Expressed Views Of Liberal Party

Two things are evident from this. One is the obvious fact that Fischer and Fry, in breaking with the two magazines because they advocated friendship with the USSR, were expressing the real position of the Liberal Party on Soviet-American relations, irrespective of the sugar-coating that party might use in presenting its platform to the public.

Second, it exposes the fact that Liberal Party claim to being the channel of political expression for liberalism is a thorough sham. The Nation and New Republic are major organs of liberalism in this country. Fischer and Fry, by their resignations, have revealed that they and the Liberal Party are in fact isolated from the main stream of American liberalism.

If the Liberal Party has thus far managed to get away with its pretense of representing liberal opinion, it is chiefly through default. I have always felt, and feel now, that the American Labor Party, whose policies and aims are far more akin to those adopted by genuine liberals, has been remiss in allowing the Liberal Party to pose as the voice of liberalism.

Opposition From Within

Incidentally, another expression of the isolation of the Liberal Party from liberals, is the recent action of Dorothy Norman, New York Post columnist, in combatting the Liberal Party's coalition with Dewey in the New York elections. Mrs. Norman, a Liberal Party vice-president, is one of the very few officers of that party not directly associated with David Dubinsky's Social Democratic crowd.

The main trend in liberalism associates itself with labor and with those sections of agriculture and business that follow a policy of friendship with the USSR in foreign affairs and of progress at home.

Reaction, whether in the form of Dubinskyite Social Democracy or Peglerian pro-fascism, has, of course, made contiuous efforts to disrupt that association or unity, and its chief weapon has been red-baiting. It is now trying to distort the current discussions within the Communist Political Association concerning future American Communist policy for its divisive purposes.

Unfortunately, Eleanor Roosevelt gave it a helping hand with her column advocating an "authoritative solution" to the Communist question. Joseph Starobin has already discussed the implications of Mrs. Roosevelt's column. I simply want to note that those who aim to split the ranks of liberalism and of liberal-labor unity for the very same reasons that Fischer and Fry broke with the Nation and New Republic have seized upon Mrs. Roosevelt's column with glee.

Pegler, Riesel and Mrs. Roosevelt

Symbolically, on the very same day, last Thursday, both Westbrook Pegler and Victor Riesel, the Post columnist who frequently acts as Dubinsky's mouthpiece, jumped to Mrs. Roosevelt's defense.

Distorting Starobin's criticism of Mrs. Roosevelt's column, Riesel "warned" that the "switch in Communist philosophy" will result in a "period of assault" upon liberals who have advocated unity of all "left wing and progresives." This is a clumsy effort to set the liberals against the advanced sections of the labor movement represented by the Communists.

At the same time, Pegler, for the first time in our memory, actually eulogized Mrs. Roosevelt. He expressed the hope that she was not only speaking for herself but that her column was "prepared after the most careful consultation of her political associates."

"As a sincere suggestion, I would urge that Mrs. Roosevelt take an active part in exposing and discrediting Communists with whom she is better acquainted than most of us and in destroying their old pretense of 'liberalism'," Pegler wrote.

When Pegler becomes gleeful about anything Mrs. Roosevelt does, it is time for her to get worried and to reexamine her position.