and his victory last July over Taft for the nomination was based primarily on the fact that he stood for a continuation of the same basic policies that the present administration has carried out over the past 20 years.

So it can be confidently predicted that the only noticeable change for some time to come will be the change in the personnel that run the government agencies here and abroad, together with their assistants and ward-heelers who are not protected by Civil Service.

"Labor" and Domestic Policy

The Democratic Party, traditionally, has been regarded as the party of the workers, and at least in the last 20 years as the party of "social progress", the choice of those with "liberal" and "forward" ideas. In many large American cities, political machines have been built up by this party and political bosses such as Hague of Jersey City, Curley of Boston, Flynn of The Bronx, Kelly of Chicago, etc. have so organized the working-class vote so as to be able to deliver smashing victories in these large centers of population, large enough victories to overcome the Republican majorities in the rural areas. Whatever is left of these machines today, their efficiency seems to have been greatly impaired, in fact they appear to have failed quite miserably in delivering the votes to the Democratic Party's National candidates of '52.

If a division of the population can be made on the basis of "reactionary" versus "progressive" thinkers we find that the argument as to the "liberals" being Democrats and the reactionaries, Republican is often found to be quite the opposite. For example, while the progressive and industrial big cities in the North invariably vote Democratic with the backward rural areas just as invariably voting Republican, the exact reverse is the case in the South, for we find whatever Republican strength there is in Dixie existing in the cities, with the backward rural areas stanchly Democratic. Furthermore, for every arch reactionary that belongs to the Republican Party at least one can be pointed to in the Democratic fold. Even the Democratic Party's nominee for vice-president, Senator Sparkman of Alabama, has a long time record against Civil Liberties legislation, and those Democratic chieftains who referred to the Senator as a Southern Liberal must have done so with tongue in cheek.

The question of organized labor, however, and the new administration's attitude toward it looms big and there is much fear that organized Labor will suffer. Certainly it can be said that Mr. Eisenhower owes no debt to Labor's bosses, all of whom came out strongly for Mr. Stevenson. That Labor can be any worse off though because of a Republican victory than it has been under the Democrats is something which we would take issue with. Despite the credit that is given the Democrats, the gains that Labor has made in the past twenty years have been attributable to its activities on the economic front which is the only front on which unions belongs. The 40-hour week, the rights of picketing and organizing were not "given" to us by America's capitalist politicians until they were first wrested through long and costly strikes by powerful unions and until the fact was patently demonstrated that these gains for the workers would not fundamentally impair the capitalist system. In fact the Democratic Party's slogan in the '52 campaign: "You never had it so good" fits the capitalists much more than it does the workers.

Korea and World Policy

One of the chief promises made by General Eisenhower, toward the end of the campaign was that if elected he would, within a short period of time, go to Korea, where he could gain first hand a clearer picture of what America faced in that war-torn land. A wave of hope seemed to be raised by this pledge

that the General might be able to bring Mr. Truman's "Police Action" to a rapid end and it is possible that a lot of votes were switched because of it.

That this startling promise was, in the main, campaign oratory is apparent, however, and not only to Democrats and those of us who see through the entire capitalist tissue. Styles Bridges of New Hampshire a leading Republican senator in an article appearing in the Boston Globe for Nov. 10, states:

> **"It is not merely a Korean war; it is a world war; the fighting in Korea is only the most active portion of it . .**
>
> **"No responsible Republican or Democrat, General or Admiral, to my knowledge, has any plan for 'ending' this war.**
>
> **"THERE IS NO PARALLEL NOR LATITUDE NOR NATIONAL BOUNDARY ON WHICH WE CAN 'SIGN AN ARMISTICE' AND 'GO HOME'."**

And for those who still naively believe that the General will cut taxes because he will be able to cut the military budget, Senator Bridges has the following answer:

> **"So we are at war. And we are likely to be at war for many years. The President we have elected will be a war President; our economy will continue to be a war economy. Our taxes will be high; our sons will be drafted into the military; our responsibilities will be heavy."**

Of course the Senator is right. shall see, there is more to the Marxist definition of the value of a commodity than this.

However, not having read Thoreau, also a non-economist, on Value, we will rest content to take Schulberg's interpretation below.

First off, Schulberg rejects the "rigid materialism" involved in the Marxist definition, which according to him states that "the cost of a tion of some of America's European satellites to the Russian camp.

Another factor which will operate to keep Government spending high and perhaps even higher is the deteriorating economic outlook for the next 4 years. According to James Reston in the N. Y. Sunday Times for Nov. 9:

> **"But the world market is no longer wide open, the world demand for goods is not nearly so far ahead of the world supply as it was in the Truman years, and the problem coming up is not so much that of production, but the problem of distribution, which has caused more polical headaches for more governments in our generation than almost any other."**

Mr. Reston states further:

> **". . . .despite all the talk of inflation, the best quess of the economists here is that deflation and unemployment — the more permanent curses of our age — will be a problem long before there is another election."**

Unless the incoming administration intends to deal with future business slumps in the same lackadaisical manner as did the last Republican Government, an extremely unlikely occurrence. America's capitalists can confidently look forward to increased rather than decreased military and other employment creating budgets and higher, rather than lower taxes. The government can, of course, always get around such a blatant about-face by blaming the state of the world on the previous gang.

Importance of the Vote

The campaign of 1952 is said to have upset traditions and broken records. One record it certainly did shatter is in the money spent. The voters were harangued like they were never harangued before and the same capitalists who display such parsimony toward Labor's demands for pay-raises appeared not to mind in the least the expense involved. A single half-hour television

---

* **What Makes Sammy Run, The Harder They Fall,** and **The Disenchanted,** in the same order.