HENRY A. WALLACE: Quixotic Crusade 1948

CHAPTER 1

New Currents Forming

New York casts 23 votes for Wallace, $69\frac{1}{2}$ votes for Truman, $\frac{1}{2}$ vote for Barkley.

Ohio casts 24½ votes for Wallace, 19½ votes for Truman.

Pennsylvania casts 46½ votes for Wallace, 23½ votes for Truman.

THE TIME—July, 1944. The place—Chicago. The occasion—the Democratic National Convention. This extract is a portion of the roll call of the states to select a running mate for Franklin D. Roosevelt in the fall campaign—a vice-presidential candidate destined by fate to become President of the United States. And with this vote there came to the surface the swirling currents that only four years later were to culminate in the organization of a third party—a new Progressive Party—the Wallace Progressive Party of 1948.

On this first ballot, the roll call noted above, Vice President Henry A. Wallace received 429½ votes and Senator Harry S. Truman 319½ votes, with the balance—some 428 votes—divided among fourteen favorite sons and local choices. Since 589 votes would have given him the requisite majority, Wallace had fallen short, by a margin of some 160 votes, of regaining the candidacy for Vice President at this strategic moment. On the second ballot, the band wagon of the bosses

began to roll, sweeping Truman to the nomination, thence election, and ultimately the White House.

What lay behind the scene just described? What significant undercurrents contributed to it? First, there was a growing rift in the Democratic Party organization apparent in the split votes of the major state delegations. Second, there were sections of the nation in which streams of third-party sentiment and tradition existed and were rising. Then there were the wellsprings of an ideological discontent that was to emerge in the midst of the Truman administration and completely divide the Democratic camp. It is our task to survey these various streams that were to flow into the third-party channel and to measure their velocity—to explore the ultimate diversion of others originally expected to swell the Wallace tide, thus emerging with a clear chart of the new currents forming the 1948 Progressive Party.

At the outset, what were the contending forces within the Democratic Party?

In the 1940 Democratic Convention, President Franklin D. Roosevelt had virtually dictated the selection of Henry A. Wallace, then Secretary of Agriculture, as his fellow candidate, threatening to refuse the third-term nomination for himself if his wishes were not met. The reluctant delegates had to accept as Roosevelt's running mate a man who was anathema to many, a "renegade Republican" to others, and an unwanted candidate to practically all.

By 1944, however, the situation was nearly reversed. Despite the majority popular support indicated in the polls and the political strength exhibited on the convention floor, Wallace received what amounted to a kiss of death from Roosevelt. Instead of giving to Wallace the strong support of 1940, or the clear-cut endorsement that would have sufficed in 1944, the President saw fit to send a letter to Senator Samuel D. Jackson, permanent chairman of the Chicago National Convention, in which he announced that he "would vote for

him [Wallace] personally if he were a delegate," but that he had "no desire to appear to dictate to the convention."

A few days later, with Wallace still in the thick of the fight for the nomination, despite this lukewarm endorsement, a second letter was sent by Roosevelt—this time to National Committee Chairman Robert Hannegan, who was also manager of the Truman forces—stating that either Truman or William O. Douglas would be an acceptable running mate. The original order of preference in the letter had been "Douglas or Truman," but the two names had been reversed prior to press release. The Presidential communication proved decisive. Although the personal appearance of Wallace on the convention floor, together with his speech seconding Roosevelt's nomination, created demonstrations that almost turned the tide, the opposition strategy of postponing the vice-presidential balloting overnight prevailed.

It proved impossible to hold together for a second ballot the jerry-built Wallace convention machine. Commitments were too weak to keep the delegates in line. So confident had he been of the President's support up to the time of the convention letter, the Vice President had not deemed necessary an organization for returning him to office. Indeed, he had even neglected to secure a floor manager. Wallace has observed that as late as the Friday before the convention, the President, seated at his desk after a cabinet meeting, had put his arm around Wallace and pulled his head down to whisper, "Henry, I hope it's going to be the same old team." Only after arriving in Chicago did some of the Wallace supporters make a last desperate attempt to fill the gap, prevailing upon the aging Pennsylvanian Senator Joseph Guffey to lead the last-ditch battle. But the power of the big city bosses, the professional politicians, and the Southern Conservatives—working behind the scenes—proved too

¹ Wallace has ascribed the change to Hannegan, but Raymond Moley has claimed it was done at Roosevelt's request.

much. The house of cards collapsed. Led by Mayor Ed Kelly of Chicago, Ed Flynn and Paul Fitzpatrick of New York, and Frank Hague of Jersey City, with an assist from the National Committee Chairman Hannegan, the opposition forces which had seemed hopelessly divided at first finally agreed on Harry S. Truman as an available candidate who would, in the words of Ed Flynn, "offend no one" and be "acceptable" to almost all the contending groups.

This decision, however, was not made until the Political Action Committee of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, under Sidney Hillman, had effectively vetoed "Assistant President" James F. Byrnes—first choice of the Southern Conservatives. In this action Hillman had been supported by Flynn's protests that Byrnes—convert from Catholicism to Protestantism during his youth—would lose the votes of his former coreligionists in the crucial state of New York. Moreover, Byrnes possessed little appeal to the numerous Negro voters, whose support the Democrats hoped to retain. The liberal Douglas, with his name relegated to second place in Roosevelt's letter, was never seriously in contention, since he was most acceptable to those groups preferring Wallace.

The excuse advanced that Wallace was sacrificed for fear of costing F.D.R. votes in November is not supported by polls taken at the time. Far from a people's choice in 1940, he had nearly a majority of the rank-and-file Democrats supporting him by March of 1944, and by June this following had swelled to 65 per cent according to the Gallup surveys. At best, his abandonment may have led both southerners and city bosses to a stronger support of him than would otherwise have been forthcoming.

The results were succinctly expressed in an editorial in the Manchester Guardian:

The party bosses, . . . the machines, and the conservatives of the South could not stand Mr. Wallace who in the

popular mind embodied the New Deal and racial equality. So they turned to the colorless Truman who has never upset anyone's prejudices.

Nor does it seem likely that the nomination of Wallace would have caused the Southern Conservatives to break completely with the administration or secede from the party. Unlike the situation four years later, the promise of victory and the magic of the Roosevelt name were insurance of at least nominal support.

For our purposes, however, the bitter floor fight over the Wallace nomination not only emphasized the basic division in the party but also made clear the specific cleavage of interests and ideologies—temporarily bridged by the personal appeal and magnetism, as well as the vote-getting ability, of the "Chief." On one side were the five principal groups of Wallace supporters: first, the old line New Dealers—Rex Tugwell, Ellis Arnall, Claude Pepper, Helen Gahagan Douglas, to mention a few; second, the CIO Political Action Committee group, as evidenced by the CIO's top leader, Sidney Hillman, and by Richard Frankensteen of the United Auto Workers, who singlehandedly had almost kept Michigan in line for Wallace; third, the Negro leaders who feared the Byrd-Byrnes drive and were at best lukewarm to Truman; fourth, a small group of professional politicians—particularly those with strong union constituencies, such as Senators Joseph Guffey of Pennsylvania and James Mead and Robert Wagner of New York; finally, the Communist fringe of the party—the fellow travelers and "daily workers," noisy though feeble, with their line of wartime "cooperation."

Against these Wallace supporters were arrayed three main groups: first, the big city machines and Conservative Northern Democrats, such as Flynn, Kelly, Hague, and Farley; second, the Southern Bourbons—remnants of a slow-dying southern conservatism—Byrd, Byrnes, Bankhead, and the

Virginia and South Carolina machines, among others; finally, the Anti-Wallace Liberals, more difficult to define but including those who desired to make haste more slowly. Counting in their ranks men like Justice William O. Douglas, Thomas Corcoran, Harold Ickes, Representative Estes Kefauver, and Senator Alben W. Barkley, as well as some of the Southern Liberals, this third group considered Wallace impractical and visionary.

Senator Truman's great virtue was that all groups could and would accept him, since Roosevelt would be the name on the ballot. Thus, the breach had been closed, at least on the surface, and the rather motley array of the Democratic Party closed ranks for the election battle with a common Republican enemy. As Arthur Krock so aptly put it in the New York Times, Henry A. Wallace had been "sacrificed to expediency."

Despite the convention rebuff, Wallace, with the opening of the fall campaign, began working actively for the Democratic ticket. Speculation began about the role he might play in a new Roosevelt administration. With the election issue still undecided, there came a rumor that he was to succeed the aging Cordell Hull as Secretary of State. In fact, this report gained such widespread circulation that the President saw fit to deny it publicly.

Following the election, word reached the press that, in return for his "sacrifice" at Chicago, the former Vice President had been offered his choice of Cabinet posts, with the sole exception of State, and that he had decided upon Commerce. Wallace himself has stated that, late in 1944, he had heard rumors of the impending retirement of Commerce Secretary Jesse Jones and that since he was not anxious to "push anyone out" of the Cabinet, he requested the Commerce post.

On January 22, 1945, President Roosevelt submitted the name of Henry A. Wallace to the Senate to succeed Jones in this position. After a bitter battle on Capitol Hill, in the

course of which the post was stripped of many of its powers, including that of control over Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds, the appointment was finally confirmed. Wallace, after a four-year interval as Vice President of the United States, resumed his place at the head of an executive department.

As Secretary of Commerce, Wallace weathered the advent of Harry S. Truman to the Presidency in April of 1945 and, in contrast to his usual accompaniment of controversy, settled down into relative obscurity for nearly a year. However, during this period significant changes took place within the ornate walls of the Commerce Building. A strong friend of small business was now in power. Expansion of technical and other assistance for small firms from \$300,000 to \$4,500,000 per year was initiated.

In addition to performing his administrative duties, Wallace found time to oppose strenuously Republican attempts to undermine the reciprocal trade agreements in favor of higher protective tariffs. Citing the unemployment of the 1930's as an example of the ill effects caused in part at least by previous tariff policy, he argued that there could be no stability of employment without continued export-import agreements of the Cordell Hull pattern. While such views intensified the enmity of certain business groups, they seem to have left the general public apathetic.

Finally, to culminate the period of calm before the storm, Wallace's postwar doctrine of socio-economic planning emerged in book form as 60 Million Jobs. But, with rapid reconversion and business boom making this figure reality in short order, the author was spared much of the customary attack on his "impossible dreaming."

This discussion summarizes the situation of the Democratic Party in late 1945. The rifts revealed at the Chicago Convention the previous year had indicated the deep and basic divisions within the party. But those had been healed

over—at least on the surface. Liberal Left and Conservative Right had once more been reconciled. Viewed from Washington, any possibility of a third-party movement seemed remote indeed.

But what of the earlier background of Henry Wallace, this man of peace now standing on the verge of the most fateful decision in his whole career? What had been his governmental experience? What was his popular role?

Henry Agard Wallace had not been the first of his family to head the sprawling agencies of our largest peacetime instrument of government—the Department of Agriculture. His father, lifetime Republican Henry C. Wallace, had filled this same post during the 1920's in the Cabinet of Warren G. Harding. But along with so many other midwestern Republicans, the son had found long-standing political adherence challenged by the farm problems of the twenties and thirties and the failure of the GOP to move far enough or fast enough. He had become a Democrat, a public supporter of Franklin Roosevelt in the pages of the family journal, Wallace's Farmer, and had gone on to become one of Roosevelt's first Cabinet appointees.

Throughout his many years in public service—first as Secretary of Agriculture, then as Vice President—Wallace had found himself the target of unprecedented abuse and the object of unrestrained praise, with the former clearly predominating in the pages of the press. During the period of the New Deal and the Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Wallace had become much more than just another Cabinet politician. He had become a symbol for those Americans conscious that in the midst of the plenty, the means of production, and the know-how—in the midst of all these riches—one third of their nation was still ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed. Liberal groups, labor groups, and groups of the

common people had rallied to the Wallace call "for a better world right now." Despite the unending press campaign of vituperation waged against him as a "visionary," a "radical," a "mystic," and an "idealist," Wallace had remained unswerving in his devotion to the common man. As he remarked cheerfully on one occasion, "The people who are fighting against me know that they are not fighting a starry-eyed liberal or mystic. If they really thought that, they wouldn't be worried."

Confident of the rightness of his position, Wallace had pressed the fight throughout his public career and had seen his popularity with the American public climb slowly but steadily to the high point recorded prior to the 1944 convention. With the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1945, many of these persons came to feel that the true spiritual heir to the New Deal had been passed over. Pointing to the administration's handling of domestic and foreign affairs, those close to the scene concluded that Henry A. Wallace, rather than Harry S. Truman, represented the legitimate line of descent for the policies of the late President.

This description represents the man and the scene in Washington in late 1945. Although the crusader may have been mentally testing his armor, he was scarcely prepared for embarkation, nor was there yet any indication on that shore of the flood tide appropriate to the launching of a third-party venture.

What political attitudes were prevalent in other sections of the nation? What were some of the movements outside the Democratic Party that were to furnish tributary currents of varying size for the main stream of third-party sentiment in 1948? There were two regions of primary significance—the Middle West, traditional seat of third-party unrest, and New York, home of an existing balance-of-power third

party. The year 1946 witnessed important developments in both areas.

There was the final dissolution of the Progressive Party in Wisconsin. Although founded as late as 1934, its roots went much deeper, even beyond 1912 and the Teddy Roosevelt movement. Through all these years it had been linked to the name of La Follette—first old "Fighting Bob," standard-bearer in the presidential race of 1924, and later his two sons, "Young Bob," who replaced his father as Senator, and Phillip, who became Governor of the state.

The party had built up a substantial following for itself and for its ideas of governmental reform, becoming, indeed, one of the state's two major parties. By 1944, however, it had fallen to third place at the polls, receiving only 5 per cent of the popular vote. And in 1946 it seemed that even the magic of the La Follette name would be insufficient to re-elect Young Bob to the Senate on its slate. Practical politics dictated a merger with one of the major parties.

Secretary of Commerce Wallace addressed a personal letter to the Senator, urging that the Progressives "with their great tradition of liberal action come home to the party of Roosevelt, rather than return to the party of Hoover." But, impelled by the desire to see La Follette re-elected, in state convention the party overcame the protests of a minority that wished to remain independent and decided to rejoin a reluctant GOP.

Labor groups within the party, however, had battled for acceptance of the Wallace invitation. Defeated, they withdrew from the Progressive-Republican coalition and entered their candidates in the Democratic primary. The defection proved fatal for La Follette in his Republican primary race, for the Conservative wing was busy engineering his replacement with a state circuit judge, Joseph R. McCarthy, distinguished chiefly by his youth (the youngest person ever

elected to the state's circuit court), his political brashness, and his wartime service as a marine, rather than by his judicial competence or behavior (he had been censured by the state bar association for unethical practices). The loss of the labor votes—particularly in Milwaukee County—that had previously given Robert M. La Follette his margin of victory cost him the primary and his seat in the Senate.

For the first time in years, no member of the La Follette family held a high post in the Wisconsin government. But even more important, leaders who had crusaded for the Progressive banners, voters with a long tradition of independence, now felt that they had no place to go. Seemingly, there was fertile soil for a new third party in the state of Wisconsin, and the state convention had revealed substantial Wallace support—particularly among younger segments of the old Progressive Party.

At about the same time there came significant rumblings from the neighboring state of Minnesota, where, according to Malcolm Moos and E. W. Kenworthy, "Greenbackism and Populism and Bryanism are still slogans that awaken memories, and where 'Wall Street' and 'malefactors of great wealth' make the eyes see red and the blood pound in the veins."

In Minnesota, a Farmer-Labor Party had grown in the years following World War I from the merger of urban labor sentiment represented by the Socialist Party and rural unrest stemming from the Nonpartisan League. For two decades it had been highly important in state politics, but with the advent of a progressive Republican organization under Harold Stassen, it had gone into decline. A deathbed wedding with the Democratic Party had been arranged in 1942, but now this uneasy alliance showed signs of splitting. As in Wisconsin, there had been many persons—including former Governor Elmer Benson—who had never been completely

reconciled to operating within the confines of a major party. And Benson's sympathy with the Wallace movement was clearly emerging.

Further indications of a right-left split in the Democratic Farmer-Labor alignment were present. In its traditional stronghold, the Iron Range, the DFL candidate for Congress was the pro-Wallace John Blatnik. Within the state organization, power seemed to rest with the malcontents. They promised sturdy roots for the grafting of a new nation-wide third party. Only one caution was in order—the Moos-Kenworthy warning that "despite the agrarian radicalism of Minnesota farmers, they want no truck with communism, and have an abiding fear and distrust of Russia."

Turning from agricultural to industrial America, the year 1946 marked significant developments in New York State. Evidence of growing support for a third-party movement can be traced to two parties there—the American Labor Party and the Communist Party—both centered in the New York City area.

The American Labor Party, a product of the 1930's, had already achieved a balance-of-power position for the entire state on the basis of its strength in the metropolitan New York City area. Despite the fact that it had already been rent by one anti-Communist fission—the departure of the Liberal Party group headed by David Dubinsky and the powerful International Ladies' Garment Workers Union—it had survived, and even thrived. Although this group had become the second party in only a small number of New York City districts, it possessed a solid regularly-voting core of some 350,000 to 400,000—a turnout large enough to spell the difference between victory and defeat for the Democratic candidates that the party tended to support.

The American Labor Party, after a running battle between left and right wings for many years, appeared to have stabilized itself in 1946 under the chairmanship of Representa-

tive Vito Marcantonio ("Marc"). A protégé of Fiorello H. La Guardia, Marcantonio had at various times been the congressional nominee of both major parties, as well as of the American Labor Party. He had also earned for himself the title of "Communist party-line follower" by such tactics as his rapid shift from anti- to pro-interventionist with the invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Marc's leadership was based on a very solid foundation of precinct- and ward-level organization that had gained him the respect, if not the admiration, of Tammany and GOP workers in his district.

Having established his control over the state American Labor Party machine, Marcantonio left little doubt about his position on forcing a new third party, or the number of votes he expected to be able to deliver in New York. Following Wallace's dismissal from the Cabinet, he was to tell a Transport Workers Union Convention:

This crisis . . . marks the beginning of the disintegration of the two American parties. I don't know which will go, but the historic condition is present for the creation of a new party resolving the question of peace and progress on the side of the people.

500,000 votes on Row C, the American Labor Party line, will be the forerunner of leadership given to the great movement for a new political party in America.²

In much the same vein, he repeated this call to a meeting of the American Youth for Democracy, saying, "We must build now for the establishment of a new political party in the United States. We must move now and not when it is too late." It should be noted, however, that not all of the American Labor Party membership was in accord with these sentiments. Jacob Potofsky of the Amalgamated Clothing

² New York Times, September 27, 1946.

Workers Union consistently opposed tying the party to a national Wallace third party and eventually walked out when the decision was made to do so.

Nor had the Communist Party yet determined its new course of action. During the war years, under the leadership of Earl Browder, the Communist Party line had been one of cooperation with the Democratic Party. It had attempted to employ infiltration tactics, the boring-from-within technique, as evidenced at the 1944 Convention.

Finding this tactic ineffective, the Communist Party, in late 1945, suddenly changed its line and replaced Browder as chairman with William Z. Foster. This emergency convention action to adopt the "popular front" approach successfully employed in Europe was reportedly in response to the international policy directives of Jacques Duclos from abroad.

Later evidence suggests that the Communists based their strategy upon the hope of developing a balance-of-power party, in which they would be able, by virtue of bloc cohesiveness, to exercise disproportionate power.

Many other ideas have been advanced concerning their reasons for supporting the Wallace party. It was suggested, particularly in labor circles, that they desired to split the Democrats to insure the election of a reactionary Republican President, thus making inevitable their predicted "capitalistic depression" and gaining them converts faster than any device of their own making. Another possibility was that the Communists desired to force the Democrats so far to the right that all Liberals would then flock to a new major party, in which the Communists, by being in on the ground floor, would have an important role. Quite possibly they realized that their endorsement of Wallace would be the kiss of death for him and that, by tagging him with the Red label, they might effectively eliminate the moderate reform element so feared by them in European countries.

However, in view of their own writings, and in view of

their limited American political experience, it seems more reasonable to credit them with attempting to follow the observed pattern of New York State rather than with formulating any supercrafty strategic concepts.

As Robert Minor wrote later in the Daily Worker:

The central task of the Communist party . . . is to help forge the broadest people's anti-monopoly and peace coalition, in which the working class must play the leading role It is to curb the war-mongers and pro-fascists and break once and for all the reactionary two-party system of the monopolies.

. . . a correct picture of the New Party [is] as the beginning of a break up of "The Two-Party System." . . . One of the most dangerous mistakes we made [was] when we accepted the anti-Marxist theoretical proposition made by Browder that the political struggles of the country could be fought out within the two-party system.³

Regardless of the reasoning behind the decision, the Communist Party continued to be one of the strongest advocates of third-party activity for the 1948 campaign. They may have wavered in choosing their candidate, but never in planning their strategy.

Having thus surveyed some of the significant developments outside the Democratic Party and outside the Truman administration, let us now return to the Washington scene where, for our account, the most dramatic single incident since 1944 was being prepared. The central character was again the same—Henry A. Wallace.

The year 1946 marked the development of two broad areas

³ Robert Minor, "Lessons of Past Third Parties," Daily Worker (New York), August 2, 1948. Italics supplied.

of discontent with administration planning—discontent with the administration's shift from the policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt. First, there were signs of increased questioning of the altered policy toward the Soviet Union. Second, there was growing unrest with its changed handling of labor affairs at home. At first, it was the foreign policy opponents who favored continued action within the Democratic Party, while the disaffected labor segment began to demand third-party action.

Under newly appointed Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, former "Assistant President" and vice-presidential hopeful of 1944, there was a perceptible change in foreign outlook; the previous Roosevelt attitude that the United States and the U.S.S.R. could live together in peace despite their different political and economic systems was gradually replaced by a firm policy toward Russia.

Many groups in the nation viewed the worsening relations between the former allies with misgiving, especially as the United States initiated steps interpreted as by-passing the United Nations. There were pacifists, religious leaders, scientists, and old-time midwestern isolationists in this critical category, as well as the professional friends of Russia. All were spurred on by the threatened devastation of a third world war. Mankind, they agreed, possessed the means—atomic, chemical, and bacteriological—of exterminating itself now in any new conflict. Consequently, any course of action by the administration tending to increase tension and build up public acceptance of the inevitability of a future war with Russia was to be deplored. These dissenters viewed the Truman-Byrnes program as leading inevitably to hostilities.

On the other hand, the administration defended its course as the only road to peace. The Russians, they said, could be deterred from plans of world conquest only if the American government took a firm stand to contain communism.

Thus, a broad cleavage began to develop over foreign

policy, with an ever increasing tendency on the part of some to interpret all criticism of American conduct of foreign affairs as communism or following the party line. Thus Mississippi Representative John Rankin was one of the first to trot out the Red label for Wallace, while a number of his fellow southern Congressmen conspicuously absented themselves from a Jackson Day dinner at which the Secretary of Commerce was to speak. These incidents followed a series of speeches and press releases early in 1946, in which Wallace decried the talk of war with the U.S.S.R. and urged a foreign policy that would build the United Nations as the stepping stone to an eventual world federation.

Notwithstanding his increasingly critical attitude toward the Truman-Byrnes conduct of American foreign policy, there were, at this time, no signs of his splitting completely with the Democratic administration. In fact, on May 25, 1946, in a speech to the American Labor Party in New York City, Wallace stated his opposition to any third-party move. As he phrased it, "Because of the election laws in any states, it [a third party] would give a reactionary victory by dividing the votes of the progressives."

The fact that such a rebuff was necessary indicates that some new current of sentiment favorable to the creation of just such an organization was already stirring on the extreme left. However, most foreign policy critics, including Senator Claude Pepper of Florida, agreed with Wallace that the most promising course was to work within the framework of the Democratic Party.

There had been a shift to the right in the domestic policies of the administration. Labor dissatisfaction was growing, stoked most of all by President Truman's threat to draft the striking railroad workers. The President's veto of the Case bill, which would have restricted labor's right to strike, had been interpreted by many as an attempt to stay on the fence—a last-ditch effort to avert a complete withdrawal of

the labor segment of the Roosevelt coalition and the formation of a new third party. In addition, Truman was accused of responsibility for appointing to high office large numbers of men representing Wall Street, big business, and the military to replace the Roosevelt New Deal team.

Indications of the growing labor-liberal dissatisfaction were to be found in the statement of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, at this time allied with the CIO Political Action Committee. While placing its hopes for 1946 in the Democratic Party, the National Citizens Political Action Committee came out with a stinging statement that the party was in need of a rebirth. At about the same time David Dubinsky, speaking from both a labor (International Ladies' Garment Workers Union) and a third-party (liberal) viewpoint, called for a union of labor forces behind a new party. The boring-from-within technique of labor in major parties was inadequate, he said, since it would never create the necessary machinery for an organized labor party strong enough to run its own candidates for office on a national scale.

Thus by the summer of 1946 there were two main currents of unrest brewing under Harry S. Truman—one, which was critical of foreign policy, led by the Secretary of Commerce, who urged action within the Democratic Party; the second, critical of domestic policy, headed by labor leaders thinking in terms of a new and powerful labor party. Although scattered geographically, there was already a long-enduring undercurrent of third-party sentiment among groups as diverse ideologically as midwestern isolationists and Union Square Russophiles.