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We are attaching a copy of the 10,000-word analysis of the first three months of the Wallace campaign. The document is based on the most 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.
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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 added as Wallace impers or thumps his views in subsequent speeches.

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

As new sections are completed, or 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.

It is our continued effort 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 $1.50. Beyond that we cannot forecast the amount of supplements 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 subscriptions.
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HENRY A. WALLACE
THE FIRST THREE MONTHS

(This sample of the first three months of the Wallace campaign is presented by Joanne for purposes of interest. Please credit Joanne in using this interpretation and assembly of the Wallace record.)

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION
PROGRESSIVE CONFERENCE
1900 M Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.
(Instead of numbering the pages consecutively throughout, the pages within each section are numbered. This is to permit the insertion of supplementary material which will be issued periodically during the Wallace campaign and to facilitate separation of the handbook according to topics.)

INTRODUCTION

IT ALL GOES BACK TO PERSHING: A brief outline of the origins of the Third Party


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

WALLACE: CONSUMED-EVINRUDE...Third Party candidate: "man of integrity"...Wallace hails "that...he..."for his integrity as war II winner 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 ELABORATIONS: Third Party opposes liberal candidates in key elections.

WALLACE—CIVIL LIBERALISM...His own record as civil libertarian.

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

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

SONE OF GUBERN'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 him 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 upon a whirlwind campaign which carries him into remote areas, unfrequented by other national campaigners. By early April he had made over 25 major speeches since announcing his candidacy and had personally addressed more than 25,000 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 closely 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" them 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 ended such opposition a matter of formal CIO policy. Lee
Freeman, Murray's chief counsel in the CIO and Steelworkers left to work for
Wallace for President. John J. Met resigned his post as counsel to the Amalgamated
Clothing Workers to stand at Freeman's side when the Amalgamated refused to
support Wallace. Both Freeman and Met 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 these 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 realignments occurring in Wallace's
campaign record are cited here against the background of the formation of the
Third Party.
IT ALL GOES BACK
TO FRANK JACOBUS

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 decision of Mr. Browder in the summer of 1944. Jacques Durles, the French Communist leader who broke Browder and got the new line for the CPUSA, said in his manifest 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 1945, the CPUSA's official magazine)

In the same article which spelled the end of Browder's leadership of the CPUSA, Durles 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 S. Foster, the new CPUSA leader for having "called upon Wallace and others 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 mass roots political machinery and foundations for the new people's alignment and party which are new in the making..."
The report admitted regretfully that Henry Wallace, characterized as "bitter though confused," was "taking sharp issue with the trend toward a third party." (They doubtless had reference to such statements from Wallace 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 want to push you and me into the futility of a third party.")

The zeal of party underlings who sought to correct Wallace's statements and confusion on the Third Party issue may account for the Daily Worker's failure to recognize the "true" significance of Wallace's first Hudson Square Garden speech (Sept. 1946).

Bunyata 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, C.P.U.S.A., 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... (tug) were dissociated 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 Trotsky-Zinoviev policy and in the exact phrase the "last breach with Russia policy,""

The C.P. leadership certainly moved swiftly to correct this "unpalatable" mistake. Wallace's disavowal 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 L. Foster wrote in POLITICAL AFFAIRS:
"It is absolutely necessary to begin building the new mass
party now... conditions are ripe... the political situation
promotes 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 stand-
point... there must be a progressive Presidential candidate in
the field in 1948 without fail; if not on the Democratic ticket,
than surely on an independent ticket...."

Wallace's "backwardness" was slowly overcome.

In May of 1947 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 1946, became the phrase "by a new party if necessary." It
turned up in statements from the PDA in June 29 and later Oct. 9, 1947.

Meanwhile, Wallace made his next 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 efficiency, 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 equivocation 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 L. Foster and Raymond Lisle,
were the first... it was finally convinced when the Chancellor
run over as the Comms. became the second organized group to
demand the Wallace candidacy."

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

"As I followed the world Communist movement, I was confident from the time of the Comintern announcement that the Communists in America would now follow the Third Party line rigidly and that they would try to sell 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 with a fixed idea about the need for a Third Party, the gaffe hope must altogether have been that Truman would change, but that he would not change. Nothing that Truman could have done or done otherwise during the past year could have satisfied the PGA leaders. What I charge them with is not a nasty 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 embittered 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 "AWARE, 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 beginning to negotiate treaties", 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 some 'insanees' that all progressive change is 'Soviet inspired' he遏制 himself as a fighter for progress. By this very charge in the case of Czechoslovakia, the enemies of Taylor and Wallace try to trap them..."

"Nothing which is democratic and progressive can be anti-Soviet, of course...But to grant for a moment that Czechoslovakia's changes are under Soviet pressure has the effect of robbing such 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 basis of the Wallace movement."

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

* * *

On March 17 Wallace in a press conference finally accused Laurence 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 recklessnes in failing to inform himself that I departed from Czechoslovakia on November 30, 1947,...Nocked off passage in the SS America on February eleventh and consequently arrived in Cunard February 16 and did not arrive in Prague until February 19. The government crisis in Prague began on February 13 when the non-Communist ministers left the cabinet and thereafter did not participate in further cabinet meetings,...I did not converse with any member of the Czechoslovak government, Communist or non-Communist between November 30 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."
The same Mr. Wallace had on September 12, 1946 warned:

"We 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 Steikhardt 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 documented denials the Third Party candidate had this to add in public testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on March 20:

"I said that Ambassador Steikhardt was responsible. I do not know whether I put in the words, 'to some degree' but I should have put them in...He 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 First All Souls 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. Hankeys, I never did. As I afterwards discovered, he was a virtual prisoner, and unable to get rid of his guards. This guard consisted of four armed Communist militiamen. Concerning Hankeys'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 guards, Hankeys took the only opportunity open to him. He jumped from his bathroom window.

The circumstances surrounding Hankeys's suicide were not generally disputed by the press and the population of free nations.

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

On March 13 Joseph Stalthin wrote in the WORKER:

"Let them (American) researchers analyze 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 15 — four days after the DAILY WORKER handed down the "line" — Wallace declared:

"One can never tell. Maybe Winant had cancer, maybe Hankeys had cancer. Maybe Winant was unhappy about the state 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, Sen. Taft began a 9-day attack on HRB in the Senate.

The full text was in the press gallery when afternoon adjournment halted the first half of the indoctrinated senator's address. Before Taft rose in the Senate the following day, the newspapers carried the stories of Hankeys's death.

Taft 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 provided them generous help and large loans, but only on condition that they get rid of the
Commissar. Jan Hamryš says there was a plot on foot to kick
the Communists out and the Communists just kicked first. Before
the Czech incident Hamryš 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 press and
red-haters will excommunicate and anathematize him. In fact, your
old Jan will be lucky if the Senate Committee does not investiga-
te him.
DOUGLAS ISLE OF BRITAIN

On his return to Britain in the spring of 1949, Henry Wallace made a specta-
tacular about-face in his view of British foreign policy.

In his Madison Square Garden speech, September 1944, his violent denunciations
of Britain left doubts that he had ever heard that a Labour government had come to
power.

"To make Britain the key 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 for-
gotten as Wallace now in England turned on the U.S.: Reporting from London.

David Williams, AAM's representative stated in his London Letter:

"Mr. Wallace has been tireless in his praise of the British
experiment, and has thumbed American policies as hatefully
as Mr. Stalin could possibly desire."

In a speech in Manchester, England, Wallace said:

"As an 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 itself.

"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 contradic-
tions by claiming he had been misquoted. His references to American imperial-
ism, he said in Washington at a press conference, did not refer to government
policy but to a policy urged upon the government by James Burnham 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 reports drew an immediate rejoinder from Jennie Lee, British
Labour MP, wife of Cabinet Minister Aneurin Bevan, who has stated his political
future on the promise that there will be no delays in the drive to nationalize British
industry.

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

"This is a lie. Where does Wallace get this sort of story? I
am taking this off to write a note to the Committee talk-
ing with nationalization at stake. After coal, iron, electricity,
ing a steel. At the last Trade Union Conference a definite and
public understanding was given by the government that steel would
be nationalized this Parliament, which means, in terms of Par-
liamentary procedure, that a beginning will have to be made
next session.

"This Wallace statement shocks me. Maybe he has been misguided
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 EEY, published by the National Wallace for President Committee, he said:

"Nationalization of the steel industry was a key plank in the plat-
form of the British Labor party but it has been indefinitely post-
poned 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 foment the present war hysteria." In the interests of peace, Wallace insisted "we must remove the drive for profits which leads private interests to urge more armaments and warlike actions."
WALLACE: COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF

In his appearance before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Feb. 24, Wallace was asked what he would do if he were president and his Secretary of State and Defense reported to him that continued Soviet aggression constituted the main threat 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 would he have such men in his cabinet.

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

Wallace has repeatedly said that he "only knew of two or three U.S. Communists" 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 Committee "I'm not familiar with the Communist approach and am unable to discuss it."

Herbert Lehman, former Governor of New York and director general of UNESCO in addressing the New York State AIA convention declared that Wallace "is trifling with our country's security" in ignoring the nature of Communist policy.

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

William Hazen Hale, a former editor of the NEW YORKER writes in Harper's Magazine, March, 1949:

"We [Wallace] would not, he said, write anything critical of Soviet policy...because he didn't see how he himself could affect Soviet policy...criticism must stop at home."

In 1946, in conference with Robert H. Humphrey and other Democratic leaders in Minnesota on the problem of CP power in the Democratic Farm Labor Party, Wallace protested he could do nothing about it. He advised Humphrey to "try to get in touch
with Moscow and ask them to pass the word back to the party in Minnesota to lay off the DFL. 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 CP operations and the threat of Soviet aggression must, however, inevitably trouble some of Wallace's most staunch followers.

Olin Tevis, his campaign manager, has already shown signs of uneasiness. On April 14, in an address before the American Association of Newspaper Editors, Tevis admitted that even Wallace, if elected President, might be "unsuccessful" in convincing Russia of the nation's peaceful aims. He added:

"If there had to be a showdown, Henry Wallace could come unsuccessful but not as a victim 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 the McCarran Act.

As in one previous instance, Wallace made a conscious effort to sound more reasonable in his ad lib remarks than he was made to sound in the prepared statement 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 Goldin for his suggestions as to the proper size of the military establishment to protect the country in today's world, Wallace replied:

"I don't 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 not any,
of course a million men.

Under further questioning Wallace added that he thought the official military
manpower estimates are too big.

But Senator Baldwin quickly reminded him that Secretary Perret's own recom-
mandations were for an army of 250,000 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 GI -- which Perret 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 made 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 15 million veterans of
World War II who...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 these reserves right here."

Wallace replied:

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

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

Lewell Kellett 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 recur colls is that Wallace's current views represent a continuation of Franklin D. Roosevelt's policies and that everybody else has 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.

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

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

In "Up Day" February 26:

"Many of the leaders in ASA 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 Dr. Wallace. Some of them might be able to point out a number of concessions when Mr. Wallace was more on the conservative side than on the courageous, liberal side of certain questions."

In a special statement to the ASA 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, CIO:

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

The Communists, now supporting Wallace, FDR, Jr. said, "are the true American Commisars who loudly call FDR a war-singer."

"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 diabolical adventure!"
In a statement issued March 26, 1948, Jr., stated:

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

In Tacoma, Washington in March 1948, James Roosevelt, California Democratic
State Chairman added:

"Mr. Wallace and his backers claim to be the sole inheritors of and
believers in the policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt. By what right?
Look closely and you will find among these people names with strong
personal grudges, once Vice President Harry S. Truman and some
Republican propagandists. Most of them wouldn't know or support a Roose-
velt policy if they saw one.

"And some of them -- request -- none of them know what Franklin
Dulles Roosevelt's policies would be today."

In a special statement made for the Oregon AFL, April 7, Anna Roosevelt

Foster wrote:

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

"Personally, I greatly deplore such tactics. First of all, it
seems to me a real slap in the face of the people that they should
use the name of a man who is no longer here to voice his dis-
agreements or agreements 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 Socialistic form
of government in this country and the demise of our democracy.

"May Heaven help this Father stand on that particular issue
while he was alive -- that he was unswervingly opposed to Soc-
alism in this country, and had an abiding faith in the future
of our democracy."

Even Elliott Roosevelt, who shared the platform with Mr. Wallace in his Hudson
Square Garden appearance in September 1948, when asked by C. B. Waldin to support
the Third Party candidacy declined on March 26, 1948:

"...It has been indicated to me that the same individuals are run-
ing 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 1940 in his efforts to rescue and prepare this nation for
possible war..."
POLITICAL BROADCAST

In the early stages of his campaign, Henry Wallace repeatedly said that
President Truman's candidacy would either repel independent voters or create a fatal
appetite among the electorate. The President, he insisted, would make it difficult
if not impossible to elect progressive Congressmen. Giving the voters another
choice besides D-Dem and T-Dem, he indicated, improves the chances of pro-
gressive 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:

* Make the progressive case 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 72 hours after
Wallace declared his candidacy. It has already been carried out in California and
in Illinois.

Before Paul Douglas and Adlai Stevenson headed up on the Illinois Democratic
ticket (the former for the Senate and Stevenson for the governorship), a delegation
composed of D-Dem leaders and left-wing CIO union officials visited the Democratic
Party officials and warned that if the candidates were Professor Douglas and Stevenson,
they would expect a Third Party ticket in the field which might insure 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
unambiguously in entering the race.

Douglas will oppose Republican Senator C. Wayne Brooks, arch-reactorancy iso-
lateralist and favorite son of Col. McCormick's Chicago TRIBUNE.
In this context, where Douglas will have an uphill battle at best, the Progressive Party of Illinois has announced it will enter a third candidate because, as Salmon Garfield, a key Illinois Wallace supporter put it, Douglas is no longer a liberal, but a "warmonger" and a "red-hunter."

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 opposed), declared:

"We do not believe there is an issue in Illinois of the order 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 to the people of Illinois the program of Henry Wallace for our world, peace and abundance."

At the PWA 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 FDR had done. When informed that FDR 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-IOE 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. Then asked whether he would support Senator Brooks (who was against the Marshall Plan and IOE) Wallace said he was "unfamiliar" with Brooks' record. (As recently as April 5 in Muncieville, 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 president of the Senate for four years while Senator Brooks fought every defense measure, lend-lease, etc., and was a leading isolationist opponent of F.D.R.'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 on Rep.栋kin 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 NRA standards of 1947, he will be opposed because he was a supporter of the Marshall Plan.

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

In 1948 Henry Wallace has not publicly protested the action of the Tilden Party in California, which has named both members of Congress for defeat by filling third party candidates in their districts.

On March 16, Representatives Holifield and Douglas received a telegram from the Wallace forces in their districts urging them to appear for questioning or face opposition by a third party candidate. Both of them have unblemished liberal records, however, in the House, both opponents of 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 U.S. and defied the pressure to appear for questioning. Jacob Saren, a leader of the
Wallace forces in California, has filed as a Third Party candidate against Hollifield 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 20,000 in Hollifield'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 AIP to oppose any Congressman from New York who voted for the draft, NDE, 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 political figure battling the forces of prejudice and hate.

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

The dismissal of an Evanston college professor for heading a Wallace committee; the physical assault on J. B. Coltrin; 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, 1936:

"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 separated audiences. Five or six years prior to that time he had signed an agreement before convocation of the NAACP, the organization which has fought segregation 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 House Committee which in effect gave public warning that Committee action could be on the way to see what Government officials showed up at the Wallace meeting.

In the face of the hysteria created by the House group’s absurd indictment Secretary of Commerce Averell 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 a crisis and you are doing your part to help it get over now and especially a most important job which troubles me!"

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 tenure as Vice-President has persistedently 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 execution 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 headed in the other direction. Pursuing him was Mr. Robert Ruthe, the distinguished Negro leader, called, "Mr. Wallace, this is a great tragedy, we must talk to you." Wallace, in flight, spoke over his shoulder, "There’s nothing I can do" and disappeared. A number of witnesses were on hand.
Since this story in various versions has spread through the Negro organiza-
tions and committees Wallace was asked 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. L. R.ansom 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 con-
stant source of embarrassment to him.

A week after he announced his candidacy, a column appeared in the PEOPLE'S
VOICE, a leading Harlem newspaper, 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 use of 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 1947, 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 Paul Robeson and Duke Ellington (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, Yergen 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 70-member Council Board had split wide open on the issue. Opposing Wallace, Yergen listed Roy, Adam Clayton Powell, Municipal Judge Robert Delany, Alain Locke, John Hammond, Mrs. Mary Robinson Bethune, and Dr. Clancy Tobin.

He revealed publicly that Wallace supporters include Paul Robeson, Duke Ellington, orchestra conductor Jess Dixon, Dr. Gene Weltfish, J. W. D. Roberts, 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 meeting between Henry Wallace and the Italian Socialist Democratic Front in the Italian elections. He could well have to his supporters in the left-wing CIO Road and Sales and Workers, Farm Workers, and National Maritime Union. Any appeal 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 Tagliavini-Sendzi of Italy forces as a "combination whose program would bring about large-scale social and political reforms." (NEW REPUBLIC, April 5, 1947)

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

Wallace accused present U. S. foreign policy of "fomenting civil war" for Italy, and said "private interests...do everything the power 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 on 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 denying authorship of the article as printed in UNITA.
- Wallace did not know how his article became available to UNITA.

The Wallace spokesperson 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 Halvarson in a basis which can by perpetually 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 Napoleon, which sooner or later, will inevitably lead to war."

Allowing for translator's errors, the change of "may" 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 CNA had an arrangement to wire Wallace's NEW REPUBLIC article to Rome.

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

* * *

When the Commintern lost overwhelmingly in Italy, Wallace corrected:

"We shall get full credit or blame for the Italian economic situation in the months ahead... to date the money spent by American taxpayers in Italy has only purchased new concessions for international cartels."
Wallace's unearned reputation as "friend of labor" is demonstrated by an apodictical story told about the Democratic convention in 1944. At one point in the proceedings, when CIO officials and delegates were in the forefront of the Wallace-for-Vice President boom, CIO 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 (ALF) (then the Southern Tenant Farmers Union) Wallace seems to have left some deep scars.

The Farm Labor News, official organ of this union, recently printed an article outlining the union's experience with Secretary of Agriculture Wallace in 1938.

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 live beyond the provisions of government-owned credit for raising food for their families and livestock.

"The Union had evidence that the landlord did not intend to carry out that part of the government contract nor divide any share of the government subsidy," the report states.

The Farm Labor News reported:

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 Jackman, Lee 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 CPU to become a key figure in the Wallace-for-President campaign.

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

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

In the December 30, 1946 issue of the NEW REPUBLIC Henry Wallace wrote an article called "WHERE WE STAND ON LABOR."

"My object in all time will be to find a legitimate basis for a sound and enduring industrial peace."

But a careful reading of the article shows the Wallace idea of "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 the part of wisdom for labor and industry to do everything possible to avoid serious strikes in 1947."

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

"If a strike takes place in one of the little handful of industries which are essential to the continued 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 unendurable 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 unions as the final act, and the proposition that workers in government-operated industries ought not to strike. To be sure, Wallace asks that any such action be "truly representative of the people." This innovation is not unusual. Sponsors of the Buff-Hartley bill claimed that they acted in the interest of all the people.

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

"He became alarmed, quite properly, at his notion of a 'legiti-
mate' peace — since the right to strike against the state is
the only truly basic issue of freedom contained in American
principles today. That the present leaders of the liberals should
have exhibited such depths of misunderstanding 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.
SOME OF THE "LIES"

Henry Wallace has claimed that his presidential campaign would be financed
by nickels and dimes and dollars from the "little people" of America. As 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 $204,486 collected by the GOP in this 60-day period, only 1146 con-
tributors were over $1,000 and the largest was $4,500.

Out of the $15,682 collected by the Democrats, 774 contributors were over
$1,000 and the largest was $6,000.

But, out of $297,078 collected for Wallace (both by the National Wallace for
President Committee and the Progressive Citizens of America) $46,500 came from
221 large contributors of $1,000 or more. Four of the gifts were over $5,000; the
largest amount allowable under the law — one was for $4,000 and one $3,000 and
three for $2,000, two for $1,000 and the rest in $1,000 chunks. One of the top
contributors of $4,000 came from a known Communist, Frederick W. Field, once a
contributing editor to the NEW masses and a principle 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.
Ella Dexter, Los Angeles, Calif.  $10,000
Barbara Klein, New York City  $10,000
Bernard L. Adams, New York City  $10,000
Robert Delos, New York City  $4,000
Yone Soh, New York City  $1,000
Mrs. Frederick Maclean, New York City  $25,000
Mrs. Anton M. O'Connor, Chicago, a special chairman of the Wallace for President Committee  $25,000
Miles Sherron, New York City  $25,000
Mrs. John Wilson, Bethesda, Md., wife or mother of the FCA legislative representative  $25,000
Paul Fishman, New York City, a member of the Board of FCA who participated in the draft-Wallace board meeting December 10  $25,000
Dorothy Gans, New York City  $1,000
Robert L. Solol, New York City  $1,000
H. T. Harburg, Broadway lyricist  $1,000
Louise A. Feinstein, New York City  $1,000
Ralph R. Shilton, 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. Elmer S. Stowell, board member of the FCA who participated in the draft-Wallace December 10 board meeting  $5,000

Ada Wilson, New York City  $1,000
Saul H. Sedlaczek, Valparaiso, Indiana  $1,000
Dorothy Harburg, New York City (same above)  $1,000
Theodore Shapiro, Brooklyn, New York  $1,000