

Fisher, George H.

ADP1778

**“LET’S KICK
OUT BOTH
PARTIES!”**

by

George H. Fisher

Price \$1.00

A donkey that had spent most of its life walking in a circle, hitched to a small rotary grist mill, was finally given his freedom and mercifully turned out upon a fresh, green pasture. Due to his prolonged enslavement, however, he failed to grasp the meaning of his newly-acquired liberty and he merely continued to walk round and round in circles.

For a hundred years we American voters were literally tied to boss-controlled political machines. But during the past few decades we have gradually forged the weapons for our political emancipation! Let us no longer plod along, like the donkey, in circular political ruts—as if these valuable new tools had never been developed!

**“LET’S KICK
OUT BOTH
PARTIES!”**

by

GEORGE H. FISHER

Copyright 1954

NATIONAL NON-PARTISAN LEAGUE

(Formerly “California Committee to Save Cross-Filing”)

Box 4995

Los Angeles 1

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. America's Political Quagmire	5
II. "The Mute, Inarticulate Masses"	12
III. Our Totem-Pole Civilization	19
IV. "All We Want Is The Facts, Ma'am!"	26
V. California In Her Accustomed Role	34
VI. Television—Our Modern Aladdin's Lamp	39
VII. The Founding Fathers' Prophecy Comes True	44
VIII. "Sugar And Spice, And Everything Nice!"	51
IX. "What Shall We Substitute For The Parties?"	71
X. Let's Get To Work!	87

PREFACE

A couple of passengers were canvassing the smoking-car, trying to scare up some players for a few hands of poker. One old gentleman they approached happened to be pre-occupied with his newspaper.

He was not the type to be abrupt with anyone, however, so he politely laid down his paper, cleared his throat with a muffled grunt, carefully dusted the ash from his cigar, plucked his horn-rimmed spectacles from his nose and peered benignly up at the intruders with the gracious air of one who is about to decline the nomination for Governor.

"No, gentlemen," he apologized, in a patronizing tone. "I'm sorry I can't join you. In fact there are three reasons why I can't. In the first place I haven't any money, and—"

"That's enough, Mister," broke in his visitor, walking away,—“the other two reasons aren't important!"

* * * *

Its like that with our America. Her political problems are numerous, variegated and complex. But we may as well forget all the rest if we cannot solve the primary one—that of restoring interest and confidence in the ballot! For in order to steer a true course a democracy must first be motivated by the wisdom of many minds, just as a ship must have driving power before its rudder can become effective.



Politically, our ship is listing badly, and taking water. If we hope to keep afloat we must be ready when the time comes to throw overboard the dead weight of many of our obsolete political belongings.

To match the fierce tempo of our jet-propelled age Nature herself seems to be speeding up our thinking in this respect. As we note in Chapter Two she is already forcing us to jettison much of the mental excess baggage we have dragged along with us from our nation's political adolescence.

But, as Maeterlinck says in *Our Social Duty*: "At every crossway on the road that leads to the future, each progressive spirit is opposed by a thousand men appointed to guard the past . . . The least we can do is refuse to add to the immense dead weight that Nature must drag along!"

—GEORGE H. FISHER

South Gate, California.

CHAPTER ONE

AMERICA'S POLITICAL QUAGMIRE

Today, in America, the noun "politics" has become a sort of cuss word. When one man calls another a politician his tone is likely to imply that the man is a scoundrel, and without legal parentage. At the same time, interest in voting has been dropping steadily since the Civil War. In fact, at the present alarming rate of downspin we may all be ruled, in a few more years, by two small, hard cores of machine voters—men and women who have turned into mere ballot-box stuffers who vote as The Party tells them to vote, just as in Russia. Such groups of robots wearing two different party labels but with the same callous indifference to the majority's interests would

be a pushover for any ambitious dictator on a creamy-white stallion!

The growing avalanche of disillusionment with these party machines—instead of scaring us all to our ballot-boxes in self defense—has developed a dangerously cynical attitude toward the whole “art of politics.” America—leader among the world’s democracies—today has proportionately the world’s poorest attendance at her voting booths—and also the world’s only powerful political machines!

Corruption in the government of a democracy is, of course, nothing new. As long ago as 400 B.C. the ancient Greek city-state of Athens had to wrestle with the same types of bribery, tax-favoritism and job selling that bedevil America today. Trading with the enemy, although it has now become a commonplace and “a necessity” of modern warfare, was even in ancient times considered treasonous if committed by “unauthorized personnel.” It was one of the crimes of Alcibiades, that Athenian warrior-politician who was caught peddling military information to the Spartans.

We may rest assured that it is not going to be

easy to find new solutions to such old problems. Human nature being what it is, political incompetence will no doubt be with us for a long time into the future—or until it pushes us all over the precipice of atomic suicide! But if you and I are interested in saving our precious necks we had better begin to get our sights properly adjusted—had better begin to learn just where the enemy is located, and what he is like.

The fight for good government cannot be successfully waged by singling out and persecuting a few hapless individuals—any more than the battle against narcotics could be won by convicting a handful of dope addicts. The vicious, obstructive yoke of the national organizations which protect and nourish the crime must first be thrown off—whether the war is against illicit drugs or against political corruption.

Like a pair of old slum buildings hopelessly contaminated with disease and vermin, the rotten party structures which organize, shelter, and try to dignify the graft and hypocrisy of America's politics on a nationwide scale must eventually be cleansed from our democracy—if confidence in government and a wholesome, widespread atten-

dance at the polls are to be restored.

For election day seems to have lost its glamour for roughly fifty percent of America's adult citizens. Apparently they have grown tired of merely alternating between two meaningless political party labels. Since Civil War days the two big party machines have been able to make a mockery of our pathetic efforts to set up "third" parties in competition with them.

Soon after the peace was signed at Appomattox, governmental services (automatically translated into "political jobs") began to multiply far beyond anyone's wildest dreams. Patronage and government contracts soon took the place of "tradition" and "principles" as the stock in trade of the two existing parties. Both managed to dig in and perpetuate themselves during this period, alternately holding the reins of power and filling the statute books of our 48 states with all manner of inhibiting legislation to resist any new party that might have the temerity to strike out against them.

No other such mis-named "political parties" in the world's history have ever been able to transform themselves in this fashion into such power-

wielding machines—continuing to write dummy “platforms” for window-dressing in their employment-agency and contract-brokerage business to which they both so easily “converted.”

The basic weakness of our so-called “two-party system” is that it rewards victory, not virtue. The party machines, by their very nature, must concern themselves with the quantity of winners, not their quality. A Republican or Democratic candidate is valuable to the machine only if and when he wins his election. The moment he does so the machine must begin to coddle and “take care” of him because of the jobs and influence which may be attached to his victory. He may be a rascal or an incompetent when he enters the race and a bigger one after being in office a while, but as long as he can get in and stay in he can throw his weight around inside the machine.

As a matter of fact, election laws throughout America have, in effect, made it impractical for political parties to attempt to separate the sheep from the goats. Modern “direct primary” legislation has reserved that function for the citizens themselves. Thus, such will-o-the-wisps as “party responsibility” and “party loyalty” in the atomic

age are as obsolete in concept as those fraudulent abstractions called "party tradition" and "party principles."

Many of our states have already ousted the party machines from their city, county, school and judicial elections on the theory that it is undignified to permit pork-barrels in schoolrooms and courtrooms. But is it more dignified to allow these free-lunch feeding-troughs in our State and National Capitols?

Perhaps if we kick the worthless and degrading Party Machines out of the picture entirely—and celebrate the exodus as a dramatic spectacle (in the "stupendous, gigantic, colossal" tradition made famous in Hollywood) most of the back-sliding voters can be inspired to return to the polls with a fresh, new enthusiasm and a renewed faith! It might prove to be just the exhilarating stimulant we need to revive our jaded and lagging interest in the affairs of our government—perhaps bring a buoyant hope for the future, where only cynicism and resignation now dwell!

A promising introductory step in exactly that direction has already been taken by the sovereign citizens of California (in the elections of Novem-

ber 4, 1952). The present essay is an attempt to measure the broader implications of that historic gesture. The study is unique in this one respect at least: for a change the subject is approached from the standpoint of what the people think—not what their leaders think they ought to think! In short, it is practical, not theoretic; it contains a simple observation and a logical conclusion—not a sermon from the Oracle of Delphi.

CHAPTER TWO

“THE MUTE, INARTICULATE MASSES”

On the morning of November 5, 1952, the Eisenhower - Nixon victory crowded everything else off the front pages of California's newspapers. Editors were busy playing up each little sidelight in the contrasting personalities of Ike and Dick, and the divergent past histories and family life of the two winners were dramatized in tireless detail.

The glamorous world hero from the Kansas plains, with his sparkling animation and his broad grin, made excellent photo material alongside the comparatively quiet favorite son of California, who—only a few short years before—had answered a newspaper ad which asked for “a man to run for Congress.”

Such colorful copy left little space to tell of

the amazing defeat of "Proposition 13" — the cross-filing measure. "Unlucky 13" was an initiative question submitted to the voters of California, seeking to stop candidates for public office from running on both Democratic and Republican tickets at the same time. (Cross-filing has been the custom of office-seekers in the freedom-loving Golden State since 1913—defended by the "California Committee To Save Cross-Filing.")

The move to prohibit the practice had been backed by an impressive list of proponents. The surprise beating the repealer took, therefore, at the hands of the voters was one of the most startling political upsets of California's picturesque and checkered history—even though it did fail to make the headlines. Although the story of the strange defeat was pushed back to the inside pages, it did seem, on November 3 at least, that if the honorary sponsors of "abolish cross-filing" had been laid end to end they would have extended clear back to Revolutionary days. For although cross-filing is a comparatively modern invention, personalities from almost every page of American History were quoted in support of its prohibition. However, cross-filing survived!

During the campaign a list as long as a city editor's arm was published of the organizations which apparently had reserved large blocks of seats on the "repeal" bandwagon. To convince oneself how formidable and ramified this offensive was one has only to take a gander at a few names at the head of the list:—

American Political Science Association.

National Municipal League.

California League of Women Voters.

California State Federation of Labor (AFL).

California Industrial Union Council (CIO).

Further down the list one encounters the names of influential local newspapers both big and little, past Presidents of the United States, Governors, Mayors, Congressmen, Senators. A galaxy of assorted big shots from the world of Labor and civic life managed to scramble aboard also — on an individual basis. Indeed it seemed hard to find anyone at all in the brass section of public life who was willing to oppose the abolition movement.

For several months in advance of election day a "24-hour" metropolitan daily newspaper serving Los Angeles County (where almost half the

state's vote is concentrated) ran a daily article urging "Yes on #13." And along about nutting time the yeasty smell of billboard paste began to dilate the nostrils of motorists along the highways, and soon the tourist's view of our sunkissed landscapes was blocked by slogans a foot high imploring us all to "Save The Two-Party System—Vote Yes on #13!"

Radios began to blare, televisions began to glare: "Preserve The American Way—Vote Yes on #13." Skywriters gayly traced out smoke-signals against the great blue yonder, admonishing us to "Block the Crooked Lobby—Vote Yes on #13!" Even in our busses and streetcars the weary strap-hangers were reminded that "Politicians Should Be Forced To Show Their True Colors—Vote Yes on #13!"

But the Heavy Artillery itself was manned by the "Abolish Cross-Filing Committee," headed by John B. Elliott, a prominent figure in California's oil industry. His committee assumed informal charge of the "Yes" campaign. It published a 64-page speaker's manual and sent spellbinders into union meetings and civic gatherings who left behind them a red, white and blue trail of "Yes"

literature. The manual served as a complete reference work for the campaign. It discussed every possible argument in favor of abolition of cross-filing—and from every conceivable angle. It listed the dozens of organizations and newspapers and the scores of public figures who had either come out flatly for prohibition of cross-filing or were quoted as “believing in the American two-party system,”—which was supposed to boil down to the same thing. (What was not mentioned, however, was that due to the State’s political independence the big oil interests had no political party club to swing in Washington in the “off-shore oil” controversy!)

This undying devotion to the “two-party system” was, in fact, the central theme and keynote of the whole complex propaganda drive, although many other reasons were offered why a citizen should vote Yes on #13. (Oil was not one of them, however.) But if one loved his Country, his Flag, the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, The American Way of Life, the Ideals of our Founding Fathers, Our National Heritage, Our Basic Traditions, The American Dream—etc., etc.—then he should, perforce, vote Yes on

#13. Or, negatively, if he was against Communism, Fascism, Nazism, Gangsterism, illegal liquor, off-track betting, syndicated gambling, crooked lobbies—or just against Sin in General—then also he should vote Yes on #13!

The absence of an opposition campaign of any comparable magnitude caused the issue to be clearly drawn, since there was little of the customary back-and-forth banter of claim and counter-claim to confuse the voter. On this one Proposition, at least, the conscientious citizen was able to form his opinion decisively and express it plainly — for once in his harried political life. With all the “good” arguments and all the “out-standing leadership” parked lopsidedly on one side there seemed little, if any, excuse for a No vote on #13.

Special precaution was taken, in this scientifically-organized campaign, to prevent any possible misunderstanding in marking one's ballot. All publicity and sloganizing ended with the words “Vote Yes on #13!” The sign “#” was used instead of the abbreviation “No.” for “number,” to avoid any possible association with the negative, “NO.” (Since the No campaign was

quiet and poorly financed anyway there was, in truth, little danger of such confusion.)

Everybody and his brother, apparently, wanted to prohibit cross-filing!

And thus, on the night of Monday, November 3, all the dopesters and their wise money were well over into the Yes column, as far as #13 was concerned.

But lo, on the night of the following day, as the ballots began to trickle in, it gradually and shockingly became evident that "the mute and inarticulate masses" had kicked over the traces—and had decreed "NO on #13!"

How contrary can you get? There stood the verdict—bold and clear and unadorned. The fetish of partyism had taken a beating! Because of the blunt manner in which the issue had been laid before the electorate no interpretation could possibly be placed on the returns except that a telltale crack was beginning to appear in Humpty Dumpty's wall! The proud citadel of Tweedledum and Tweedledee was under siege!

CHAPTER THREE

OUR TOTEM-POLE CIVILIZATION

What, then, is this strongly touted “two-party system” that seems to be so universally prized by “leadership” but upon which the common man appears to place little, if any, value—which he seems ready, in fact, to vote out of existence at his earliest opportunity! A snap answer might be that America’s vaunted two-party system is actually the least-understood social institution the world has ever known—although such answer, of course, would not be much help to us, except perhaps to indicate the scope and complexity of our puzzle.

The truth is that in the powder-keg world of today there is little of a social nature that is left

sacred for the man in the street. Individuals find themselves grappling with their gods and their governments, and governments with each other, often forsaking old gods for new—or for none at all. Each fights for what he has been taught to sum up briefly as his “freedom,” for in war-cries and slogans one must be both brief and sonorous. “Frustrations” sometimes appears to be a more accurate summation of our grievances in general—“freedoms” seem to grow obsolete so suddenly! (Of course, “frustrations” would sound lousy in a slogan.)

In the confused political atmosphere that seems to engulf most of the world men are no longer bashful about asking blunt questions and demanding straight answers about the social institutions which are supposed to be guiding them. They want to know whether the altars to which they have been taught to carry burnt offerings are really an essential part of their culture or merely worthless fetishes.

For in the last analysis the whole story of mankind is largely an account of his never-ending struggle to free himself from his fetishes. Since he first climbed down out of the trees his leaders

have managed to confuse and confound him, as well as delay his progress, with all manner of charms and symbols—supposedly to protect him from evil spirits.

In every age his tribal chiefs and witch doctors have set up new totem-poles for him, or whittled out a new head for an old one. And what was worse, they have convinced him that his fellow creatures were his enemies if they refused to bow down and worship at that same particular post. They have draped lucky beads and amulets around his neck and stuck all sorts of gimmicks atop his gullible head—and then driven him off to war in defense of these absurd talismans!

Strange, mystic designs have been painted and tattooed on his long-suffering carcass, while gaudy trinkets to bemuse the spirits encumbered his arms and hobbled his legs. Holy rings have hung from his nose and his ears have been pinned back with the sanctified dried bones of his fightingest ancestors—in an effort to increase his pugnacity and egg him on into battle. His brow has been anointed with magical oils and his balding pate moistened with high-priority waters. Sacred plants and animals in endless variety have been

assigned to remind him of his subordination to this or that god.

Great religious leaders have uttered words of infinite wisdom for his guidance, but sooner or later their foolish apostles have permitted these messages also to petrify into hollow, ritualistic fetishes. A basic aim of most of these good teachers, for example, has been to discourage warfare among men; yet today, just as in the days of barbarism, their modern disciples piously follow us to our battlefields with their sacred writings—to sustain us spiritually while we break every commandment in the book-fetish they so solemnly hold aloft!

For their scriptures, too, have been transmuted, in large measure, into rigid, meaningless symbolisms—merely by the act of declaring them “sacred.” Once they were declared sacred they were not subject to revision to fit the rapidly changing world, and they have seemed as cold and unrewarding to new generations of men as the glistening gold was to King Midas.

Ancient and modern religions by the thousand have followed one another into oblivion because the short-sighted disciples—always against the

admonitions of the founders—have allowed the teachings of the master to become dogmatized and doctrinized—and thus hopelessly fossilized, too. They have foolishly called upon their people to worship the words themselves as being “holy writ”—regardless of how incomprehensible they may have become in new environments.

Protestant, Catholic and Jew—Buddhist, Mohammedan and all the rest of the moderns—sooner or later have found themselves marching in great numbers against the idolatries of their own churches. Many of us in the West raise our eyebrows at the Buddhist who kneels before his hand-carved statue, or the desert tribesman who worships his turban—whose flowing folds have protected him and his ancestors from the relentless sandstorms of the Sahara.

The non-Catholic scoffs at the ritualized Confessional, the non-Jew at the ritualized abstention from easily-infected meats. Yet many Protestants have themselves allowed the religion of Jesus to atrophy into an incoherent mumbo-jumbo of bibliolatry — twisting the simple wisdom and tolerant compassion of the Man of Galilee into a hundred arguing, babbling creeds. Their Deca-

logue has become so devitalized that after pounding their various altars and waving their bibles for hundreds of years many of them seem unable to comprehend their own Second Commandment (much less the shamefully betrayed Sixth!) As in days of old, its always the other fellow's Graven Images that we are taught to abhor, never our own!

After twenty centuries of knuckling under to warmaking rulers a discouraging number of our religious leaders seem content to keep us submerged in the symbolic "blood of the Savior"—with neither the time nor the inclination, nor the courage to crusade against the spilling of our living blood on today's battlefields! Small wonder, then, that in a world that sometimes appears to be standing on the very precipice of eternity, and whose people continue to plead for some sort of spiritual guidance, the religion based on the teachings of Christ lies perilously near to the fate of its numerous predecessors—bound, like Gulliver in Lilliput, by its own flimsy fetishes!

At Hiroshima a frightened world suddenly "got religion"—but also got a new wave of group im-

morality that has reached into almost every department of our lives!

In the stark world crisis that confronts humanity today the Graven Images offered us by prophet and politician alike are being contemptuously pushed aside and trampled underfoot by the people themselves. Fetishes of all kinds — whether concrete or abstract — are coming unglued, splitting at the seams and going down the drain.

In refusing to outlaw cross-filing the citizens of the sophisticated commonwealth of California merely re-stated, in voting booth terms, the well-understood fact that precious little of their love is to be wasted, anymore, on the fetish of party labels and party promises. Away from the meeting halls and the “official circles”—back where the ballots are actually marked in the comparative quiet of the home precincts—there the people seem to pride themselves on being able to “vote for the man, not the party.”—Evidently they intend to keep it that way!

CHAPTER FOUR

**“ALL WE WANT IS
THE FACTS, MA’AM!”**

The Democratic politicians object to cross-filing because, for one thing, it has permitted the Republican former Governor Earl Warren (now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court) to demonstrate his popularity in the Democratic Party as well as in his own. Warren was thrice elected to the governorship in this overwhelmingly Democratic state—the only governor ever to be so honored, and the only American governor ever nominated as the candidate of both Republican and Democratic Parties at the same election. It is this type of political independence, of course, that took him unerringly toward the Chief Justiceship.

Throughout his political career his staunch non-partisanism found an appropriate election-day vehicle in California's cross-filing procedure—which, over the years, has implemented and buttressed each of his middle-of-the-road administrations.

At the 1952 Republican Convention Warren dramatically demonstrated his penchant for fair play—and without realizing it he clinched the job he now holds in the highest Court in the land. For in the bitter debate between the Taft and Eisenhower forces over the seating of the Georgia and Texas delegations Warren could easily have chosen to enhance his own “dark horse” chances for the Presidential nomination by remaining neutral in the controversy. Instead, he vociferously dared to take sides against the traditional steam-roller tactics of the Old Guard, bringing to Eisenhower's corner the force of the California delegation and marking the climax of the Convention.

Just as Warren, Dewey and others exposed and dramatized the characteristic “railroading” techniques of the party machine, so cross-filing, during its forty years' history, has emphasized and

spotlighted the absurdity of all party-lines in an American direct primary election!

For many years the Southern Pacific Railroad lobby controlled both Democratic and Republican politics in California. The introduction of cross-filing by Governor Hiram Johnson's progressive regime, in 1913, broke up this obnoxious lobby by pulverizing party-machine control of the Legislature. The railroad's gravy train for politicians was permanently derailed and the party bosses were ditched, and left floundering around in search of new means of support. From that day to this the machine bosses have vented their spleens against lobbies in general, both good and bad, since both types have eliminated party bosses as unnecessary middlemen.

Although the corrupt lobby forms the backbone of reactionary politics all over America the fact remains that the legitimate lobby provides valuable technical assistance to legislators. It has become a vital, extra-governmental part of the law-making function in our highly technical and highly industrialized society. In California, as elsewhere, its influence is proportionate to the state's importance in industry and commerce.

Likewise, of course, the corrupt lobby wields its evil influence in about the same proportion.

The running battle against dishonest lobbies—entrenched, as they are, with big moneyed interests—is both complicated and difficult. However, this struggle against corruption is certainly not aided by those pseudo-liberals who help the politicians mislead and confuse us all by irrelevantly blaming cross-filing for the fact that crooked legislators sell their votes to the highest bidder.

California voters have had far too much experience with their initiative and referendum procedures to be taken in by such routine propaganda tricks. The history of the state convinces them that the party bosses do not conscientiously fight the lobby—but fight, instead, to become a part of the lobby.

Neither were the citizens fooled, on that November 4th, by the completely fraudulent slogan which implied that repeal would force candidates to “show their true colors.” (This overworked phrase became number one of the official “Eleven Points Against Cross-Filing.”)

But after the abolishers had screamed the slogan from the housetops the Legislature swept the

ground from under their feet several weeks before election day. They placed a separate proposition on the ballot to compel all candidates to plainly state the name of their party after their own names, on any ballot on which their candidacy was filed.

Did the repealers applaud this simple and direct solution to the "true colors" problem? On the contrary! Strangely enough—and hypocritically enough—they turned irately upon their benefactors and fought tooth and nail in the Courts to have the measure scratched from the ballot—so that voters might not even have opportunity to pass on it!

True colors, indeed! In turning tail on this paramount issue which they had previously blown up into an emotionally patriotic matter they proceeded to show their own true colors for all the world to see! And the world saw—at least that sunkissed slice of the world that forms the southwestern corner of the nation! In this one piece of demagoguery alone the ringleaders of the prohibition movement lost whatever they had left of the genuine liberals among the rank and file of their "following."

And so in the “true colors” slogan as in so many others, the repealers gave their hand away, exposing the fact that it was not cross-filing, specifically, that they were attacking. As one continued to read and listen to the emotional outbursts in the press and on radio and TV he began to get the creepy feeling that the real target of the abolishers was the entire direct primary law! Every paragraph of every page in the official manual was either a complete falsehood, a twisted half-truth, an absurd irrelevancy, or, in the case of about half the material—it exposed a crass ignorance of California’s election laws, and although a bulky section of the manual was devoted to The Lobby, by some strange editorial slip the word “oil” did not occur even once!

Every campaign dodge known to the trade was dragged out of political back rooms. Misrepresentation, tortured interpretations, hypocrisy, race- and-minority baiting—no holds were barred. The big Los Angeles daily which spearheaded the campaign in the press ran a long article detailing the statistics of the various races and minorities of the state with the implication that they were being persecuted politically by the cross-filing

provision. This, of course, was a complete piece of deceit, since nothing in the device of cross-filing relates in the remotest fashion to any race or minority.

In any election, of course, the incumbent has the advantage, all the way from President on down. This is a necessary evil of all democratic structures. The notion that cross-filing is responsible for this centuries-old principle is childish in the extreme. But the irrelevancy of any argument did not bar it from the yes campaign as was evident here, as also in the lobby argument, the "true colors" hypocrisy, and the falsification that "a YES vote will bring greater ballot-box freedom to the voter." (On June 10, 1952, the Los Angeles Daily News stated editorially in cold, unashamed 10-point: "Of course, we don't believe voters should shop around over the entire field in their voting."—!?!?)

This was largely the same crew which, a few years back, engineered a plot inside the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee to set up a party mechanism for "recommending" a slate of handpicked machine candidates to the electorate in the primaries. In this bold, daylight

attempt to illegally abridge the direct primary law the Bosses failed ignominiously, just as they failed on November 4, 1952!

As one thumbs his way through the manual and notes the long parade of politicians and their stooges who have spearheaded this affront to American democracy, one cannot help but wonder what has happened to the liberal movement in this Land of the Free. Where are the progeny of those stalwart patriots who stamped out the tyranny of King George III in our virile Colonies and later battled to keep the despotism of party bosses from the halls of government? Many of those who today enjoy wallowing in their pretended "liberalism" seem to have forgotten that the very essence of the word connotes a rugged determination to be free of all political bondage!

CHAPTER FIVE

CALIFORNIA IN HER ACCUSTOMED ROLE

The live, ever-changing pattern of California's politics has taught the plain citizens that important decisions, whether good or bad, are made by bold, quick-witted men of flesh and blood. They have noted that these decisions are seldom, if ever, dictated by the dead letter of last season's party platforms with all their crystal-ball pretensions and their catch-all package deals.

The independent spirit that has impelled citizens of the Golden State to "rise above narrow partisan considerations" (which the orators love to scream about but which Californians have made a reality) has its roots far back in the state's pioneering history. For it was in the rugged Gold Rush era that the hardy settlers first began

earning their reputations as staunch trail-blazers for political progress. They started nullifying the power of their political bosses back in 1866, when they passed the nation's first Direct Primary Law—whose modern counterparts have finally written finis to boss control throughout America!

Yet, although California's progress toward a genuinely democratic republic has been both steady and orderly, many of us seem to have difficulty in perceiving that after gaining the direct primary, cross-filing is simply the next logical step in the long-term campaign to cancel out the party-boss system entirely and give the political power to the sovereign people as their rightful heritage.

Ever since California was admitted to the Union in 1850 the bold, free spirit at the grass roots has set new political trends which all America has eventually adopted. Her entry as a full-fledged state seemed in itself a prophetic omen for political progress. In those formative days Slavery was an important issue, and it was only after heated debate in Congress that California was finally admitted as a "free" state. But from that memorable day forward the nation never again

lost her free-state controlling majority in the United States Senate!

This portentous event proved to be the foundation for a tradition of social emancipation in the Golden State, for since those early beginnings her citizens have consistently carried the ball in the never-ending struggle to make democracy amount to something more than an orator's cliché. No sooner had the Civil War ended than a campaign was started in California to sweep away the lingering remnants of those irritating issues which had led to the war between the states, and which still lay smouldering in the hearts of many of the vanquished. California herself, isolated as she was both geographically and psychologically from most of these issues, found herself in the logical position from which to lead a campaign of reform, reconstruction and political house-cleaning.

So when these dead issues had been officially buried after the war the forthright citizens of California began, as a starter, to wrest from their self-appointed political overlords the power to name their own candidates for public office. It was a faltering step and actually produced very

weak results—but it was a start. Today the Direct Primary has become a standard feature of the election machinery of all but one state. And after what happened at Chicago in the 1952 conventions it seems certain that some kind of direct primary for nominating presidents also is “in the cards.”

In a steady, unbroken chain of courageous gestures the plain citizens who kept pouring into California in search of social and economic liberties have wrested power from professional politicians with the same vigor they demonstrated in building a new empire on the sunny Pacific Slope. They blazed the trail for popular election of United States Senators (originally chosen by state legislatures). They pioneered in the non-partisan election of city, county, and school officials, and of local and state judges. They led the fight for “home rule” for cities, as a basic principle in American local self-government. They were ten years ahead of the Federal Government with woman’s suffrage. And over the years they have utilized their initiative, referendum and recall prerogatives more frequently than all other states combined!

When cross-filing came to California (during the progressive regime of Hiram Johnson) few seemed to realize that it would supply the people with the much-needed by-pass around the immovable mountain of partyism that had grown up in America. Independent, non-partisan candidates began to have their names on both tickets for the same reason that a farmer plows around an obstructive rock when he finds he cannot plow through it. Nowadays it is seldom that anyone is elected to anything, in California, unless he has arranged to give voters of both parties a chance at him in the primaries.

Strange, indeed, that a basic political freedom so universally accepted by both voter and candidate should be opposed by so glittering an array of pretended "leadership."

Stranger still that David's tiny sling (the people's voice) could slay the well-heeled propaganda giant of that befouled leadership!

CHAPTER SIX

TELEVISION—OUR MODERN ALADDIN'S LAMP

Thousands of years before Christ the first crude water-wheel irrigated the fertile Valley of the Nile. As the early Egyptian soil-tillers watched their fragile buckets bring water to their thirsty acres few of them could have prophesied that in this wooden contraption they held not only the key to modern scientific farming but also the symbol of a new kind of civilization to come.

Since the development of that first, primitive, hand-carved machine each succeeding technical advancement has likewise brought with it a proportionate social revolution — and the magic of television certainly promises to be no exception. Visionaries of even a generation ago would not

have dared prophesy the extent of the impact that TV has already made on America's way of life—any more than the ancient farmers along the Nile could understand the deeper significance of that first flapping, wheezing water-wheel.

Television, as a product of technology, is following that same pattern of social revolution, but at an infinitely accelerated pace. It is only recently that we began to realize the far-reaching possibilities of the new medium in the educational field. If we are wise enough to apply its magic to our modern electioneering techniques we can break down one of the last strongholds of political party fetishism.

The 1952 national party conventions, the first ever to be televised, will probably go down in history as the last of their kind to be staged in America. For during those two, sweltering, Klieg-lighted weeks of bedlam in the Windy City the ordinary citizens across the nation discovered the true nature of their political organizations. At first hand the voters learned the habits, outcries and protective colorings of their party politicians under fire.

At long last, thanks to the very candid cameras

of TV, the people in their living rooms received eye-witness proof that the mammoth "rat-races" held each leap year are designed not to "focus" the popular will but rather to cancel it out altogether. Belatedly the folks back home are beginning to perceive that inside the two sprawling party organizations are sheltered and pampered all the big and little political vice-lords from the precinct clubs to the nation's Capitol.

We saw Senator Kefauver learning the hard way that even a President of the United States will intervene to block the nomination of an intra-party crime-buster—no matter how clamorously the people may demand the latter's nomination! And we also watched another famous crime-buster, Governor Tom Dewey, forced to split his own party down the middle in order to dramatize and expose the strong-arm methods used by the Old Guard in an attempt to block the nomination of another popular idol, General Eisenhower. The Taft men apparently were willing to agree with Truman that "state preference primaries are a lot of eyewash!" Contempt for the public's wishes is a characteristic of both machines.

The opaque screen in our living-rooms has

provided us with the means to meet and judge candidates for ourselves, in the comfort and relaxed atmosphere of our firesides. Without being trapped in crowded, tiresome mass-meetings "we the people" can now examine and choose our own men and women for public office, independent of smoke-filled rooms, caucuses and all the rest of the under-counter sleight-of-hand of party bosses. No longer can two opposing candidates employ the same glib-penned ghost-writer for their forensic offertories.

No longer can a hostile press twist and distort the words of a candidate. Each speaker can be held strictly accountable for his every statement.

Even the old oratorical tricks, the applause-baiting, etc., are nullified on this modern speaker's rostrum. Standing before us—seemingly at arms' reach—all pomposity is glaring magnified; each mannerism—the slightest twitch of a face muscle—is exposed to the television audience. Almost overnight that glowing picture tube has reformed the art of political speechifying! While he is before the television camera a speaker's words must reveal, not conceal, the facts.

The conventions of '52 conceivably could stand

as the final punctuation mark for a passing phase of our political history, if only we are willing to put behind us our childish elephant and donkey playthings. Without these make-believe appurtenances, and the vested interests they represent, the deep-lying riches and dignity inherent in an American election day could be recaptured!

For on the unforgettable November 4 of that same convention year the folks at the California grass roots demonstrated that, no matter how tough the odds, popular sovereignty can readily be retrieved in these United States!

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE FOUNDING FATHERS' PROPHECY COMES TRUE

The founders of our republic, with a foresight that today seems uncanny in its prophecy, tried in vain to prevent the formation of our absurd political divisions. In our written Declaration of Independence and our Constitution they made America the only nation in history to spell out boldly in advance its national philosophy, traditions, precepts, principles and scheme of organization. These pioneering leaders hoped that by carefully defining them all in detail beforehand we might avert the development of what they referred to as "the corroding influence of partyism and factionalism that could serve only to divide an already unified people into meaningless sections."

These men were able to foresee that new issues and new problems would constantly arise and that difference of opinion would come too. But they were not so foolish as to assume that such problems and issues could be classified and tagged with some random party label!

In a major portion of his "Farewell Address," George Washington pleaded with his countrymen to avoid being weakened by wholesale political vivisection. He devoted the latter half of his speech to an enthusiastic denunciation of "the cancerous growths which attach themselves like bloodsucking leeches — functionless — to a free government, subverting the real issues and hiding the corruption of their cohorts — gradually allowing the integrity of a democracy to rot away."

"Political parties," continued the 'Father of His Country' (in words which, in today's political setting, are breath-taking in their foreboding) "will organize factions to give them an artificial and extra-ordinary force, and put in place of the delegated will of the Nation the will of a party — often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the population; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties

to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction." (One gets the wierd feeling that he is listening to a modern roundtable television discussion, rather than to ideas expressed almost two centuries ago!)

Washington concluded his last official message to his people with the fervent hope that above all else the nation he loved so dearly and served so devotedly, and whose leadership he was now turning over to others, would not fall into the hands of selfish men who would corral the citizenry into "ridiculously irrelevant categories to carry on sham battles with one another while their leaders divide the spoils of their meaningless victories."

James Madison, the "brain of the Constitution," as he was called, also bent his vast prestige and his fiery pen to the task of warning his colleagues of the partisan pitfalls which even at the nation's infancy seemed to be looming ahead. "The instability, injustice and confusion," wrote Madison in his "Federalist Papers," in the year 1787, "that are introduced into the public councils by parties have in truth been the mortal

diseases under which popular governments everywhere have perished." (No doubt many of those Californians who voted No on abolition of cross-filing were students of Madison!)

Adams, Jackson, Monroe—almost every noteworthy leader during those apprehensive and formative days, joined in the crusade "to do battle with faction, caucus and party—to keep the reins of government always directly in the hands of the people." Correspondence between Jackson and Monroe is replete with earnest discussion as to the best manner of avoiding party growths.

Yet all the words of wisdom that poured from the lips and pens of these sincere students of democracy were not powerful enough to stand against the irresistible force of the spoils system which inevitably was to grow rapidly in our lush, young country. An energetic, hard-working and fast-growing population demanded more and more services from the government. There was no Civil Service in those days to examine and qualify people of competence for the administrative departments. Political "handouts"—jobs and contracts—seemed to most people as a wholly

necessary evil. Soon there arose in America something new under the sun, and never since duplicated elsewhere—the spectacle of two employment agencies and contract brokerages calling themselves political parties but now lacking even the remotest resemblance to the classical definition of the term!

Here is the heart of the whole matter! We Americans have simply failed to comprehend the tremendous political impact of the government-job market that has been built up in our vast, highly industrialized, highly commercialized nation. No one has sat down with pencil and adding machine and totalled up the number of public servants that we have required in the functioning of this great empire.

But each tiny cross-roads hamlet, each struggling village, each bustling town and giant metropolis, each county seat and state capital, the network of office buildings at Washington, our farflung public works systems, our foreign service and a hundred and one other agencies both at home and abroad—all have contributed to the building of so mighty an army of political job-holders as to stagger the imagination. Control of

this vast network is the only real bone of contention between the two parties.

We need more of the merit system at every level of government. Furthermore we need to free it from the domination of the party hacks so it can function efficiently. Civil Service is the enemy of the party machine. Which of these two can we do without?

The profitable trade in political jobs and contracts came into full bloom under the skilled hand of that master patronage dispenser, President Martin Van Buren. And who could have foreseen, in those early years, that some day these innocent-looking political plums would swell across a great nation to such mountainous proportions—and wield such blind, Frankensteinian power—as to completely dominate the government they pretend to serve, and through the government the whole economy!

Who could have foretold that one day such great hydra-headed dragons would not only reduce democratic government to a mockery but silence the voices of all its critics to boot! Brave indeed is the editor or public office holder who has dared to speak out the truth about the octopus-

like grip which the party machines have exerted over our political lives. Not Alexander, Caesar nor Charlemagne — not Napoleon, Hitler nor Stalin ever dared to dream of a more subservient following of “loyal subjects.”

In contradistinction to such subjection, the voters of California have sought to vindicate America’s proud boast that we are the world’s first and foremost democratic republic!

The tyranny of the machine over our popularly chosen public officials has been broken, in California. It can be broken, also, throughout the nation!

CHAPTER EIGHT

“SUGAR AND SPICE, AND EVERYTHING NICE!”

“But if we eliminate the parties, what shall we put in their place?” The question is as inevitable as dawn after darkness — although no such problem existed when parties were voided from many of our local governmental jurisdictions. Still, it is natural, one might assume, that anything so big, so awesome, so all-pervading as the Democratic and Republican Parties cannot simply be shoved over the edge of the California Palisades into the blue Pacific — even though the idea may catch the fancy of certain Californians!

However, the question will be asked seriously and must be answered seriously. To find the answer we must place the Parties under a high-

powered microscope and try to determine their real nature — and their real function, if any.

The Democratic and Republican Parties both came into existence during periods of national expansion — chiefly to protect westward-moving pioneers against entrenched business interests. The issue vanished, of course, when the geographical frontier vanished, and we should have given the Parties to the Indians then and there!

As it is, their machines have lingered on like some grotesque form of mercenary ghost, managing to keep themselves alive far into this twentieth century and forcing us all to worship their antedated totem-poles so they can continue traffick-
ing in jobs, contracts and influence.

What is the secret of their longevity? How have they been able to prevent the rise of the dozens of third parties that have ventured to compete with them? These two questions have engaged the attention of several generations of political scientists and students of American history.

The complex nature of the Parties has made it difficult to bring them into focus for study. Composed of hundreds of conflicting elements—

some old, some new, some concrete, some abstract — they are the end result of mixing lots of theory with a little reality — great gobs of legend with a savory sprinkling of fact — a pork-barrel full of callous cynicism with a nostalgic bit of torchlight romanticism. And millions of sincere men and women with perhaps a hundred or so powerful, self-seeking shysters!

No wonder they are the despair of our social scientists who all but drive themselves mad trying to force these two shapeless, elusive, intangible masses into conventional, traditional, political party molds. Untiringly and fruitlessly they attempt to rationalize and compare our American Parties with “orthodox” parties past and present, on both sides of the globe.

To discover the American Party machines’ fountain of youth and their secret for smothering out all their rivals we must first seek their counterparts in nature. We must find some tangible organism to which they can be likened, compared or contrasted. And the more we explore into natural structures the stronger grows our conviction that the only biological counterpart of America’s two political party machines is to be

found in the phylum of protozoa — the lowest form of animal life!

This particular animalcule, second cousin to an amoeba, under a powerful microscope resembles more than anything else a bowl of Lemon Jello without the bowl, that someone has spilled on the kitchen floor on a warm day. Just a big blob of quivering protoplasm!

This protozoon can live forever, devouring its enemies for food much as the political machine swallows up third parties. It doesn't actually digest their substance at all, for it has no stomach for assimilating new things anyway. Lacking the guts to deal with a proposition head on it sidles cagily up to its prey and tries to court it by turning a few graceful flip-flops. It thus turns first one side and then another toward its intended victim until it finds a receptive section of its own body that can be softened up to "accept" the incongruous, yet tempting, morsel.

By late Autumn the "third party" tidbit manages to make a dent somewhere in the thick hide of the big, flabby creature—perhaps in some remote and less sensitive portion of its structure. Thus "encouraged" the weaker elements inside the

smaller unit begin to show signs of wanting to "amalgamate" with the big, influential "brother-in-law-to-a-sponge."

Gradually the new "party" moves in, puncturing its way through the ooze texture of its spineless host — irritating certain elements here and there and causing miscellaneous internal splits. But the agitation soon subsides and the cracks finally heal. Before long the bloated protozoon appears much the same as before except for a slight bulge which vaguely gives the impression of an awkward two-headedness. This condition, too, is soon ironed out and life goes on again, occasionally repeating the process while the protozoon grows fat and smug.

Just as the protozoon owes its continuing existence to the one-celled simplicity of its structure, so our modern party machines can trace their longevity to the hearty, single-purpose life they lead. They trouble themselves with only one function — to win elections so they can continue bartering jobs, contracts and influence.

The machines have three natural enemies—Civil Service, The Lobby, and third parties — with each of which they must compete for their

sustenance, for their very life's blood. They devote much of their time, energy and money in seeking to prevent competent men and women from obtaining government jobs through qualifying examinations — and they tangle constantly with The Lobby over legislators' votes, influence and patronage. And some three or four dozen third parties have been "absorbed" by the machines during the past century and a half.

Leaders of the machines love to tell of their devotion to the "deathless traditions, principles and issues sacred to the party." History shows, however, that such traditions, issues and principles have been paid tribute by individuals in all parties. Hence the "Republicanism" of Lincoln closely resembled the "Democracy" of Jefferson—the "Democracy" of Buchanan the "Republicanism" of Harding, etc.

Spokesmen for all our parties have been at some time or other champions of war and of peace, of booze and of temperance, of slavery and of abolition, of capital and of labor, of free trade and of tariff, etc. The temper of the times — not the party label — has determined, and always will, the "opinions" of statesmen. It would prove

suicidal for the party itself to have official "opinions" on any subject.

Those who dream idly of building "third parties"—except in terms of a "following" for some outstanding leader, have failed to understand the dynamic that has fashioned every third party in our history. For in third parties, too, citizens, in the final analysis, vote for the man, not the party. Third parties arise when strong leaders stand at the helm, beckoning to their people. Never do they take root merely because someone decides that "a need for a new party exists."

Something like that is true, also, of "realignment." Voters line up behind a great public figure, regardless of his or their party label, and as a result a realignment of the party registration follows. But the strange notion persists anyhow that "liberals" and "conservatives" (who can define them in today's confusion?) should be arbitrarily sorted out and separated into two neat packages with or without their consent! Anyone who got as far as McGuffey's Third Reader should know that our American democratic republic is itself founded upon a "liberal" — nay, a "radical"—revolutionary principle of freedom!

Who wants to be classed as conservative? Only a tiny handful in Congress are willing to so label themselves, even when the "rightists" are in ascendency. Same in our legislatures.

When President Eisenhower took office and began to grapple with foreign affairs (which had dominated campaign oratory) he found himself doing just about what Adlai Stevenson would have done. Non-aggressive nations like America can do no more than prepare to retaliate decisively in case a foreign aggressor makes a daring advance. Unlike an industrial plant, for example, a peace-seeking, non-imperial nation cannot have long-range programs. Only totalitarian states have "five-year plans" and aggressive, long-range schemes for government-controlled production and warfare.

Leaders of Federalist, Democratic, Whig and Republican Parties have been ready to change their opinions on important issues as the changing times and conditions have warranted. Thus the great issues which are supposed to divide the parties are shown to have been non-partisan through the years. For instance the Democrat, Madison, opposed formation of the United States

Bank, prior to the War of 1812, but after the War he changed his mind, since the war had drastically altered economic conditions. He also signed the first Protective Tariff law, (although tariffs are assumed to be the private province of Republicans!) As a matter of fact the first four tariff laws in our history, those of 1816, 1824, 1828 and 1832 were drafted and promoted by Democrats.

Other outspoken leaders of the parties have reversed themselves on basic, so-called "party" issues, Webster and Calhoun trading sides in the controversy over the fundamental banking issues that raged in the early days of our democracy. In later days we find the Republican, McKimley, favoring bi-metalism and then repudiating his stand in order to oppose the great "free-silver" advocate, William Jennings Bryan, the Democrat.

Each year the terms "liberal" and "conservative" grow less useful in classifying statesmen. More and more our political decisions are becoming scientific and technical in their nature. Less and less can they be classified as either "left" or "right." The beautiful traditions and sentiments which the party orators pretend to adore are

irrelevant in an age which must decide — often hastily — just how much national defense, and what kind, must be provided immediately.

If Jefferson and Lincoln could come back today they would very probably not go near the present Democratic and Republican Parties with a ten-foot pole, although the party hacks never tire of referring to the “traditions” of these two fighters for social justice. But the only traditions that still live today which could, by any stretch of the imagination be considered the peculiar heritage of the Democratic Party itself are the unique gangster methods of party organizing. The technique was made famous by Tammany Hall and its outlying branches, the machines of bosses Crump, Hague, Kelly and Nash, Pendergast, etc. These local organizations represent the real heart-beat of the Party. Without their Hooliganism and payoff systems the Party certainly could never have achieved its present “greatness!”

As for the “conservative” Republican Party, its basic traditions are fully recorded in its first newspaper, Horace Greeley’s “farmer-labor” New York Tribune. The Party leadership and its paper were both considered quite leftish in their day,

with Karl Marx himself as European correspondent and a regular column on "Utopian Socialism" by Albert Brisbane — in addition to the "radical" Abe Lincoln, who was the Party's first President. (Of course, styles have a way of changing abruptly sometimes—even in a party's "basic traditions!")

It was Republicans like La Follette, Norris, Borah, Olsen, Lindbergh, Nye, Lemke, Amlie, etc., who formed the solid backbone of 20th Century progressivism in the vast agricultural Northwest. Yet, Republican Old Guard leadership prefers to emphasize instead the much briefer pro-tariff conservatism of the McKinley era, just prior to the turn of the century. "Traditions" are exactly what any contemporary party hack wishes to make them — no more, no less.

"Voice of the People" is a favorite term applied to the Parties by their temporary leaders. A moment's reflection will brush away any notion that either of the big parties could ever serve in such capacity. For example, citizens in every American community will often gather spontaneously in small, local mass meetings to discuss some immediate and urgent problem. Let us say it is a glar-

ing tax injustice, a sudden crime epidemic, an imminent threat against public health, a school-fund scandal — or whatnot.

But harken to the opening words of the temporary chairman! At these grass roots gatherings — which usually “mean business” and mince no words about it — those first words are something like this: “Ladies and gentlemen, let me emphasize at the outset that this group is determined to remain strictly non-partisan in every manner and respect!” Instinctively the people seem to realize that the parties, by their very definition will surely “part” — not unify — the power of the group, and that their strength would be immediately dissipated if they allowed party lines to bi-sect them. And conversely the power of the machine would be dissipated too if it permitted issues to fragmentize them.

So it is in national and foreign affairs also. The best wisdom of the times must be concentrated on each problem as it appears. Even if party traditions were valid they could scarcely aid us in solving the ticklish diplomatic problems of our atomic age.

Analysis of the bales of voting records of state

legislators and Congressmen on all issues both domestic and foreign indicates that party lines play a very small part in determining a member's vote. Party whips and floor leaders will bend every effort, of course, to swing party power behind important legislation but their control of votes has approached zero during the past two or three decades. Reasons for voting this way or that are many and varied, but party ties seem to have little or no significance in legislative halls, except in minor matters where a party vote may bring some trifling advantage to a member. Independence is valued as highly in our great deliberative bodies as in the precinct voting booth!

Yet it is in the organizing of each Congress that the power of The Party is supposed to be most evident. For example, aside from the matter of seniority a legislator's chance for "promotion" to important committees may depend to a greater or less extent upon the regularity of his party votes. But on the whole, the spirit of Party, and machine control of either house, is fast fading from the American scene.

What about "party responsibility" at the grass roots? Under our direct primary laws — which all

but one state have adopted — any citizen may run for any elective office he chooses, and on any party ticket he believes will spell victory for him. He carries on his own primary campaign, interpreting issues as he himself sees them — in fact the Party is morally, and sometimes legally, inhibited from taking sides in a primary election.

The strange notion that a party machine or any of its bosses — or any part of the organization — could “stand responsible” for any and all candidates who choose to run, for each one’s personal integrity as well as all of his pet projects and issues— is not very far short of complete nonsense. As for supporting the “official platform,” only a hypocrite or a complete fool would make such a pretense in the primary election since platforms are written by men chosen at the same primary; hence platforms don’t even exist at the time the “pledges of support” are in order!

One of the cruelest of all hoaxes perpetrated upon the people at the grass roots is that widely accepted fiction that the Democratic Party, somehow or other, is the party of “labor.” Poor, tired old Sam Gompers, first President and founder of the American Federation of Labor, devoted half

his life and most of his energy to a vain and totally unrewarding attempt to put down this completely false doctrine which has proved disastrous to the cause of working people everywhere. There is no specialized group on the American scene that stands to profit more by a steadfast policy of non-partisanism; yet it seems that at the eleventh hour before each election day the moguls of Organized Labor and the Democratic bigwigs "manage to get together"—or discover that they "agree in principle." Anyway, just in the nick of time Labor's political torchlight parade is headed off into the Democratic camp, and all is forgiven.

Long before the days of Sam Gompers a political technique for ensnaring the trade unions was developed inside the Republican Party. When President Grant ran for his second term he put up a shoe cobbler as his Vice-Presidential running mate, to attract the "working man's vote." During the ensuing administration several vain-glorious labor leaders from the newly-formed Knights of Labor were given worthless "chairmanships" in the party councils—thereby setting a pattern followed til this day for keeping Organ-

ized Labor "in line."

It was President Cleveland — a Democrat — who cynically and illegally called out Federal troops against the workers in the Pullman Strike of 1894 — which was the first great precedent-making assault upon Organized Labor by American soldiers. In modern times, such "labor-control" laws as the Smith-Connally Act and the Taft-Hartley Act have been supported equally by Republicans and Democrats in Congress.

Even in the "anti-labor" Senate a recent tally of the "top dozen" pro-labor-voting members showed an equal distribution from each Party. As a matter of fact in the top nine were five Republicans and only four Democrats—Morse, Smith, Lodge, Aiken, Saltonstall and Ives (Rep.) and Douglas, Kefauver, Lehman, and Fulbright (Dem.). And, as indicated a few pages back, the Republican Party began life as a "farmer-labor" party anyway.

Another political myth that is recklessly bandied about is to the effect that the party out of power is "essential to our form of government" because it serves as a "loyal opposition" — constantly nudging our public officials into good behaviour

by being ready at all times to offer criticism and dissent. (The complete phrase was originally "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition" and represents one of our many stupid attempts to borrow old-world political concepts.)

In the British Parliament "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition" plays a rather distinct role. But the form and functioning of the British Government and its political parties have so little in common with ours that for us to adopt a chopped-off half of one of their political terms seems rather silly and infantile, to put it mildly.

It is common practice for prominent men and women in every field — and particularly in public life — to sharply criticise government administrators, from the President on down, for what the former might consider a bad course of action. Organizations, too—civic, patriotic, labor, farmer, business, educational or whatnot — also are found raking the government or its agents over the coals for some specific deed believed by them to be not in the public interest.

And such criticism is very often immediately effective, bringing a sudden reversal of policy and a hint of an apology, even, from the particular

executive or underling who "went too far" (or perhaps merely used poor judgement or timing.) But the point that must be emphasized here is that no political party nor its "spokesman," as such, has either the facilities or the authority to present anything akin to "loyal opposition" sufficient to even discipline or reprimand a fellow party member, let alone a public office holder of the opposition party! It is the quick-witted, sharp-tongued individual that scares the official—not the party.

To know the real party, as a concrete, going concern, one must visit a County- or State-Central Committee meeting in some populous region. Here is the actual "business office" of the party machine. In these gatherings, and in the smoke-filled rooms close by, occur the life-and-death struggles for existence of the patronage-mongers. It is here that the running fight against the Civil Service merit system is planned and organized; it is here that the strategy is laid down for muscling in on the payoff that The Lobby receives for legislative favors, from commercial and industrial interests.

Throughout our national history each of the

forty-eight states has experimented with hundreds of election laws designed to curb the power of the Machine and to encourage independent voting. A detailed study of this 175-year-old crazy-quilt of legislation would, by itself, fill a five-foot shelf of books. Such study would prove rewarding, however, for it would demonstrate how sordid have been the motives and how unscrupulous the methods of those who have held the reins of behind-the-scenes political power in America.

Millions of American voters each year have felt more and more ridiculous as they drew the voting-booth curtain behind them and tried to affect a patriotic solemnity while making their random choice between a machine-bossed Democrat on the ballot and a machine-bossed Republican!

In this enlightened day, the human creatures on this whirling gyroscope called Earth have learned that the letter of the law grows obsolescent at a rapidly increasing pace. Whether we like it or not we must place our confidence in the human leaders among us. When their best judgment falters, when their integrity withers away,

we must replace them as hastily as we can, and find new ones. Leadership — genuine leadership — must, as always, come from living, contemporary leaders if it is to be dynamic and effective, and not from hand-me-down totem-poles nor fetishes, either written or graven! On November 4, California chose human leadership in preference to totem-poles! Instinctively the people acted to shake free from their political shackles — as a growing tadpole struggles to slough off its outgrown and obstructive tail.

Is the rest of the nation willing once again to “look toward the sunset” and accept the challenge laid down by the pioneering citizens who have carved a new agricultural and industrial empire in the sunny hills and valleys of California—and have carved also a bold, new political tradition?

CHAPTER NINE

“WHAT SHALL WE SUBSTITUTE FOR THE PARTIES?”

In earlier chapters we noted that various abstract “key words” were used by party spokesmen to suggest definite functions and properties of the parties. For example, we saw that each party is supposed to possess its own set of “traditions,” “principles,” and “issues” which are claimed as the specific appurtenances of this party or that. We found that the parties are assumed to promote “responsibility,” “loyalty,” “regularity” and “discipline.” They are said to serve as “unifiers of public opinion,” “forums for debating and clarifying new ideas,” — and to form a “loyal opposition.”

However, we discovered on close scrutiny that

the relationship of each of these fine-sounding intangibles to any existing parties was either (1) hopelessly obsolete, (2) purely theoretical, (3) completely fictitious, (4) fantastically legendary—or (5) just plain phony! In the strong sunlight the entire category evaporates like a filmy soap-bubble!

What does one substitute for a soap-bubble?

Let us turn, instead, to the more concrete elements of the party and see if we can discover some part of the structure that is really performing a useful function. We will find that the tangible segments of our jig-saw puzzle are just three in number, comprising the mechanisms for organizing campaigns, elections, and legislative bodies. Let us look at each of these functions separately.

CAMPAIGNS

Every candidate who runs for public office in America—whether for town constable, legislator or president—begins with a small or large personal following of citizens who are convinced that the particular candidate concerned can and

should be elected. Without such more or less spontaneous and well-defined nucleus the candidate could not launch his campaign. The party organizations have nothing whatever to do with the forming and developing of these personal followings. Only if and when the candidate succeeds in winning the party nomination under his own steam does the party machine swing into action behind him with all its bunting, brass-bands and ballyhoo. If he is elected his top assistants are chosen from this following — with or without the sanction of the Machine.

Throughout his political career the man in public life must develop and expand his personal following — which is the measure of his political strength. Party bosses may smile or frown upon his candidacy or his incumbency, but the man with the strong personal following is unbeatable, nevertheless.

F.D.R., who has been called the greatest politician of modern times, feared no party. Eisenhower didn't fear the parties either: in fact when his campaign was just budding he said he would not run unless both conventions nominated him! In his political technique he stood in sharp con-

trast to Roosevelt but both men demonstrated the impotence of party machines against a man with a strong personal following. It is the latter that does the campaigning — eventually comprising the dominant portion of the party machine. After Eisenhower was nominated he made a series of “deals” with the regular party bosses (led by the late Senator Taft) in order to gain their support for the general election in the Fall. But note that he, like every other executive worthy of the name, has made many appointments over the heads of party machine bosses.

He named three Democrats to his original cabinet (Durkin, Anderson and Hobby) causing a violent rasping of gears inside the machine!

In victory, the “following” forms the sinews of government, filling most of the top governmental posts. In defeat it becomes the genuine “loyal opposition” and the potential threat which keeps the incumbents “in line.”

California’s cross-filing law permitted former Governor Earl Warren to campaign in Republican and Democratic Parties at the same time and become the first Governor in history to be nominated by voters of both parties. It was his broad-

minded non-partisanism, in fact, that led to his eventual appointment as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court — the first Californian to fill this post. Like F.D.R. and Eisenhower, he was able to build up a wide following of campaigners and boosters in both parties. The careers of all three men are a vindication of California's determination to keep cross-filing. For each of these leaders fashioned his own "party" to a large extent, to fit his own temperament, his own principles — and the particular problems which confronted him at the moment. Each of them chose their own top aides to fill important policy-making posts — even though it meant breaking with the party hacks to do so!

All great leaders, in free governments, have done the same, and when the leader passed on the personalized "party" he built disintegrated along with his bones. And new leaders came along, in time, to grapple with new issues and new problems — and to form new "parties" of followers and campaign workers. Particularly in a dynamic, pioneering, trail-blazing democracy such as ours the stupidity of the theory of fixed,

tradition-bound political parties should have been recognized long ago.

In an age whose world diplomacy is constantly being punctuated by unheralded explosions of atomic and hydrogen bombs we ought to be able to recognize that the traditions which are supposed to be idolized by our two parties are hopelessly irrelevant and impotent. The torchlight sentimentalism of the "two-party system" belongs to a period of our history that has passed; it can no more be "restored" or "renewed" than European Feudalism or the Dark Ages can be reincarnated in the Old World!

LEGISLATIVE BODIES

The choosing of officers and committees in Congress and State Legislatures according to party lines is a piece of ritualism that has thwarted and frustrated genuine statesmanship in America for many generations. The party base of the committees serves no constructive purpose but simply aids in the party's back-stage wire pulling, log-rolling and mutual back-scratching. In the committee room, in the cloakroom, and out on the floor the

party organization has the same obstructionist effect upon legislation for the general welfare as the firmly entrenched "seniority system" for assigning the committees' chairmanships. There is nothing in any of these protocols that could not be easily and profitably cancelled out as soon as we decide we are ready to sweep a few musty cobwebs from our wagon-rut thinking.

ELECTIONS

Here, at last, is where we run up against a stone wall. The election machinery of America is rooted in a vast network of legislation — legislation that is engraved on the statute books of the forty-eight states; and in no two states do we find identical election procedures. Each set of laws is designed with an eye to regulating, restricting and defining the privileges of that state's political parties. They are the fruition of much debate and soul-searching, for the struggles of our ancestors to find true democracy at the ballot boxes of the nation has been a rough and tortuous road. At every election-day milepost

there has loomed the threat of what we have recently learned to call "the smoke-filled room." In each state the maze of restrictive legislation is complex enough, but multiplied by forty-eight it becomes a veritable barb-wire entanglement!

In moving from one state to another people naturally try to bring their voting habits with them, just as they bring along their religions and their lodge membership. But the mammoth crazy-quilt of strange election-day procedure that is waiting to confuse the roving citizen when he ventures across his own state line is, as a rule, something he hasn't counted on. This is one tragic reason why so many Americans have given up voting altogether. Many have come to feel that their bewilderment is the result of some cynical conspiracy and have resigned themselves to "leave politics to those who understand it" — with the present disastrous effect upon the integrity of our democratic processes.

It is this "stone wall" phase of the party structure that has engaged the attention of California voters. Citizens of the Gold Rush State — with the bold, forthrightness of pioneers written into their state's history — care "not a hoot nor a

holler” for all the tired old party promises and inane platforms which represent so shoddy an example of the “responsibility” which the Bosses like to orate about. California’s progressive electorate seems content to simply get away from it all and vote for those men, regardless of party labels, who either have demonstrated their ability and integrity or who seem worth taking a chance on. And to balance up the odds in the gamble the voters have developed the initiative, referendum and recall to a high degree of efficiency. They prefer these non-partisan weapons — and the merit system for filling “political jobs”—to any fanciful “party responsibility.”

Before cross-filing was introduced, the state’s “closed primary” system formed a Maginot Line against all independent voters. For in California each voter receives only the ballot of his own party as he enters the voting booth, and the non-partisan who “declines to state” a party preference forfeits his chance to vote in the primaries.

However, since the candidates may cross-file their names to both party ballots the non-partisan can, as an alternative, name either party as his “preference” and still find almost all candidates

listed on his ballot regardless of party. This non-partisan action on his part in no way interferes with his neighbor's privilege of voting a "straight party ticket" should he so desire.

In our democratic republic the struggle to remain unfettered has centered around such issues as: (1) the direct primary, (2) the initiative, referendum and recall, (3) the introduction of civil service merit systems, (4) relaxation of voting restrictions, (5) re-enfranchisement of "decline-to-state" voters, (6) popular election of United States Senators, judges, school boards and local administrators, (7) woman's suffrage, and (8) the greatest seven-league stride of all, the cross-filing of candidates' names to both party ballots so that every voter can see the entire field.

These are peculiarly non-partisan issues. Americans have had to battle the party bosses every inch of the way to push them through! And they are still at it, for eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It is disconcerting, therefore, to find so many of our so-called "liberal leaders" ready, at the drop of the hat, to throw in their lot with the notorious party bosses—just as though America had no finer brand of liberalism to defend than

that exemplified, for instance, at the 1952 national conventions!

One cannot help but recall the bitter, challenging words of Walt Whitman, one of America's best-loved poets, who penned the following remarks as he observed a political campaign of a century ago:

"Today, of all the persons in public office in the States, not one in a thousand has been chosen by a spontaneous movement of the people; all have been nominated and put through by great or small caucuses of the politicians, or appointed as rewards for electioneering.

"Well, what more? Is nothing but breed upon breed like these to be represented? Where is the real America? Where are the laboring persons, ploughmen, men with axes, scythes, flails? Where are the carpenters, machinists, masons? Where is the spirit of manliness and commonsense in these States? It does not appear in the Government. Never were these States so insulted, and attempted to be betrayed.

"Whence the delegates of the politicians? Whence the Buchanan and Fillmore conventions? [representing the Democratic and Whig Parties] Not from sturdy American Freemen; not from industrious homes nor thrifty farms; not from the ranks of fresh-bodied young men — not from among teachers, savants, — not from among learned, beloved and temperate persons. . . ."

More and more frequently, nowadays, as the enemies of freedom all over the world close in on

their victims, we hear the question echoed in America by some lone, despairing voice—"What is happening to liberalism in the United States?" With each repetition the query seems to grow more academic and rhetorical.

Why has the question of liberalism in America become academic? Is it because the study of political science in our schools has become content to remain academic? Is America paying the penalty today because political science in our universities has remained a dry-as-dust "descriptive" and "analytic" subject, like nineteenth century history or grammar? Perhaps it has concentrated too heavily on classifying and pigeon-holing the experiments and blunders of our groping past.

No doubt if American political scientists, like present-day biologists or geologists, for example, strove to relate their subject to the actual problems that confront us today our textbooks would not be filled as they are with obsolete gibberish about "party programs" and "party responsibility." If the basic, grass-roots drives and political trends were as clearly understood by the high-brows in our colleges as they are by the "rabble" who mark ballots in voting booths we

might have a better chance to avoid the chaos that sometimes appears to be just around the corner.

Yet the "cultural lag" theory is supposed to refer principally to that mythical "man in the street"—the hoi-polloi! In the September 1950, issue of the "American Political Science Review" an effort was made to summarize the best thinking of the entire profession relative to the strengthening of our Country's political structure. The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse entitled "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System." This lengthy study was so completely unrelated to the actualities of the American political scene that it could well be recommended to weary social science students as "escape literature!" It seemed to be discussing, not the structure of American democracy, but the imaginary figment of some strange scene on a far-away planet.

We have failed to build political structures to encourage the rapid development of competent leadership and to facilitate the speedy handling of the urgent issues which confront our atomic age. Instead we have allowed "politics -for-profit"

to develop as a normal facet of our dollar-dominated "American way of life." Foreign observers have noted that "In the United States everything is for sale—even the politicians." It is an unfair generalization, of course, though not entirely unjustified.

We have sown the wind and are reaping the whirlwind. In recent years the parties, with their torchlight parades, conventions and carnivals, seem to have concentrated on trying to out-clown one another.

Only well-fed, geographically-isolated America could possibly have gotten away with so frivolous an attitude toward politics!

But the invention of the airplane has sobered some of us, and the invention of the atomic bomb has scared the rest of us stiff. We are beginning to sense that something more than a pair of symbolic animals will be required to save us and our civilization from complete annihilation.

The tools we need to clean out the sink-holes of American politics and equip ourselves to cope with the perilous stalemates of international affairs are immediately within our grasp. But we have been too preoccupied with prostrating our-

selves before political totem-poles to develop these tools intelligently. We have failed to utilize the very democracy which the pioneers of our nation have bequeathed to us.

In the foregoing pages we have seen that America's political parties are more legendary than they are real. What many of us have ludicrously assumed to be all-encompassing and all-powerful we find to be composed largely of superstition and mysticism. Frequently we have been like the small boy who complained that

“Last night, on the stair,
I saw a funny little man
Who wasn't even there!
He wasn't there again today—
(Oh, how I wish he'd go away!)”

America is mature enough to lay aside the bogey-men and tall tales surrounding her political structure and grapple with the tangible realities. And these realities, as we have seen, can be approached only on a non-partisan basis.

Since the days of the Founding Fathers non-partisanism, as a courageous movement against

centralized power in our political life, has had a difficult time of it. During our own generation it has burst forth as a spontaneous Midwestern revolt of agrarianism against an intolerable banking structure, and more recently as the united political voice of workingmen. The Non-Partisan League of the wheat farmers and Labor's Non-Partisan League twenty years later were destined to be short-lived, however, since they argued only for two segments of America's economy.

There is no doubting, however, that the basic approach of these great movements—involving disenchantment from the hypnotic spell of the party machine bosses—is clearly indicated in the present stage of political erosion into which we have finally muddled.

CHAPTER TEN

LET'S GET TO WORK!

Today, American citizens, regardless of occupation, who still believe democracy can be made to function, can easily carry the political balance of power against the entrenched Machines. If we will act in unison the proud banner of non-partisanship can wave for every citizen who has a stake in our nation's future and who abhors the corruption in his government and the moral stagnation in high places close to the government.

But we must mobilize the high-principled, moral elements in our schools and churches, in our civic, business, labor, professional and veteran's groups, in our governmental agencies and patriotic organizations. We need to enlist all who are convinced that by a united non-partisan effort we can re-

move the selfish political forces which have a tight strangle-hold on our election machinery.

Unhampered by the legal restrictions which would surround us if we formed "just another third party" our non-partisan league in each community can select people of competence and independence for every elective office, whether local, state or national. We will run them as candidates on whatever party ticket promises greatest success. After working for their election we will support them in their legislative halls as a loyal peoples' lobby—providing them the grass-roots support which legislators have seldom enjoyed in the past!

To prevent corruption of state and local non-partisan leagues the major aims of each one should be indelibly and unchangeably engraved into the charter of the local organization. If any league should abandon its basic tenets it will also abandon its right to use the title of the organization.

Unlike a political party, each local non-partisan league can be kept self-cleansing — eliminating traitors and "phonies" as soon as they are found violating the charter. Each local and state league

will manage its own affairs and raise its own funds to elect its own chosen slates of candidates. The national organization will serve chiefly as a clearing house for accumulating and coordinating information and statistics to aid the overall national picture.

At the County Seat or Town Hall one can usually get copies of maps for determining boundaries of the various election districts. When local non-partisan leagues have been organized for choosing and electing state legislators and town and county officials, these groups should be brought together on a Congressional District basis to undertake the selection of a Representative in Congress. For endorsing and campaigning for United States Senators, Governors and other state-wide officers the Congressional Districts should send delegates to state councils.

As soon as any local or state league becomes powerful enough to accomplish results the professional party politicians will attempt to move in and take over. Whether they are successful or not must remain the responsibility of the conscientious leaders of each group. Of course, if the customary run of party-minded individuals are

permitted to run the show from a party standpoint, then the betrayed name of the organization will automatically be detached from the corrupted unit. Much will depend, of course, on the fibre of those who ascend to leadership in each local league. Only those wholeheartedly and unswervingly committed to the league's ideals should be permitted a voice in the group's affairs.

The new type of organization should succeed in developing a host of tough-minded meeting-chairmen who do not tolerate the slightest deviation or distraction from the central goal. Those who waste the organization's time with such tactics must be disciplined together with the long-winded member who makes a hundred words do the work of ten. If every non-partisan league meeting is very brief and very much to the point the over-all success of the movement will be assured.

The program will vary according to the political situation and election laws in each state. The immediate work of the local league should be concentrated toward finding and electing a high type of men and women to fill every elective office in every election district. In each district the

voters should be urged to register into the party of that candidate which the league has chosen to back—regardless of former sentimental affiliations. If we are to be successful we must be at least as realistic as the enemy—we must use the legal party machinery as it is presently geared to operate: as a practical instrumentality rather than as a romantic fetish.

When each election is over the interest and the membership that have been built up must be put to work planning for the long-term objectives to which the local league is to dedicate itself. The basic essentials should be the development and promotion of:—

1. Cross-filing laws where none exist.
2. Non-partisan ballots to re-enfranchise “decline-to-state” voters in primary elections.
3. A national primary for choosing Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates.
4. Introduction of the initiative, referendum and recall where they do not already exist.
5. Extension of civil service merit systems to all levels of government.
6. Drafting laws to disqualify candidates for their own false statements during a campaign.
7. Providing state-controlled publicity allocations for all candidates and issues—in press, radio and television.

8. Proclamation of all election days as legal holidays.
9. Shifting of alcoholic beverage licensing from state to local control, in order to protect juveniles, and improve local law enforcement.
10. Place narcotics law enforcement in the hands of citizens' committees not approachable by the political "payoff."
11. Conversion of state legislatures into unicameral bodies, thus raising the standards and pay of the members—as well as facilitating control of lobbies.
12. Encouragement of "peoples' lobbies" and staffs of government-supported technical experts to advise legislative committees—in order to eliminate the present one-sided influence of private lobbyists. Tightening of lobby registrations laws.
13. Extending the democratic principle of home rule to cities and counties.
14. Liberalizing of voting restrictions to broaden the base of the electorate.
15. Extension of free public educational facilities.
16. Improvement of local industrial health and safety laws, workmen's compensation, and child-labor restrictions.
17. More equitable administration of veterans' affairs, to favor the returned service man rather than the lending institutions.
18. Applying the principle of "ability to pay" to all tax levies.
19. Rewriting of obsolete state constitutions to streamline governmental functions and eliminate duplication and overlapping.

20. Stimulating popular interest in politics by dramatizing and celebrating the dislodgment of political bosses, their corrupt machines and their spoils system.

Other issues, both immediate and long-term, will be waiting for the local leagues to grapple with—issues which the two parties have been unwilling to tackle because of their “controversial nature.” In fact the non-partisan league will find itself actually performing those little chores which are traditionally and theoretically, but never actually, the province of the Party. These will include “clarifying” new ideas, “debating” controversial matters, spotting and ousting the traitors and fakers from the ranks, actively taking sides on all issues and aggressively working to elect a high type of candidate to each office—they are all “party” duties which American political parties, paradoxically, cannot perform, for such is the stupid partisan morass into which we have blindly led ourselves!

The national office of the league will stand ready to put you into contact with others in your state and community who see promise in such a program as outlined above. It will attempt to provide a national cohesion and national view-

point for educational and election campaigns on the nation-wide level. Further than that it will have no jurisdiction. The conditions in each state must dictate the local program.

Our new concept of political organization will face the fact of state sovereignty — 48 separate entities, 48 separate sets of laws, 48 sets of historical precedents each one jealously guarded. The peculiar combination of national cohesion and state sovereignty has never been held in political balance by the parties. The latter have had no effective national organization to perfect such a balance. They have, instead, endeavored to be all things to all men and to all big interests. As a result they have been nothing, from the standpoint of cohesion and historical effectiveness. The non-partisan league can, if it wills to do it, face all issues and all men squarely, and in the doing it will provide, also, a genuine program and a genuine responsibility, without farce and without flinching!

With a purpose such as this formed into a dynamic program, carried forward by determined men and women eager to recapture their fading dream of “popular sovereignty” a thrilling new

vitality will soon spread across the land. It will infect the great bulk of the conscientious citizenry of every state of the 48—and in time remake the entire warp and woof of our present shakey political structure.

And in the offing will eventually appear the irresistible force of a revived democracy to reclaim the confidence of all those who love freedom everywhere. We shall present an overwhelming challenge to warmakers and corrupters of the people's will wherever they occur.

The Machines, with all their end-products of disillusionment, despair and cynical resignation will not have to be kicked out! In the warm sunlight of a re-awakened and re-energized American democracy they will disappear like the last snows of winter!

771051
“The juices of history seem to be working on our two major parties.”

—ROBERT BENDINER
(Politics and People, Dec. 1949.)

* * *

“ . . . the Democratic platform is sheer platitudes and the Republican is mere noisy ambiguity . . . ”

—WALTER LIPPMANN
(after the 1952 Conventions.)

* * *

“What is called a two-party system in the United States is a myth . . . ”

—RAYMOND MOLEY
(How to Keep Our Liberty.—Dec. '52)

* * *

“The United States cannot afford one more of these quadrennial orgies. It is time for America to grow up.”

—DOROTHY THOMPSON
(after the 1952 elections.)

CALIFORNIA COMMITTEE TO SAVE CROSS-FILING

Harold M. Guthrie (for Education)
(Professor of History, West Coast University)

Thomas R. Kennedy (for Agriculture)
Fresno, Calif.

Norman Bancroft (for Labor)
(U.R.M. Local 941)

J. K. Lambertson, D.D. (for the Churches)
(Pastor, Southwest Lutheran Church, Los Angeles)

James M. Hall (for Veterans)
(U.S.N. retired)

Harvey Ackerman (for Business)
(Pres. Monmoth Machine Corp.)

Helen M. Turner (for Women's Groups)

George H. Fisher (at large) Chairman

Francis B. Turner (at large)

Martha Danielson (at large)

Peter Roberts (at large)

“On a shelf in my cellar are two bulky wine bottles which remind me of America’s political parties. Both have gaudy labels, boasting luridly of their contents. However, both are empty!”

—JAMES BRYCE
(“The American Commonwealth”)

“In America the party goals are not good government but merely the sordid spoils of victory.”

—ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE
(“Democracy In America”)