

President Murray in support of President Roosevelt and the war. The political significance of the Lovestone types remain; they are the American version of the notorious Frenchman, Jacques Doriot, henchman of Laval.

All these muddy waters furnish ideal fishing grounds for the sinister forces of the Fifth Column, Hitler's secret weapon in the United States. None of them should be underestimated. The terrible experiences of all countries conquered by Hitler must teach America to be vigilant and on guard against all these breeding grounds of recruits for the Fifth Column in its widely ramified conspiracies against a victorious consummation of the war.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND NATIONAL UNITY

THE MAIN currents of public life in the United States continue to develop within the channels of the traditional two-party system, through the Republican and Democratic parties. There is no immediate prospect of a fundamental change in the formal aspects of this political system.

Beneath the surface appearance of two long-standing rival political parties representing conflicting programs for the country, however, the realities of life are not so static. On the contrary, most profound changes are taking place. The institutionalized party structure, preserved by tradition and habit, as well as by its being imbedded in statutory law, furnishes only the shell within which the political life of the country evolves. And within each major party struc-

ture all political currents and ideas find expression, some more, some less, without much apparent system or coherence. The apparent simplicity of American politics hides a complexity equal to that of any other country.

There is a certain arbitrariness, therefore, in dealing with our national politics by examining the Republican and Democratic parties separately. It is apparent to every student that the real political forces in our country, engaged in struggle to determine the policies of the nation, cut across all party lines; that in the political battles that take place, the party structure serves only as a sort of fixed fortification sometimes occupied by one side, sometimes by another; in some places by the one, in other places by the other. The structures themselves furnish no reliable guide to the battle lines.

This is especially true in relation to the problems of national unity and the policies required for victory. Party labels come to mean less and less. No firm attitude permeates either the Republican or the Democratic Party, whether they be examined nationally, regionally, by states, or locally, on any of the questions of the day.

Keeping this fact in mind, we will nevertheless find it convenient to examine political issues and relationships as they are expressed through these major political structures, the ossified forms of past political experience in which the living politics of the day must move and work.

The difficulties of this method appear the moment we begin to attempt a description of the Republican Party in relation to the problems of national unity. The titular head of the Republican Party is Wendell Willkie. Yet Mr. Willkie expresses an attitude toward these problems which is closer to that of President Roosevelt, head of the Democratic Party, than it is to the attitude of most leading

Republicans. Evidently there is no "typical" Republican Party attitude.

Certain *trends* of policy can, however, be clearly traced. Those interests, groups, and individuals who naturally respond to Hitler's Fifth Column tend first of all to turn to the Republican Party as their channel of political expression (except in the "solid South" where the Democratic Party has a monopoly). This was illustrated in the "Memorandum" of the Fifth Column quoted in Chapter III, which raised the prospect that the "German suggestion" of "changing the spirit of the nation" could "center around the Republican National Committee." Further, within Congress the reactionary bloc which so often controls a majority against Roosevelt's policies has as its core Republicans allied with *Southern* Democrats who could as easily be Republicans if they moved north of the Mason-Dixon Line. In the past, the Republican Party was the chief vehicle of the "isolationist" trend of thought, and this inheritance facilitates the pro-German and appeasement trends today in the Republican councils. Two of the most influential figures in Republican affairs most sharply express this trend: former President Hoover, and the Presidential candidate of 1936, Alfred Landon. Senator Robert Taft, edged out of the Republican nomination in 1940 by Willkie, is another of similar inclinations. This trend dominates in *official* and *party-machine* circles of the Republicans.

Willkie is the outstanding leader of the national unity forces in the Republican Party. He exerts growing influence among the "non-professional" ranks of his party, but experiences increasing resistance from its machine dominated by professional politicians.

Thomas E. Dewey represents the Hoover-Landon

forces, but maneuvers to avoid the sharp issues in his struggle against Willkie and the national unity forces.

The appeasement-isolationist camp made a strategic retreat at the recent meeting of the Republican National Committee, when they accepted a compromise tending to support the Willkie formulations condemning isolationist doctrines. That this was only a retreat, not a surrender, is demonstrated by the whole course of events since then, for the appeasers have not changed their practical politics one iota.

Thus the Republican Party is the scene of struggle between the two main political camps in the country. The party itself is not an entity, and cannot be classified as a whole, in the actual politics of the day.

It is of more than ordinary importance to emphasize this estimate of the Republican Party, since a similar process goes on in the Democratic Party which formally controls the administration of the national government. The mass of citizens, the workers, farmers, and lower middle-classes, having only the Republican and Democratic Party machines through which to find electoral expression when they commit themselves to a simple "party" allegiance, become mere pawns to whichever main political tendency happens to control their chosen "party" at a particular time and place.

Effective political action in the election of governmental officials and legislators, on the part of the masses of voters, therefore demands that they shall have a "neutral" attitude toward "the Republican Party" as toward "the Democratic Party," that the party label shall be looked upon as a formality, a technicality, so long as the masses still have no party which really belongs to them in a complete sense. Since the two-party system is so firmly established in law

and custom, since the real divisions within the country on immediate policy cut across both major party lines, since the camp of privilege and reactionary influence manipulates within both major parties to cancel out the masses of the people and monopolize political power in the hands of the upper classes—there is therefore no immediate course possible for the masses except themselves to become “bi-partisan,” to be ready to throw their votes and influence to one or the other *according to which main tendency of politics dominates its candidates and proposals at each time and place.*

This is the main thought necessary to emphasize in relation to the Republican Party and the issues of national unity. It is the rejection of “politics as usual,” the most damaging form of which is, among the people, a blind adherence to party label or an equally blind prejudice against any particular label. During this critical period we Americans need, above all, to be “non-partisan” or “bi-partisan” in relation to the traditional major party structure. This is the only way the masses of the people can impose their national unity within the governmental structure, within Congress, and within the forty-eight state administrations.

The consequence of this approach of an open mind, without prejudice, toward the Republican Party, will strengthen the forces of national unity within it and weaken the appeasement-isolationist-reactionary camp. And, equally important, it will simultaneously have the same influence upon the Democratic Party, where reactionary influences thrive upon blind party allegiance.

In a few states, this approach will bring labor and the non-partisan masses to support, in general, the Republican Party tickets, in others to fight uncompromisingly against the Republican Party. And in most states, it will lead to

support of individual Republican candidates who have distinguished themselves as more progressive than their Democratic Party rivals, especially for legislative posts.

This approach is essentially nothing but an effort to unite those like-minded persons who are now divided by artificial party lines, pending the time when parties can again become the means of unity, not of division.

From quite a different viewpoint, judgments of a similar nature were voiced recently by Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, “member of the Republican Party organization longest in its service,” and bearer of culture to Hoover, Landon, and fellows. Mr. Butler says quite frankly: “There is no longer any Republican Party.” Nominal Republicans “are far from being in agreement on fundamental principles.”\* He sees a similar situation regarding the Democrats.

Dr. Butler’s political views are of the extreme conservative brand usually known as “Tory.” But since the Tories always discredit themselves before the masses of their own generation, they always change their name in the next generation, indignantly denying their own political parents. So Dr. Butler calls his own present-day political camp, scattered now between Republican and Democratic parties, the “Constitutional Liberals.” He foresees their uniting in a new political party, which cannot use the name “Republican” because its hope for national supremacy lies in uniting with the “poll tax” Democrats of the South, who would risk losing their dictatorial control there if they tried to use that traditionally hated name.

We are not interested, of course, in helping unite the Tory Republicans with the “poll tax” Democrats of the

\* “Should There Be Two New Parties?” *New York Times Magazine*, July 26, 1942.



South in order to put that combination in control of the nation. On the contrary, we can think of nothing so disastrous for our country, or productive of such deep-going divisions and struggles as this inevitably would be. We would oppose with all energy such a new combination of forces in its ambitions to control our nation. Nevertheless, there is much to be learned by a careful study and evaluation of the Butler ideology and political tendency.

At this point it will help emphasize one of the main points of this book if we make it clear that the national unity we are advocating is not to the exclusion of Dr. Butler and his associates of both parties. *To the extent that they are prepared to subordinate their own special interests and ideologies to the needs of victory in this war, Tories and Communists can severally and jointly contribute to national unity*, together with all others. We assume, throughout this book, that there are patriots in all classes, parties, and groupings, whose unity and collaboration will be decisive for the unity of the nation, and who will more and more, as the issues arise more sharply, subordinate their own special interests, ideas, and prejudices to the pressing needs of the war for survival, to the requirements of victory over the Axis.

This book, from beginning to end, is designed to help break down all obstacles to such an all-embracing national unity.

The Republican Party can and will, from its many-million nominal followers and their leaders, make vital contributions to this national unity. At the same time, within the Republican Party there operates the most powerful section of the enemies of national unity and of victory.

A life-and-death political struggle is already going on within the Republican Party between these two forces and

tendencies. In many individual leaders we can see the struggle going on in their own minds and hearts. It is a complex and complicated struggle. As its issues are more sharply and clearly raised and fought out, to that degree the nation will find the guarantee that Baron von Killinger's hopes in the Republican Party will not be realized.

Perhaps Dr. Butler is right in his judgment that there are only the millions of Republican voters but no Republican Party. Perhaps he is further correct in believing that the Republican Party must disappear in a general political regrouping in the country which will more nearly correspond to the issues and alignments of the day.

If these things are true, then it is even more true that the new regrouping and political-party crystallization that must take place will be dominated by the war, by the conceptions held as to the nature of the war, and as a consequence by the policies that are put forth as the road to victory in the war. And these are the only important questions of the day, regardless of what the future may hold for particular parties.

All leaders and factions of the Republican Party are, since December 7, 1941, committed in words to victory. No public figure in any party dares to express openly a defeatist and appeasement attitude now—except Norman Thomas, who seems to be granted a special immunity, perhaps something like that given to the weak-minded. But this is only a verbal unity, behind which the struggle goes on more fiercely than ever. Thus when the Republican National Committee compromised on Wendell Willkie's formulations on war policy, this was immediately taken by isolationists and appeasers like Senator Brooks of Illinois as the starting point for an election campaign on the platform of their own notorious record, thus completely

nullifying their formal acceptance of the Willkie resolution. Such are the every-day realities of the political game as it is played in this democratic U.S.A.

The greatest threat against our victory in this war is the confusion sown among the people by such double-dealing cynicism in the handling of war policy, by the multiple masks which are used to hide the real face of the defeatists and appeasers. To penetrate these masks to the reality, and expose the reality to the people, is a central problem for the winning of the war.

There are a few common-sense rules for identifying the defeatists in the Republican high command. Take those most energetic in propagating defeatist and pro-German ideas before December 7, and ask if they have publicly corrected those ideas since then, or if they have merely remained silent about them. It is, of course, entirely legitimate to assume that December 7 may have shown some of them that they were wrong before, that they have sincerely changed their minds, and they should from now on be dealt with as loyal and patriotic citizens. In that case, the only thing to be held against them is their past gullibility, a demonstrated weakness that should count against an aspirant to public office. Such a change of mind requires very tangible evidence to be convincing.

In the case of such Republican politicians as Hamilton Fish, Jr., who began his career in 1933 as the American representative of Hitler's International Committee, and whose Capitol office was a base of operations for George Sylvester Viereck up to the moment he was indicted and sent to prison, there is of course nothing to debate. Hamilton Fish's cynical campaign for re-election "on his record" is nothing but the expression of his opinion that in his district the majority of voters are still controlled by the

conscious pro-Nazi "Cliveden set" Americans—and unfortunately he may prove correct in this opinion. As to this, we will know a few weeks after this book appears in print.

Strangely enough, however, the very same publicists who denounce Fish and his record in the next breath give their warm greetings and congratulations to Herbert Hoover and his new book, produced in collaboration with Mr. Hugh Gibson, *The Problems of Lasting Peace*. This is strange, because Mr. Hoover is the real American manager of the "political vineyard" in which Mr. Fish was, after all, only a humble "worker," and his book is the platform for American imperialists in this war. It was Hoover's protégé, Colonel Lindbergh, who openly declared in the summer of 1941 that he preferred an alliance with Hitler-Germany rather than with the Soviet Union. Hoover, in anticipation of the United Nations, called it a "gargantuan jest"; he elaborately argued that there will be "no possibility of bringing the war to conclusion except by a compromise peace"; he urged that the way to get rid of Hitler is to make peace with him: "Hitler's real weakness would be in peace"; he argued that the United States and the Western Hemisphere could live peacefully with a Hitler-dominated Europe: "It would not be pleasant, but it can be done"; and so on *ad nauseam*.\*

He anticipated his present "surrender of freedom" during wartime when he would not be able to repeat, in his book, all his basic ideas. But in his book, by expounding in a veiled form the roots of his political platform, without repudiating a single one of its planks, he has in fact completely reaffirmed it in its entirety.

What makes Herbert Hoover's book an ominous portent

\*Speech delivered over National Broadcasting Corporation radio network, June 29, 1941.

is not that he wrote and published it. It is not the contents of the book as such, for it is intellectually beneath contempt. It is rather the fact that at this moment of world crisis this contemptible book was greeted as a "valuable contribution" by Democrats and Republicans alike; by most of the newspapers of the country, liberal and reactionary; and there was hardly a critical note to be heard in the whole chorus.

How in the world can America fight through to victory in this desperate war if its "molders of public opinion" are so shallow-pated or venal that they hail Hoover's shoddy piece of defeatism as a "great service" to the country at war?

Hoover remains a powerful influence in the national councils of the Republican Party. He heads the most conscious and best organized section of the party machinery; he represents the worst forces of monopoly capital of the most unenlightened sort, the American counterparts of the French "200 families" who welcomed Hitler's conquest of their country as a salvation from their own people. Hoover symbolizes as well as leads the upper-class defeatists who are the greatest danger to national unity and to victory.

The Republican rank and file must be won away from the leadership of Hoover and his friends. That is the problem of national unity and the Republican Party.

## CHAPTER X

### THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND NATIONAL UNITY

UNQUESTIONABLY the Democratic Party, which is the administration party, gathering over twenty-seven million votes in the 1940 elections for President Roosevelt, is the chief factor in the matter of national unity, in so far as political parties are concerned. It not only retains the backing of a great national majority but it also furnishes the chief political foundations for the wartime administration, the most important organizational strongholds and rallying centers for the broadest national unity. At the same time, however, it must be noted that the Democratic Party contains within itself some of the most damaging Fifth Column forces, that by its reliance upon the "solid South" of poll tax and "white superiority" it is resting upon a dangerously rotten foundation, and that it is honey-combed with defeatist and appeaser elements busily conspiring behind the scenes against an all-out drive for victory in the war.

The most important single factor in the Democratic Party is, of course, the man who is Commander-in-Chief of the potentially strongest nation on earth, and thereby one of the most important factors in the world situation—President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In the period of fatal confusions, from the end of 1939 to the first half of 1941, I have spoken and written many bitter words of criticism against President Roosevelt. Since