Communists. Because of this, the comrades failed to grasp the fact that Wallace, in his own way and within the limitations of his position, was challenging the main line of the Symons-Vandenberg policy and in the first place the "first touch with Russia policy.""

The CP leadership certainly moved swiftly to correct this "unprecedented" mistake. Wallace's discharge from the Cabinet simplified their task and the Communist statements on behalf of the Third Party began to emphasize the need for immediate action.

Thirty days after Dennis explained the party's error in assessing Wallace's speech, William Z. Foster wrote in Political Affairs:
"It is absolutely necessary to begin building the new mass party now... conditions are ripe... the political situation permits it... there must be an illusion that the Democratic Party as such can be won for the task that a people's party will perform... the Communists must form an active recognized section of the movement. From an immediately practical standpoint... there must be a progressive Presidential candidate in the field in 1948 without fail; if not on the Democratic ticket, then surely on an independent ticket..."

Wallace's "backwardsness" was slowly overcome.

In May of 1967 he said:

"Americans demand a two party system and a liberal party. If the Democratic Party betrays its responsibilities, the people will have to find other means of political expression."

The PDA, which had since become the broad united-front demanded by the CP in the summer of 1966, began to use the phrase "by a new party if necessary." It turned up in statements from the PDA board in June 28 and later Oct. 7, 1947.

Meanwhile, Wallace made his most coherent statement on the possibilities of a third party in his Washington speech in June 1947 when he justified the move, not in terms of political efficacy, but as an expression of the American people's "will for peace," which would be understood abroad.

In the series of PDA meetings addressed by Wallace, the fund-raising pitch was to collect for a "people's party," after which Wallace would open his speeches with a statement of equivalence on the issue.

Finally in December of 1947, a meeting of the National Board of PDA in New York split wide open on the issue of a Wallace-led Third Party.

Dr. Frank Kingston, co-chairman of PDA among others, resigned from PDA. Kingston explained it this way in his New York POST column:

"Who asked Henry Wallace to run? The answer is in the record. The Communist Party, through William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, were the first... I was finally convinced when the chairman ran over on the night PDA became the second organized group to demand the Wallace candidacy."

Ten days later Wallace announced his candidacy in Chicago.
On December 28 Van Lerner wrote in PM:

"As I followed the world Communist movement, I was confident that the Communist Party in America would now follow the Third Party line rigidly and that they would try to call the idea to American progressives harder than ever.

"However, searching the thought that the PGA progressives have given the matter, their conclusion is the same as that of the Communists, and their reasoning is the same. For those who were in a fixed idea about the need for a Third Party, the move in the past year must be not that Truman will change, but that he would not change. Nothing that has happened in the past year could have satisfied the PGA leaders. What I change them with is not a heavy judgment, but a fixed idea immune to events in the world outside their own minds."
In its report on the special plenum of 1948, the National Committee of the Communist Party characterized Henry Wallace as "honest though confused."

Subsequently the Communists have demonstrated great anxiety to correct these faults in the Third Party leader. The extent to which they succeeded is best shown in a series of Wallace quotes on the Czechoslovakian crisis. In one instance Wallace clearly embarrassed the Communist leaders by implying that native Communists might be Soviet agents. In general, however, the views he expressed on the Czech crisis closely conformed to the CP line.

In Minneapolis, February 29, 1948 Wallace blamed the Czech coup on the Truman Doctrine and indicated that Russia was retaliating against U. S. aggression. Glenn Taylor Third Party Vice-Presidential candidate gave a similar answer when asked if he thought the Czech crisis was the result of actions by the Russians:

"I imagine it was the result of pressure by the Russians," Taylor said, explaining that the Soviet Union was being "defensive in an aggressive way."

These statements raised two serious issues for the CP strategists. They implied that Moscow was interfering in Eastern European countries; that the Czech Communists were, in effect, Soviet agents. This would leave U. S. Communists open to the same charge.

So Joseph Starobin chided Wallace and Taylor in the DAILY "COMMUNIST," March 1.

Starobin said the Third Party standard bearers hadn't thought this thing through. That while there is a "kernel of truth" in the statement "in the sense that the peoples of Eastern Europe in alliance with the Soviet Union are buttressing down the threats," there is a very fundamental danger in describing Soviet policy (in this fashion). Starobin wrote:
"The danger exists for the American progressive-coalition,...the minute anyone 'imagines' that all progressive change is 'Soviet inspired' he waltzes himself as a fighter for progress. By this way change in the case of Czechoslovakia, the enemies of Taylor and Wallace try to trap him...."

"Nothing which is democratic and progressive can be anti-Soviet, of course...But to quote for a moment that Czechoslovakia’s changes are under Soviet pressure has the effect of robbing each people of their nationality, their specific character, their own interest right to determine their own affairs — which happens to be the fundamental American right at the very base of the Wallace movement."

What Steinhardt really meant, of course, was that a few more such Wallace-Taylor faux pas and the CP would have trouble maintaining the illusion that Americans, as well as Czech Communists are not Soviet collaborators.

* * *

On March 17 Wallace in a press conference insistently accused Lawrence A. Steinhardt, U.S. Ambassador to Czechoslovakia of having attempted to stage a “rightist coup” in that country. The New York TIMES reported:

"Mr. Wallace left the clear implication that the Communists in Czechoslovakia acted in self-defense in seizing control of the Czech government.

Mr. Steinhardt emphatically denied Wallace’s charge:

"His (Wallace’s) unfounded statement merely discloses his recklessness in trying to insinuate that I departed from Czechoslovakia on November 25, 1947,...boarded a plane on the SS America on February eleventh and consequently arrived in Prague February 16 and did not arrive in Prague until February 19. The government crisis in Prague began on February 15 when the non-Communist ministers left the Cabinet and thereafter did not participate in further Cabinet meetings...I did communicate with any member of the Czechoslovak government, Communist or non-Communist between November 25 and until long after the government crisis was over and the new Communist government in power."

Steinhardt’s and the State Department’s reputation did not phase Wallace.

He retorted:

"There can be no doubt that Mr. Steinhardt hoped for the same result in Czechoslovakia as in France and Italy where the pressure of our State Department forced Communists from the government."
He must be certain that Russia is not carrying on territorial expansion or world domination through native communists faithfully following every twist and turn in the Moscow Party line.

It is hardly necessary to point out the seriousness of the original charge leveled by a former Vice-President of the United States against the American Ambassador to Prague.

Wallace in explaining how Steichhardt had attempted to engineer the "rightist coup" in Czechoslovakia said the Ambassador

"issued a statement expressing the hope that Czechoslovakia would be able to take part in the Marshall Plan. Clearly a provocative statement."

Under the impact of facts and documentation detailing the Third Party candidate had this to add in public testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on March 30:

"I said that Ambassador Steichhardt was responsible. I do not know whether I put in the words, 'to some degree' but I should have put them in...It was to some degree responsible for the situation the way it finally resulted, I will put it that way."

He added:

"With the crisis that existed in Czechoslovakia at that time a statement by the American Ambassador inviting Czechoslovakia to come into the Marshall Plan could not be looked on favorably by the Russians."

* * *

Two weeks after the Communist coup, Jan Masaryk, Czechoslovak foreign minister committed suicide in Prague on March 10.

A. Powell Davis, pastor of Washington's famed All Soul's Church was Masaryk's guest in Prague at the time of the Communist coup.

Davis stated:
"Although I was repeatedly told that I would presently see Mr. Hamary, I never did. As I afterwards discovered, he was a virtual prisoner, and unable to get rid of his guard. This guard consisted of four armed Communist militiamen. Concerning Hamary's suicide I have been informed directly of the circumstances in which it took place. There is no doubt of its being suicide. To get away from his guard, Hamary took the only opportunity open to him, he jumped from his bathroom window.

The circumstances surrounding Hamary's suicide were not generally disputed by the press and the pro-Soviet free nations.

But the Communist Party's DAILY WORKER faithfully reported the Moscow lynch.

On March 18 Joseph Stalin wrote in the WORKER:

"Let the true prisoner commit suicide — of John Winant, who found that postwar America was not what he hoped and expected it to be, and could not endure the strain of it?"

Wallace preferred to accept the latter version. On March 18 — four days after the DAILY WORKER handed down the "line" — Wallace declared:

"One can never tell. Maybe Winant had cancer, maybe Hamary had cancer. Maybe Winant was unhappy about the fate of the world."

This is the only recorded account by the Third Party candidate on the implications of the Czechoslovakian's foreign minister's death.

Meanwhile, on March 9, John Taylor began a 9-day attack on 322 in the Senate.

The full text was in the press gallery when afternoon adjournment halted the first half of the late Senator's address. Before Taylor rose in the Senate the following day, the newspapers carried the stories of Jan Hamary's death.

Taylor continued his speech, omitting these 111 words which appeared in the text submitted earlier to the press:

"The Marshall Plan, I believe, is responsible for what recently occurred in Czechoslovakia. We promised then generous help and large loans, but only on condition that they get rid of the
Communists. Jan Hamryk says there was a plot on foot to kick
the Communists out and the Communists just kicked first. Before
the Czech incident Hamryk was considered by us to be a good
democrat and patriot. Now that he says he is still a loyal Czech
and is remaining in the government, I would suppose our priests and
red-haters will excommunicate and anathematize him. In fact, your
old Jan will be lucky if the Congress Committee does not investi-
gate him.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}}
DODGE TALE OF BRITAIN

On his return to Britain in the spring of 1947, Henry Wallace made a spectacular about-face in his view of British foreign policy.

In his Madison Square Garden speech, September, 1946, his violent denunciations of Britain left doubts that he had ever heard that a Labour government had come to power.

"To make Britain the base to our foreign policy would be, in my opinion, the height of folly. We must not let reactionary leadership force us into that position. We must not let British balance of power manipulations determine whether and when the United States gets into war. Make no mistake about it — the British imperialistic policy in the Near East alone...would lead the United States straight to war."

A few months later before a British audience, British imperialism was forgotten as Wallace flew in England turned on the U.S. Reporting from London David Williams, AIA's representative, stated in his London Letter:

"Mr. Wallace has been tireless in his praise of the British experience, and has thumbed American politics as mercilessly as Mr. Martin could possibly desire."

In a speech in Manchester, Wallace said:

"As one patriotic American I am utterly opposed to this policy of imperialism. I have said in America, and I say again here, that it will end by setting the world against America and dividing America against herself.

"It is a dangerous programme for America to embark on imperialism. It may cost little to divide the world. But to keep the world divided is beyond the resources of any nation."

When he returned to America, Wallace attempted to explain away these contradictions by claiming he had been misquoted. His references to American imperialism, he said in Washington at a press conference, did not refer to government policy but to a policy urged upon the government by James Burrough and Henry Luce.
When Wallace testified before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on Feb. 24, 1946, the British press headlined Wallace's charges that the Marshall Plan was being used to halt the process of nationalization of basic industries in Western European nations.

These press reports drew an immediate rejoinder from Jennie Lee, British Labour MP, wife of Cabinet Minister Aneurin Bevan, who has shaken his political future on the promise that there will be no delays in the time table of British socialism.

Quoting a Wallace charge, headlined in London papers, that 'capitalist America pressure has compelled the Labour government of Britain indefinitely to postpone the nationalization of steel', Jennie Lee wrote to Aneurin:

"This is a lie. Where does Wallace get this sort of story? I am taking time off to write this note from the Committee dealing with nationalization of steel. After coal, gas, electricity, comes steel. At the last Trade Union Congress, a definite and public undertaking was given by the government that steel would be nationalized this Parliament, which means, in terms of Parliamentary procedure, that a beginning will have to be made next session.

'This Wallace statement shocks me. Maybe he has been misquoted but if not, what can be made of a man of reputedly high moral character deliberately bearing false witness.'

Needless to say, Mr. Wallace was not dissuaded. In the text of his testimony against IBEW, published by the National Wallace for President Committee, he said:

'Nationalization of the steel industry was a key plank in the platform of the British Labor party but it has been indefinitely postponed under U.S. pressure.

'I have pointed out how the pressure of our government to retreat and retreat and retreat in its programs for the general welfare..."'

* * *

An interesting footnote to Wallace's views on nationalization occurred in a conversation between Wallace and Charles La Follette, then a Republican Congress-
man from Indiana, in 1946.
In his primary campaign, La Follette had advocated nationalization of the railroads and coal mines, and reported that he told Wallace he was "beginning to feel that certain other basic industries such as steel and food processing might have to be similarly operated."

"Congressman," Wallace replied, "you have a much weaker belief in the free enterprise system than I have; I don't think any of those things are necessary."

But on April 5, 1948 in a speech in Evansville, Indiana, La Follette's home town, Wallace called for nationalization of the aircraft industry which he said was "helping foster the present war hysteria." In the interests of peace, Wallace insisted "we must remove the drive for profits which lends private interests to urge more armaments and warlike actions."
WALLACE: COMMISSAR-IN-CHIEF

In his appearance before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Feb. 24 \nWallace was asked what he would do if he were president and his secretaries of state \nand defense reported to him that continued Soviet aggression constituted the main \nthreat to world peace.

Wallace replied: "I would tell them to prepare for war."

He added quickly that that could never happen because under no circumstances \nwould he have such men in his cabinet.

This could only mean that Wallace would have a Secretary of State and Secretary \nof Defense as ignorant of Communist policy as he claims to be.

Wallace has repeatedly said that he "only knows of two or three U. S. Com-\nmunist" he has even met; says he does not read Communist publications or literature.

In answer to a question from Chairman Sol Bloom that same day he told the House Com-\nmittee "I am not familiar with the Communist approach and am unable to discuss it."

Herbert Lehman, former Governor of New York and Director General of U.S.A in \naddressing the New York State A.A.A. convention declared that Wallace "is trifling with \nour country's security" in ignoring the nature of Communist policy.

Wallace, on at least two occasions has made startling and naive revelations as \nto the reasons for his apparent lack of concern over the Communist issue.

William Hazlitt Hale, a former editor of the NEW YORKER writes in \nHarpers Magazine, March, 1946:

"We [Wallace] would not, he said, write anything critical of Soviet \npolicies...because he didn't see how by himself he could affect \nSoviet policies...Criticism must come at home."

In 1946, in conference with Robert M. Habrany and other Democratic leaders in \nMinnesota on the problem of CP power in the Democratic Farm Labor Party, Wallace pro-\ntested he could do nothing about it. He advised Habrany to "try to get in touch
with Moscow and ask then to pass the word back to the party in Minnesota to lay off
the UFL. 7 Wallace added that he would hardly be the one to get in touch with Moscow
since he would surely be taken for a Communist.

The nature of the UFL operations and the threat of Soviet aggression must, how-
ever, inevitably trouble some of Wallace's most stalwart followers.

Allen Tate, his running-mate, has already shown signs of uneasiness. On
April 14, in an address before the American Association of Newspaper Editors, Tate
admitted that even Wallace, if elected President, might be "unsuitable" in convin-
cing Russia of the nation's peaceful aims. He added:

"If there had to be a showdown, Henry Wallace could not succeed
fully Endline me than any other on the political horizon."

Wallace had an opportunity to set forth his views as a potential commander-in-
chief when he appeared before the Senate Committee on Armed Forces on March 26,
1948 in opposition to UFL.

As in some previous instances, Wallace made a conscious effort to sound more
reasonable in his ad lib remarks than he was made to sound in the prepared state-
ment written for him by a member of his staff.

After a laborious delivery of the hour-long written testimony, Wallace settled
down for a grilling by members of the Senate Committee.

First, when pressed by Senator Baldwin for his suggestions as to the proper
care of the military establishment to protect this country in today's world,
Wallace replied:

"I do feel that a military man, in order to be true to the
security of this nation, must think in terms of the next possible
conflict, instead of in terms of the last conflict,
and therefore a military man, in view of the various types
of dangerous weapons which are now available, must think in
terms of the sciences involved in these weapons....That is a
matter of having an exceedingly well trained force, we will any, of course a million men.

Senator Baldwin asked that he thought the official military manpower estimates are too big.

But Senator Baldwin quickly reminded him that Secretary Forrestal's own recommendations were for an army of 380,000 men — almost a quarter of a million under Wallace's own estimate. Yet the purpose of the Wallace testimony was to oppose the two measures — draft and OEE — which Forrestal recommended as the only measures to bring the army up to within a quarter million of Wallace's recommended figure.

In another passage in his testimony Wallace noted the somewhat unique suggestion that the veterans of World War II be used as a reserve in preference to creating a new army.

Pressed by a Senate interrogator Wallace on two occasions made this proposal:

"If we need trained reserves, we now have 10 million veterans of World War II who could constitute a reserve of trained personnel that will be available for at least ten more years."

Wallace was asked directly:

"Do you feel that it is right then to lean on the group of veterans of World War II in case of any emergency?"

Wallace replied:

"I do not anticipate any such emergency, but I say we have them there as an insurance if the case of need should arise."

Wallace was asked whether he was "definitely against any program to build up other reserves, so therefore personally relying on those reserves right here."

Wallace replied:

"I am standing on the statement I just made."

"I would have the men of World War II as a reserve but I would have a stronger policy that would not make it necessary to call them."

Levall Nellett pointed out in his syndicated newspaper column that Wallace "will regret that statement. It will not sit well with the veterans among whom he may have hoped to obtain some votes."
A frequently recurring theme of Third Party spokesmen is that Wallace's current views represent a continuation of Franklin D. Roosevelt's policies and that everybody else had abandoned the late President's progressive program.

On that point, every single member of the late President's family actively engaged in political life has taken issue with Wallace.

ADA has reprinted a series of three "My Day" columns by Mrs. Roosevelt disputing the Third Party.

Since then Mrs. Roosevelt has at least twice again repudiated the Third Party claim.

In "My Day" February 26:

"Many of the leaders in ADA worked as closely in shaping the national policies that met the various crises, both on the domestic front and on the war front from 1933 to 1945, as did Mr. Wallace. Some of them might be able to point out a number of occasions when Mr. Wallace was more on the conservative side than on the courageous, liberal side of certain questions."

In a special statement to the ADA in Oregon:

"I have consistently opposed the Third Party under Mr. Wallace because I am convinced that he has with him elements which are dangerous to this country and any use of my husband's name in connection with that party is from my point of view, entirely dishonorable."

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., wrote in a letter to Pennsylvania State Senator.

Minor J. Holland, an officer in the United Steelworkers, ICC:

"All the members of my family have earnestly refrained from ever stating what we thought Franklin D. Roosevelt would do were he alive today, for the simple reason that no one on earth could possibly tell."

The Commnists, now supporting Wallace, FDR, Jr., said, "are the true American Communists who loudly called FDR a war-sinner."

"Again I reiterate my conviction that no one has or ever will inherit the mantle of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and most certainly not Henry Wallace in pursuit of his present dangerous adventure."

In a statement issued March 28, Mrs. Roosevelt, Jr., stated:

"The Third Party candidates in no conceivable way reflect or
inhere the liberal objectives and principles of my late father.
In a moment of world crisis he is confusing and dividing the
country."

In a special statement made for the Oregon J.I.L., April 7, Anna Roosevelt
Beattie wrote:

"I’m not at all surprised that the Third Party people in Oregon are
following the same old tactics of using Fether’s name to promote
their aims.

"Personally, I greatly deplore such tactics. First of all, it
seems to me a real sign of weakness on their part that they should
use the name of a man who is no longer here to voice his dis-
agreement or agreement concerning the expressed aims of the
Third Party. While some who are backing the Third Party are un-
quuestionably loyal to democratic concepts and principles, there
are unfortunately others who would prefer to see a Communitarian form
of government in this country and the demise of our democracy.
They know full well how Fether stood on that particular issue
while he was alive — that he was unswervingly opposed to Commu-
nism in this country, and had an abiding faith in the future
of our democracy."

Even Elliot Roosevelt, who shared the platform with Mr. Wallace in his Hudson
Square Garden appearance in September 1948, when asked by C. B. Rait to support
the Third Party candidacy declined on March 25, 1948:

"...I have been indicated to me that the same individuals are run-
ning the policy-making of the Third Party as was exemplified in that
so-called group of Liberals who bitterly fought Franklin D. Roosevelt
in 1932 and 1936 in his efforts to rescue and prepare this nation for
possible war...the group who immediately became his ardent supporters
as soon as the Soviet Union entered the war against Germany."
POLITICAL DILEMMA

In the early stages of his campaign, Harry Wallace reportedly said that
President Truman’s candidacy would either repel independent voters or create a fatal
apathy among the electorate. The President, he insisted, would make it difficult
if not impossible to elect progressive Congressmen. Giving the voters another
choice besides Dewey and Truman would, he indicated, improve the chances of pro-
gressives in congressional races.

Within three months after Wallace announced for the presidency, the Third Party
had established itself as the chief threat to the election of progressives. The
Third Party ticket will be used either to:

* Blockall progressives into supporting Soviet foreign policy as
defined by Wallace supporters.
* Punish at the polls those progressive candidates who do not come
to terms with the Wallace forces.

This strategy was clearly revealed in the DAILY Worker within 48 hours after
Wallace declared his candidacy. It has already been carried out in California and
in Illinois.

Before Paul Douglas and Adlai Stevenson teamed up on the Illinois Democratic
ticket (the former for the Senate and Stevenson for the Governorship), a delegation
composed of PWA leaders and left-wing CIO union officials visited the Democratic
Party officials and warned that if the nominees were Professor Douglas and Stevenson,
they would expect a Third Party ticket in the state which might ensure their defeat.
The threat was ignored.

Douglas, in particular, was tagged for defeat by the Third Party supporters be-
cause he was a vocal and enthusiastic supporter of the Marshall Plan, as he stated
unapologetically in entering the race.

Douglas will oppose Republican Senator C. Wayne Morse, arch-reactionary iso-
linationist and favorite son of Sen. Hickenlooper’s Chicago CHICAGO.
In this contest, where Douglas will have an uphill battle at best, the Progressive Party of Illinois has announced it will enter a third candidate because, as Balson Gorfield, a key Illinois Wallace supporter put it, Douglas is no longer a liberal, but a "sneak-supper" and a "red-catcher."

The Progressive Party, which has set out as a campaign depicting Douglas as an advocate of a "preventive war against Russia" (which he opposes) and a friend of the Taft-Hartley Act (which he opposes), declared:

"We do not believe there is an issue in Illinois of the lesser of two evils. Rather, in the contest between Brooks and Douglas there are two great evils, both of which must be opposed. We shall oppose the candidacy of both these men with a candidate who will carry the people of Illinois the program of Henry Wallace for the world, peace and abundance."

At the FCA convention in Chicago in January, Wallace was confronted with some of these facts. When asked by a reporter what he would do about Communist support, he answered that he would do as FCA had done. Then informed that FCA had repudiated the Communists on a number of occasions, Wallace replied that he would look up the record. When asked if he found these statements confirmed, would he then repudiate the Communists, he replied that he would look up the record.

Laying down three conditions on which he would support any candidate (anti-Marshall Plan, anti-ICC and anti-Taft-Hartley Bill) he indicated that the foreign policy planks would be considered most important. When asked whether he would support Paul Douglas on the basis of his liberal record, Wallace replied that he did not know his views. When asked whether he would support Senator Brooks (who was against the Marshall Plan and ICC) Wallace said he was "unfamiliar" with Brooks' record. (As recently as April 5 in Waverly, Indiana, Wallace repeated that he had not taken a stand in the Illinois race for Senator, "I still don't know where they stand on the draft, military training and the Taft-Hartley law and I haven't bothered to look it up," Wallace said.)
Wallace, of course, was presiding officer of the Senate for four years while Senator Brooks fought every defense measure, lend-lease, etc., and was a leading isolationist opponent of FDR's foreign policies. He has opposed all domestic progressive measures during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

In another Illinois district, the 'Progressive' Party has opened up an attack on Rep. Melvin Price and threatened to run a third party candidate against him. Although Price has one of the best labor records in Congress, and a perfect record by AFL standards of 1947, he will be opposed because he was a supporter of the Marshall Plan.

In 1946 Henry Wallace, writing in the KANSAS CITY STAR, singled out Helen Gahagan Douglas and Chet Holifield, both members of Congress from California, as outstanding progressive Democrats.

In 1946, Henry Wallace has not publicly protested the action of the Third Party in California, which has named both members of Congress for defeat by filling third party candidates in their districts.

On March 18, Representatives Holifield and Douglas received a telegram from the Wallace forces in their districts urging them to appear for questioning or face opposition of a third party candidate. Both of them have unswerved liberal records. However, in the House, both opposed aid to Greece and Turkey and have occasionally criticized other aspects of U.S. foreign policy. Because of this it was expected that the Communists would be less harsh than in instances where congressional candidates voted straight down the line for U.S. foreign policy. Holifield and Douglas, however, committed the unpardonable crime of supporting the European Recovery Program.

In answer to the query, both Congressmen reaffirmed their support of USSR and denied the pressure to appear for questioning. Jacob Barone, a leader of the
Wallace forces in California, has filed as a Third Party candidate against Hollisfield and Sidney Moore, an ex-postal clerk, member of the CIO, left-controlled United Public Workers, filed against Mrs. Douglas under the Third Party banner.

Third Party opposition would virtually spell defeat for both Congressmen. In 1946, Mrs. Douglas won by 9,000 votes. The Wallace people have already collected 20,000 signatures in her district, and 30,000 in Hollisfield's district.

Speaking in New York April 12 at an organization conference of the American Labor Party, the Wallace electoral vehicle in New York state, Rep. Vito Marcantonio announced that he would urge the AFL to oppose any Congressman from New York who either votes for the draft, U.S. or aid to Europe.

That would mean that virtually every liberal Congressman in New York can expect opposition from a Third Party entry.
In the role of campaigner, Henry Wallace has posed as a military figure battling the forces of prejudice and hate.

Reactionary and fascist-minded forces have lent validity to his claim by intimidating and assaulting Wallace supporters.

The dismissal of an Evansville college professor for heading a Wallace committee; the physical assault on I. B. Holland; the refusal of Indianapolis hotels to admit Wallace; the publication in the PITTSBURGH PRESS of names of signers of a Wallace petition are incidents which arouse the indignation of every decent citizen.

It is impossible however, to disregard certain weaknesses in the Third Party candidate's own record on civil liberties issues.

THE CRISIS, official organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People said in an editorial in February, 1948:

"Under his secretaryship, the Department of Commerce was more than ordinarily ridden with humiliating separations of workers because of color and limitation of promotion for the same reason. While in the latter months of 1947, just before the announcement of his candidacy, Mr. Wallace was railing against segregation and refusing to speak to segregated audiences, for five or six years prior to that time he had engaged openly before conventions of the NAACP, the organization which has had the segregationists as its war cry since it was formed. While turning aside NAACP invitations, Mr. Wallace found time to speak several times at Guadalupe, an institution where white and colored guest speakers are sent to separate guest houses."

During his regime as Commerce Secretary Wallace insisted that the segregation policy in the National Airport Restaurant which was under his jurisdiction could not be changed. Two reasons were advanced: 1) the airport was located just over the District Line in Virginia, 2) the restaurant was a concession and the policies were not established by the Commerce Department.

The validity of Wallace's reasons was quickly destroyed when Secretary of War Stimson ordered a non-discrimination policy in the cafeterias in the War Department's Pentagon Building.
The cafeterias there were also run on a concession basis, and the Pentagon
Building is located in Virginia.

When Wallace returned to Washington in mid-June 1947 to make an open-air
speech attacking the Administration's foreign policy, a crisis was precipitated by
the Thomas Committee, which in effect gave public warning that Committee action
would be on hand to see what Government employees showed up at the Wallace meeting.

In the face of the hysteria created by the Thomas group's absurd investigation
Secretary of Commerce Harriman urged his employees to attend the rally so
they could hear the other side of the question.

Harriman did not publicly advise his employees to attend but word of his
action reached Wallace who wrote the Secretary of Commerce:

"This is still another and you are doing your part to keep it
nationalized and definitely a most eminently an impulse trouble."

Despite this, Wallace has demanded the President drop Harriman from the Cabinet
as proof that the President really means what he says when he speaks of civil
liberties.

One widely reported incident that took place during Wallace's career as Vice-
President has persistently plagued him during the current campaign.

A Negro sharecropper from Virginia, Odell Waller, was to be executed for murder
despite a campaign for his acquittal. Twenty-four hours before the scheduled exe-
cution a delegation of outstanding Negro and white leaders called on Wallace, then
Vice-President, to enlist his last-minute aid. After promising to meet them in his
office, Wallace dashed for three hours. As they were leaving, they caught sight of
Wallace leaving his office, embarrassed, he eloped in the other direction. Purs-
uing him was Henry Louis Johnson, the distinguished Negro leader, called, "Mr.
Wallace, this is a great tragedy, we must talk to you." Wallace, in flight, spoke
ever his shoulder, "There's nothing I can do" and disappeared. A number of wit-
nesses were on hand.
Since this story in various versions has spread through the Negro organizations and communities Wallace was queried about it at a recent press conference in Minneapolis by a Negro reporter. Wallace denied that the incident was true and claimed that Mrs. Bethune would verify this.

Wallace and C. J. Baldwin did visit Mrs. Bethune and asked her for a letter denying the occurrence. Mrs. Bethune declined to give it and together with other prominent non-Communist Negro leaders is conspicuously absent from the lists of Wallace supporters.

The manipulations of Negro Communists in behalf of Wallace have been a consistent source of embarrassment to him.

A week after he announced his candidacy, a column appeared in the PUBLIC'S VOICE, a leading Harlem paper, signed by the singer Lena Horne, endorsing Wallace. A few hours later her press agent released a statement saying the column had appeared without the authority of Miss Horne and she was withdrawing her name in the columns of that paper.

On April 8, Dr. Max Yergan, Executive Director of the Council of African Affairs, charged that Communist members of the Council were attempting to divert its educational efforts into support of Wallace.

Yergan is former president of the National Negro Congress, and was its chief spokesman against the defense program in 1940 and 1941. Yergan left the Congress in October of 1949 however, because he said, "the communists sought to sabotage decisions of the Board."

Yergan said his trouble over Wallace started when a faction of the African Council led by Foul Robinson and Doris Wilder (member of the National Committee of the Communist Party) sought to use a Council publication to "give the impression that the Council is supporting the Wallace campaign."
In explaining his position, Yergun said:

"I will not support Wallace because I think his candidacy will do a disservice to the Negro. It breaks up Negro unity."

He said the Negro Council Board had split wide open on the issue. Opposing Wallace, Yergun listed Hope, Adam Clayton Powell, Municipal Judge Robert Delany, Dr. Alain Locke, John Harmon, Mrs. Mary Roland Bethune, and Dr. Manning Tobin.

He revealed publicly that Wallace supporters include Paul Robeson, Deode Wilkerson, orchestra conductor Dean Dixon, Dr. Gene Weltfish, W. E. B. DuBois, Research Director of the NAACP, Charles Collins and Ferdinand Smith and Irving Potash (both of the latter prominent Communists.)
There is no record of any message from Henry Wallace wishing success to the Togliatti-Quadri Democratic Front in the Italian elections. He could well have to his supporters in the left-wing CIO Food and Tobacco Workers, Fur Workers, and National Maritime Union. Any cable from Wallace would be superfluous.

Wallace instead exhorted his followers to start a letter campaign to the State Department "to get on the side of the people."

He characterized the Togliatti-Quadri CF Italy forces as a "combination whose program would bring about long overdue social and political reforms." (NEW REPUBLIC, April 5, 1947)

"Italy must be allowed to gut through...fundamental reforms....", he said in New York March 31, 1947.

Wallace accused present U. S. foreign policy of "brewing civil war" for Italy, and said "private interests....use every means they can to protect their profits.... They are equally eager to protect their profits abroad."

The Communist organ in Rome UNITA, for obvious reasons, reprinted the complete text of the article Wallace wrote for the NEW REPUBLIC of April 5, 1947 titled "Buying Foreign Elections." under his by-line.

On April 6, a spokesman for Henry A. Wallace said that:

* UNITA had interpolated sentences into the Wallace article, entirely changing its sense.
* Wallace was forced to write Italy's foreign minister asking retraction of the article as printed in UNITA.
* Wallace did not know how his article became available to UNITA.

The Wallace spokesman pointed to only one interpolated sentence in the UNITA version:

"The American people condemn the intimidations of Truman."
Wallace said as much in his New York speech on March 31, if not in the columns of the New Republic.

The other paragraph which the Wallace spokesman pointed out as having been changed, is the following:

NEW REPUBLIC VERSION

"The outcome of the Italian elections could, it is clear, be made the excuse for putting troops into Italy, and eventually papalism on a basis which can by repercussions stages generate a hot war."

UNITA VERSION

"The outcome of the Italian elections could— it is clear—be used as an excuse for the sending of troops to Italy and even to papalism; which sooner or later, will inevitably lead to war."

Allowing for translator's errors, the change of can to will is certainly a slight one on which to base the contention that it 'entirely changed the sense of the article.'

As for the contention that Wallace did not know how his article was available to UNITA, a spokesman for Overseas News Agency, explained that GEA had an arrangement to wire Wallace's New Republic article to Rome.

UNITA published a brief notice April 5, quoting GEA on the point that while the article was not written expressly for UNITA, GEA had distribution rights in Italy.

* * *

When the Communists lost overwhelmingly in Italy, Wallace continued:

"We shall get full credit or blame for the Italian economic situation in the future abased...to date the money spent by American taxpayers in Italy has only purchased new concessions for international cartels."
"FRIEND OF LABOR"

Wallace's unassailed reputation as "friend of labor" is demonstrated by an apocryphal story told about the Democratic convention in 1944. At one point in the proceedings, when CIU officials and delegates were in the forefront of the Wallace-for-Vice-President movement, CIU President Philip Murray is reported to have slowed down for a minute and said to an aide, "By the way, what did this guy say for us?

It was a good question. And a diligent search of the record still leaves Mr. Murray's question unanswered.

As a Cabinet member and subsequently as a candidate, Wallace reaped the political benefits of historic New Deal labor measures. But his personal role in the major and minor battles to establish labor's rights is somewhat obscure.

As Secretary of Agriculture, when his major dealings were with one union — Farm Labor Union (FLU) (then the Southern Tenant Farmers Union) Wallace seems to have left some deep sore.

The FARM LABOR NEWS, official organ of this union, recently printed an article outlining the union's experience with Secretary of Agriculture Wallace in 1935.

Recalling that southern sharecroppers heard a Roosevelt speech about the "forgotten man" and thinking he meant them, their union raised funds to send a delegation to ask Wallace to enforce Section 9 of the AAA. This section said that landlords should keep the tenants on their land and allow them to use a portion of the government-subsidized acres for raising food for their families and livestock.

"The Union had evidence that the landlords did not intend to carry out that part of the government contract nor divide any share of the government subsidy," reports the FARM LABOR NEWS.

After some delay, a similarly "embarrassed" Wallace faced the delegation, and an investigation ensued. It was climax in the famous controversy in which
Wallace fired Jerome Frank, Gardner Jackson, Leo Pressman and other associates who stood firmly with the sharecroppers instead of the landlords. (Those who were ousted with Pressman recall that he expressed his determination that "to get Wallace,"
he has recently resigned as General Counsel of the CIO to become a key figure in the
Wallace-for-President campaign.)

The Farm Labor Union argues that Wallace's action meant that big planters
using government money received for cutting down cotton acreage...bought tractors
and hundreds of thousands of sharecroppers were evicted from the land, or as some
expressed it, "We were AAA'd out of house and home."15

"Now Henry Wallace is running for President. We predict that
there will be few people on the farm or in the cotton South who
will vote for him.”

In the December 30, 1946 issue of the NEW REPUBLIC Henry Wallace wrote an
article called "WHEN WE THINK OF LABOR".

"My object at all times will be to find a legitimate basis for a sound and end-
during industrial peace."16

But a careful reading of the article leaves the Wallace ideas on "industrial
peace" as startling and naive as his current ideas on "peace" between nations.

He writes:

"Because of the public temper, it seems to me that the practice of
industrial organization of labor and industry to do everything possible to avoid strikes
in 1947."

"If there is to be legislation," he continued, "it would suggest first, a carefully
worked-out program for fact-finding around a mechanism for voluntary arbitration; and then a labor
court operation under the supervision of the President's Economic
Advisory Council and dealing only with those disputes in key
industries which it is felt were of supreme interest to the
general welfare."

"If a strike takes place in one of the key industries which are essential to the conduct of life of the
nation, the industry should be taken over and operated by the
government until a settlement can be reached..."
If experience proves, by repeated strikes in such an industry, that the welfare of the whole country is damaged to an unbearable degree by continued private ownership and operation, I feel we must consider public ownership and operation. In such a case the workers in that industry would, like other federal employees, give up the right to the ultimate resort to the weapon of force, in the form of a strike.

Thus Wallace advanced a scheme for settlement of industrial disputes with government sanction as the final act, and the proposition that workers in government-operated industries ought not to strike. To be sure, Wallace made that any such action be "truly representative of the people." This innovation is not unfamiliar. Sponsors of the Buff-Hartley Bill claimed that they acted in the interest of all the people.

David T. Basin, a NEW REPUBLIC and RATION contributor, writing in COMMENTARY in April 1947 says this of Wallace's labor program:

"No one became alarmed, quite properly, at his notion of a 'legitimate' peace — since the right to strike against the state is the only single basic issue of freedom confronting the American people today. That the present notion of the liberals should have exhibited such depths of misunderstanding and of the reform state is significant beyond measure."

It is curious that Wallace, a recent convert to nationalization (see section of "Double Talk On Britain") advocates that workers in nationalized industries must not strike. Carried to its ultimate conclusion, the Wallace theory would deprive workers under a socialized government (such as Great Britain) of their fundamental rights.
Henry Wallace has claimed that his presidential campaign would be financed by nickels and dimes and dollars from the "little people" of America. In a matter of fact, during the first two months of 1948, there were more big contributors (over $1,000) to the Wallace campaign than to the Republican and Democratic Parties combined.

Out of $204,604 collected by the SWP in this 60-day period, only 89 big contributors were over $1,000 and the largest was $4,600.

Out of the $215,633 collected by the Democratic seven contributors were over $1,000 and the largest was $5,000.

But, out of $897,078 collected for Wallace (both by the National Wallace for President Committee and the Progressive Citizens of America) $46,500 came from 88 large contributors of over $1,000 or more. Four of the gifts were for $5,000—the largest amount allowable under the law—one was for $4,000 or one $2,000 and three for $2,000, two for $1,000 and the rest in $1,000 chunks. One of the top contributors of $5,000 came from a known Communist, Frederick Y. Field, once a contributing editor to the New Masses and a principal financial contributor to that magazine before it folded.

Here are the other contributors, as listed in statements filed with the Clerk of the U. S. House of Representatives:
Elise Baxter, Los Angeles, Calif.  $5,000
Barbara Klein, New York City  $5,000
Bernard L. Adams, New York City  $5,000
Robert Solo, New York City  $4,000
Terry Solo, New York City  $1,000
MRS. P. H. POLK, New York City  $2,000
Mrs. Arthur McConnell, Chicago, a co-chairman of the Wallace for President Committee  $2,000
Miles Shoreower, New York City  $2,000
Mrs. Luke Wilson, Helena, N.D., wife or mother of the PGA legislative representative  $2,000
Paul Fishman, New York City, a member of the Board of PGA, who participated in the draft-Wallace Board meeting December 13  $2,000
Dorothy Gardner, New York City  $1,000
Robert L. Solo, New York City  $1,000
H. T. Harburg, Broadway Lyricist  $1,000
Louise A. Bronstein, New York City  $1,000
Ralph E. Shifrin, New York City  $1,000
(All the above contributions were made through the Wallace for President Committee.)
The following were made to the Progressive Citizens of America.
Mrs. Wilson S. O'Neill, board member of the PGA who participated in the draft-Wallace December 13 Board meeting  $2,000
Anita Wilson, New York City  $2,000
Saul E. Schindler, Valparaiso, Indiana  $2,000
Dorothy Chisholm, New York City (see above)  $2,000
Theodore Shapiro, Brooklyn, New York  $2,000