

Demagogy Can't Hide GOP Reactionary Aim

By William Z. Foster —

The national convention of the Republican Party in Chicago has left behind it such a stench of defeatism, isolationism and imperialism that many of the party heads, became, alarmed at the negative

effects upon the masses of voters, are now trying to make us forget the reactionary platform adopted and the sinister speeches made at the convention. Especially they are seeking to create the illusion that the reactionaries, Dewey and Bricker, constitute a progressive, win-the-war, win-the-peace ticket.



The Dewey campaign managers find themselves in this predicament because the reactionaries overdid themselves in Chicago. In the party struggle leading up to the nomination of Dewey and Bricker, there were involved three big groups of capitalists and their henchmen. The largest of these groups, reactionary in character, had as its leaders Hoover, Vandenberg and Dewey; the second group, defeatist and pro-fascist, followed the lead of McCormick, Taft and Bricker; the third group, of a liberal trend, had Wendell Willkie as its outstanding figure. In the bitter fight for control, the reactionary Hoover group lined up with the pro-fascist McCormick group, and smashing defeated the Willkie progressive group. The victory of the Hoover-McCormick combination was so thorough that they completely dominated the convention, writing its platform and selecting its candidates, just as they pleased.

Indeed, the Hoover-McCormick victory was too complete for their own good. It went to their heads, and in their exultation at defeating the Willkie group, they turned the convention literally into an orgy of reaction. The speeches of Hoover, Warren, Luce and other leaders fairly dripped with Soviet-baiting, imperialism and a general spirit of reaction. The platform they cooked up is unrelieved by any trace of progressivism. And the candidates they selected, Dewey and Bricker, are thoroughly representative of the whole reactionary affair.

But now it appears that some of the Dewey leaders feel that they made a serious mistake at the convention in giving such a free rein to the expression of reactionary and pro-fascist sentiments. They think it would have been far cleverer, in view of the democratic mood of the American people, to season the reactionary convention mess with at least a semblance of progressivism. These leaders are now trying to correct their convention mistake by pilfering Roosevelt's policies and record, both foreign and domestic.

They and their mouthpieces are telling us that really there are no basic differences between the two parties. Both want to win the war; both want to win the peace, they declare. And both are for full production and the extension of social insurance after the war.

Thus, typically, Mark Sullivan, in the New York Herald Tribune of July 10, states that "there is no issue about the proposed international organization to prevent future wars." In fact, Mr. Sullivan sees no foreign policy election issues at all, and as for domestic issues, he boils these down pretty much to the charge of bureaucracy against Roosevelt. To hear such Republican apologists tell it, and they are legion, Dewey is a sort of new edition of President Roosevelt; but, of course, a younger, more energetic and less bureaucratic one.

In the election campaign we will be hearing a lot of such demagogy, designed to build a progressive facade upon the reactionary structure that was built by the Republicans at the Chicago convention. But the win-the-war Roosevelt forces must not let the Deweyites get away with it. They must hold the Republicans to the spirit and decisions of their Chicago convention, which was quite in line with the reactionary record of the Republican Party in the past and its program for the future.

The big ideological task to be accomplished by the progressive forces in this election is precisely to make clear the fundamental differences in political policy between Roosevelt and Dewey. The reelection of Mr. Roosevelt would mean that our country would go forward to accomplish the great objectives of Teheran—the complete winning of the war, the building of an organization to maintain peace in the postwar period, the systematic furtherance of world economic reconstruction and the strengthening of international democracy. Whereas, the election of Mr. Dewey would be a heavy blow against the whole Teheran program.

A Dewey administration would compromise the war with fascism; it would embark upon imperialist policies that would head the world towards a new world war; it would plunge the world into economic crisis after the war; it would weaken American and world democracy. The two opposed political lines of the rival presidential candidates and parties must be made clear in the campaign, despite every Deweyites (or Willkieite) effort to make it appear that a Republican victory would mean the continuation of Rooseveltian policies, only more logically and effectively.