

---

## PARTISANSHIP—A LUXURY AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD!

BY EARL BROWDER

**P**RESIDENT ROOSEVELT, in his message to Congress on January 11, reported on the historic conferences of October and November which culminated in the concord of Teheran. He said:

“The one supreme objective for the future, which we discussed for each nation individually, and for all the United Nations, can be summed up in one word: Security. And that means not only physical security which provides safety from attacks by aggressors. It means also economic security, social security, moral security—in a family of nations.”

The program of Teheran is the only possible road by which the world can reach security through victory and a stable peace.

One should expect that the mighty newspaper press of America would have carried to our people some systematic elucidation of this mighty, far-reaching, history-changing character of the concord of Teheran. But nothing of the kind has taken place. Instead of this, our great metropolitan daily papers with their tens of millions of circulation every day have in their great majority de-

liberately campaigned to hide, distort, and misrepresent the Teheran program. The minority of papers which have not done so are, however, not campaigning in favor of Teheran, but are a mess of confusion, opening their columns with equal hospitality to the most vicious slanders of Teheran as well as to honest attempts to understand and explain Teheran.

This failure of the chief instrument of public intelligence, of most of the press, to function in full support of our nation's war policy, is one of the greatest threats against our war effort, one of the greatest obstacles to victory.

Many of our newspapers print Adolf Hitler's speeches in full, just as they print President Roosevelt's—and then in their editorial columns and in the slant they give to the news some of them give more support to Hitler's line than they give to our President's.

It is a sad fact that Adolf Hitler still has more influence in guiding the thought of many of our American newspapers than has our own Commander-in-Chief. And it is a sad commentary on the vigilance of our nation that we allow the pro-

fascist newspaper axis of the McCormicks, Hearsts and Pattersons to spread Hitler's poison and to plump for a negotiated peace.

Berlin's propaganda line today drives toward one supreme goal—to weaken the alliance between Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and America, and eventually to split it. That is the one remaining hope of Hitler.

The Teheran concord answered this by proclaiming that the Allies will work together in the war and in the peace that will follow, envisaging that victory over the Axis will banish the scourge of war from the world for generations to come.

Read your newspapers every day with this question in your mind: Which leading thought has guided the writers who produced the paper, that of Berlin or that of Teheran?

If the newspapers really represented America, then our cause would be hopeless, for many of them clearly lean more to Berlin than to Teheran.

Fortunately, we already know from past experience that most of the newspapers do not represent the American people, who are as overwhelmingly in support of President Roosevelt as the newspapers are opposed to him. But the American people must learn how to recognize and reject Hitler's mental poison that comes to them every day in numerous American newspapers.

\* \* \*

There exists in the United States an ideology fostered by many news-

papers and some other pro-fascist circles, which holds that eventually, and the sooner the better, the United States must go to war against the Soviet Union in order to destroy its social and economic system because it is different from ours.

This anti-Soviet ideology is Hitler's secret weapon in America. It is toward this that he directs his short-wave propaganda broadcasts to our continent. It is this un-American and anti-United Nations propaganda that is spread by the Hearsts and the *Chicago Tribune*.

The recent meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States proposed several new features of policy which have been widely commented upon—and misrepresented—by the press of the nation. A complete exposition and explanation of these policies is published in a forty-eight page pamphlet entitled *Teheran and America*, which is available to everyone at the nominal cost of five cents.

It will facilitate an understanding of the views and proposals of American Communists, if they are examined from the beginning as proposals directed single-mindedly to the destruction of Hitlerism and the Axis, and the victory of our country as a part of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition leading the United Nations.

A gentleman recently, in commenting upon the new policies of the Communists, remarked to me: "I can understand your policy as one designed solely for winning the war; but I don't understand what, as a result, has become of Marxism."

I answered him that I was glad he understood what was necessary to win the war, but that I was sorry he misunderstood Marxism as a theory of how to lose the war.

Marxism, the body of theoretical principles which brings science into the service of the political advancement of mankind, undertakes to guide and facilitate human progress. It is a fact that the problem of how to win this present war is still the supreme problem for all future progress of mankind. If Marxism were indifferent to this problem, and even more if Marxism were an obstacle rather than a help in solving it, then the gentleman who spoke to me could indeed raise the question what has become of Marxism! But when, instead, Marxism comes forward as the clearest, boldest, most effective explanation of the problems of winning this war, and the Marxists come forward as the leading mobilizers and organizers of the masses for that purpose—then there is no question of what has become of Marxism, for it has passed the severest tests of life and proved itself.

The Marxists of America were able to understand the significance of the Teheran concord, and its consequences, more quickly and deeply than any other organized political mass organization in the country, precisely because our scientific training in Marxism had prepared us for the most complicated and difficult problems of social and political transformation.

Some persons, long inured to the anarchistic tendencies that dominate too many intellectual circles which

make a virtue of lack of agreement and of multiple answers to all questions, profess to find the Communists an alien and un-American body because of our unanimity of political views. In this they see an absence of thinking among the members, who, supposedly, take their opinions ready made from an all-powerful political apparatus.

Such a caricature is, of course, the opposite of the truth. Communists as a body do more intensive thinking than any comparable political group, and discuss and decide their problems more democratically. That is the very foundation of our unanimity.

This character of the Communist organization receives its fullest confirmation when we find that, even without the opportunities of consultation and discussion, individual Communists under the most diverse conditions and widely dispersed geographically, come to identical conclusions about the world situation. I think you will find as interesting as I did, the following example which has just come to my attention.

An American Communist, who has been over two years away from home in the U.S. Army, is now somewhere in the Far Pacific, some eight or ten thousand miles away. On January 8, the same day our National Committee was meeting in New York, he wrote a letter to his wife in which he included some political conclusions to which his isolated thinking about the world situation had led him. His conclusions were identical with the basic thesis of our National Committee

meeting. Permit me to quote his exact words:

"The change in world history brought about by the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences poses a whole number of new practical and theoretical questions. The kind of world there will be after this war (already in its early stages) is so completely different from that of 1918! The determining factor of world politics is now and will be, the long-time collaboration (now in war, later in peace) of the greatest capitalist nations with the Socialist ones, as distinct from the hostile encirclement of 1918. It will be a world in which the most decayed and reactionary elements of capitalism will have been decisively defeated, and in which the most democratic sections were able to survive only with the help of the socialist nations, and through the advancement of formerly-oppressed colonial peoples towards greater independence and consolidation as free nations. It will be a world in which governments of a new type, neither capitalist nor socialist in the old sense, will come into being. All this means that every old theory has to be re-studied again and that many new ones are presented for solution. Plenty of room for creative thought and action! There will be no lack of things for us soldiers to do once we get through fighting and come home. Never a dull moment!"

Of course, in real life absolutes do not exist, and the unanimity of the Communists is not absolute. In every great crisis or historical turning point, we always find a few who have stopped thinking, who have become welded to old formulas, or

who, for various particular reasons, find themselves diverted out of the main stream of historical development into stagnant backwaters. They are the exceptions that prove the general rule.

The vast majority of our people in America cannot be united for the great task of victory in this war and the post-war reconstruction of the world, through participation in the process of Marxian thinking. When we turn to the vast and complicated problem of uniting the effective majority of the American people behind the program of Teheran, we must understand to the full that the Marxists are numerically one of the smallest political parties in our country. And the country is by no means turning to Marxism or socialism or communism. Nor will it do so in the predictable future if the program of Teheran is successfully carried out, if a catastrophic aftermath to this war is avoided.

\* \* \*

Whether the promise of Teheran will be realized or not depends to a considerable extent, insofar as Americans can influence the decision, in the first place upon the outcome of the 1944 elections. There are strong and powerful pro-fascist forces in our country who are the sworn enemies of everything for which Teheran stands. In the national elections these forces are preparing a desperate attempt to seize the direction of our country for the purpose of turning it away from Teheran, and toward a new world war after the present one is finished.

President Roosevelt is the only political figure in our country whose election next November would constitute a guarantee that the policy of Teheran would guide our country in the ensuing four years. But it is my opinion that if Americans wish Roosevelt to accept the nomination it will be necessary to assure him in advance that the people are rising above all partisan considerations, that they are uniting behind his policies so strongly, that without any diversion of his major attention from the tasks of the war his reelection is practically assured.

That is my opinion. But it is an opinion based upon the fact, which every intelligent man knows, that while our country needs Roosevelt at the helm in the next four years, it does not need and cannot afford to have Roosevelt as an unsuccessful candidate in 1944. Our country needs above all a stable policy in its foreign relations, it needs the feeling and atmosphere of stability, it needs to have the policy of Teheran, adopted by the whole country in its overwhelming majority regardless of partisan alignments—therefore it needs Roosevelt, not as a partisan, but as a national leader in the broadest sense.

Yesterday was the anniversary of the great Lincoln. This raises before us the inevitable parallel between 1944 and 1864. Eighty years ago, Abraham Lincoln faced problems which in many respects were similar to those faced by Roosevelt today. He faced an unfinished war of survival for our country; he faced a hostile Congressional majority made up of a coalition of special interests,

prejudices, and defeatism, which reached deep into his own party; he faced the necessity of winning a national election without partisanship, by rising above party lines, and yet without conceding an inch in questions of principle in the struggle against his opposition. That is an accurate description of the situation facing Roosevelt and our country today.

In order to solve the problems of 1944 in the spirit of Lincoln, it will be necessary for patriotic men and women of all parties and all ideologies to rise above their partisan alignments, interests, and ambitions. It will be necessary for them, especially for labor and the working people, to find means of upholding the policies of Teheran, of securing continuity of leadership for our country, of creating a national unity in our country which cannot be threatened by any elections or any subsidiary issues.

That means inevitably that patriotic men and women of all parties and of all people's organizations must unite to convince Roosevelt that the country demands his continued leadership. For if Roosevelt, not seeing sufficient support in the country transcending party lines to guarantee his election without a partisan campaign on his part, should retire from the political scene, then indeed would our country be embarked upon uncharted seas of uncontrolled factionalism at the moment of our deepest national and international crisis.

I have no desire to attack the many aspirants to the Presidency. Their right under our American sys-

tem to forward such an aspiration in a practical way is as unquestionable as the right of labor to strike in protection of its living standards. But just as we urge the patriotic duty of labor not to exercise its right to strike during the war, no matter what the provocation, in exactly the same sense we must urge in the 1944 elections that all patriotic groups and individual aspirants to high position shall subordinate their special interests to the cause of national unity for winning the war and realizing the aims of Teheran. We must urge them to reject partisanship which in 1944 threatens to delay victory in the war and to increase its cost in the lives of our young men at the battlefronts.

Would the prospects of national unity be advanced by one iota, if Roosevelt should announce his retirement?

It is obvious to everyone that such an act by Roosevelt would throw the whole country into turmoil. Even the Republican Party in its most partisan and diehard sections would be completely disoriented by such a development, and far less united on any phase of practical politics before them and the country.

I know I am speaking the thoughts of many millions of American men and women when I thus raise these questions. I am able to speak thus forthrightly, when so many other public figures who think along similar lines keep silent, because my party, the Communist Party, is the only national political organization which has renounced all thought of partisan advancement and completely subordinated all other con-

siderations to the needs of the quickest and most complete victory in the war. Millions of individuals, including leaders among all classes, accept that standard—but they have not yet demanded and secured its adoption by their political organizations.

Narrow partisanship is a luxury which America cannot afford in this year of 1944. It threatens to weaken and even to divert our war effort. It will surely increase the cost of victory, which is counted not only in dollars but in lives. It obscures the glorious promise of Teheran, of a world from which the scourge of war is banished for many generations and in which mankind can work out its destiny in freedom and prosperity. It makes the highest aspirations of our nation and the world into political footballs to be kicked around the arena of a domestic struggle for power to which no restraints have been established. Partisanship in 1944 threatens the future of our nation and of the world.

That is the supreme question of the 1944 elections.

America will ride the storm of this world war, will achieve victory together with its glorious allies, will participate in the reorganization of the world as a family of democratic nations, will achieve the promise of Teheran. America will do this because the working people and the majority of all patriotic citizens, in the spirit of Jefferson and Lincoln, will rise above all old prejudices, group interests, and partisan alignments and will turn the 1944 elections into a great demonstration of national unity.