

# FOOLS GOLD

# *Madison & Marshall, Inc.*

18 EAST 48TH STREET

NEW YORK CITY

## *PUBLISHER'S NOTICE*

The pen name, "The Senator from Alaska," used by Mr. Fred R. Marvin for the first two editions of FOOLS GOLD resulted in so many requests from all parts of the country for better identification, that both the real and the pen name appear with this, the third, edition. The nom de plume, "The Senator from Alaska," was used by Mr. Marvin more than three decades ago when he was a mining editor in the Pacific Northwest. His record as a writer is listed in "Who's Who in America."

As a newspaper reporter, Mr. Marvin covered many conventions of the People's Party. He investigated the strike activities of the Federation of Miners in the '90s in Northern Idaho. He personally watched the formation of the I. W. W. in 1904. This was the organization which fomented the strike in Colorado in 1913 which developed into an open rebellion against constituted authority. He made a detailed survey of the Nonpartisan League shortly after its formation and his successful fight against this organization is well known in the West because of his writings in the Mountain States Banker, a journal which he founded and of which he was editor.

As representative of the Boston Transcript, his articles covering the trials of the communists arrested in the Bridgeman raid in Michigan in 1920 were reprinted in a large number of leading dailies.

In 1923 he came to New York to become editor-in-chief of the New York Daily Commercial, which position he held for a number of years.

He assisted in the formation of, and later became secretary of, the American Coalition of Patriotic and Fraternal Societies. In recent years he has continued his research as head of the Committee on American Education which is closely affiliated with the American Coalition.

He has written several other books and pamphlets which have been well received throughout the country, and recently he prepared for use of more than sixty radio stations many fifteen minute addresses.

Only one having Mr. Marvin's background and experience could have so perfectly assembled the factual material contained in FOOLS GOLD.

# FOOLS GOLD

*An Exposé of Un-American Activities  
and Political Action in the  
United States since 1860*

BY

“THE SENATOR FROM ALASKA”

FRED R. MARVIN

MADISON & MARSHALL, INC.

18 EAST 48TH STREET, NEW YORK

1936

---

Copyright, 1936, by  
MADISON & MARSHALL, INC.

FIRST PRINTING, APRIL, 1936  
SECOND PRINTING, MAY, 1936  
THIRD PRINTING, AUGUST, 1936

### THIRD EDITION NOTICE

The finer edition of FOOLS GOLD, in handsome cloth binding, larger and more readable type, with an attractive and striking jacket, is available to those who wish this book for permanent use at the original price of two dollars.

MADISON & MARSHALL, *Inc.*

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| PREFACE  | v   |
| I. THE CASE OUTLINED   | I   |
| II. SOCIALIST PLATFORM AND NEW DEAL<br>LEGISLATION COMPARED                | 7   |
| III. SOME OF THOSE IN COMMAND AT WASHINGTON                                | 16  |
| IV. THE PHILOSOPHY OF DESTRUCTION  | 24  |
| V. THE PHILOSOPHY OF DESTRUCTION BECOMES ORGANIZED<br>IN THE UNITED STATES | 31  |
| VI. THE BIRTH OF THE BRAIN TRUST   | 43  |
| VII. SOCIALISM AND THE NONPARTISAN LEAGUE                                  | 55  |
| VIII. THE COMMUNISTS ENTER THE UNITED STATES                               | 68  |
| IX. THIRD PARTY MOVEMENTS IN THE '20S                                      | 80  |
| X. "STEALING" PARTY NOMINATIONS  | 92  |
| XI. NEW DEAL LEGISLATION IS DESTRUCTIVE                                    | 104 |
| XII. A FINAL WORD  | 122 |

---

## APPENDIX

|     |  |     |
|-----|--|-----|
| "A" | FACTS CONCERNING SOCIALISM THAT SHOULD BE UNDER-<br>STOOD                | 127 |
| "B" | THE INTERNATIONALS   | 133 |
| "C" | THE POPULIST MOVEMENT  | 137 |
| "D" | THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD                                      | 146 |
| "E" | SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM SAME THEORY                                      | 152 |
| "F" | CITATIONS FROM SOCIALIST SOURCES OF INTEREST IN<br>STUDY OF THE NEW DEAL | 158 |
| "G" | CITATIONS IN RE SOCIALISM APPLICABLE TO NEW DEAL                         | 162 |
| "H" | SOCIALISM WOULD DESTROY RELIGION   | 166 |
| "I" | RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND AUTHORITY OF THE<br>GOVERNMENT              | 172 |

## P R E F A C E

THE glittering particles of worthless mica found in the sands of the many streams in the West and Alaska deceived innumerable untrained prospectors who had gone out, full of hope and ambition, to locate Nature's hidden stores of real gold. Posting their location notices and believing that they were rich beyond even the fondest dreams of avarice, they hastened to the nearest mining camp there to celebrate their good fortune in days and nights of riotous spending. When they had exhausted their available cash and much of the credit they had gained by telling of their discovery, they retired to sleep off the debauch. Upon awakening, they were informed by some old-timer that what they had found was nothing but worthless fools gold.

The enchanting promises of paternalism under the name of a New Deal have, like the false gold of the foolish prospectors, deceived many minds. Those who believe they have found the key to the vault in which is stored the real gold of "a new social order" that will buy "a more abundant life," and "greater security for all," have posted their location notices upon the door of the federal government and are celebrating by the riotous spending of public funds. When at last they have exhausted the taxpayers' ready cash and mortgaged all wealth, thus ruining the credit of the nation, they will retire to sleep off the debauch. Upon awakening, they will be informed by those who saw the folly of it all, that what they found was nothing but another kind of worthless fools gold.

*"The Senator from Alaska."*

## *Chapter I*

### THE CASE OUTLINED

IN November, 1932, because this nation, for two or more years, had been in something of an economic muddle, there was a growing demand to "get rid of Hoover." It had not been difficult to create the impression that, in some manner not explained, he was personally responsible for the ills of the people. The vote that placed Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the White House did not come so much from those truly anxious to elect him as from those determined to unseat Mr. Hoover.

Three full years have elapsed since Mr. Roosevelt entered the White House. His many promises, made on the stump, have not been kept. The Democratic platform has been tossed to one side. Experimental legislation, much of which is held unconstitutional by many, and some of which has already been nullified by the Supreme Court, clutters the statute books. There are as many, if not more, persons out of employment now as there were on March 4, 1933. The debt which has been created in the past few years is the largest in the history of the United States.

The growing demand to "get rid of Roosevelt" which was no more than the feeble moan of the distracted a year ago, now takes on the proportions of a mighty roar. Unfortunately, we think too much in terms of politics. We seem to be of the impression that the man in the White House can work miracles. He cannot. No man, elected in 1936, no matter how able, can, in four short years, accomplish much, and he will accomplish little unless he knows and undertakes to eradicate the germ which now infects the body politic. A sound, safe, conscientious man wedded to the theory of constitutional government, one who holds even a political prom-



ise sacred, himself not affected by this poison, will do a great deal toward restoring confidence. With confidence restored, business will be encouraged again to produce; capital investments will follow; the demand for workers will steadily increase; and this, in turn, will give these wage-earners the means to purchase foodstuffs and so benefit the farmers.

If, however, the man who succeeds Franklin D. Roosevelt—and it matters not what political label he wears—is at all infected with the dangerous philosophy upon which New Deal legislation is based; and if those elected to the Congress remain subservient to group pressure, there can and will be no change for the better.

The thing the American people must get rid of is the germ of our troubles. That germ is found in the fallacious theory, alien in its origin, that, by the abolition of the institution of private property and by the establishment of a form of government that does not recognize the right of the individual to acquire and own property, the people, as a whole, will enjoy what many term “economic security.”

At one time in this nation we had a large element enjoying economic security. They were the colored slaves of the South. They had no worries over economic questions since they had houses in which to live, food to eat and clothing to wear, while if sick or disabled they were supplied proper medical attendance—but they did not have liberty and freedom.

Whether we call that false philosophy socialism, communism, paternalism, Fabianism or New Dealism matters little. A snake is a snake even if the name given to this or that species is sonorous or unpronounceable. The philosophy which has the political support of a large element in our society under various titles, is un-American, unethical, anti-religious and economically unsound.

It is un-American because by its acceptance we reverse the system of government outlined by the Constitution. Under the Constitution the citizen is master and the State the servant. The false philosophy holds that the State is master and the

citizen the servant. Under the Constitution we are governed by laws, not by men; the philosophy mentioned would have us governed by men, not by laws.

It is unethical because its acceptance would deprive the citizen of his freedom of initiative and action; would elevate the shiftless and penalize the thrifty; would exalt the ignorant and crucify the intelligent.

It is un-Christian because it is based wholly upon a materialistic conception, would abrogate the laws of nature which are God's laws; would subordinate and, in the end, eliminate the spiritual side of life; all of which leads to the deification of man.

It is economically unsound because its acceptance would result in the abolition of the right of the individual to own and acquire property.

The philosophy upon which the New Deal is founded is destructive. It has appeared during the ages under many names and has been propagated by many different groups and organizations. It is best known to-day as socialism and communism.

This book is offered to present briefly—and only briefly—the nature of that philosophy; how it gathered force on the Continent many years ago; how, when, and by whom it was introduced into the United States; how it has been knowingly and intentionally advanced through the use of various organizations and movements resulting in a number of its leading exponents being installed in key positions in the federal government; how it has shaped much of the restrictive, regulatory and confiscatory legislation now on the statute books; and how, if carried to its final conclusion, it will result in the complete socialization of this country and the abolition of the institution of private property, the foundation upon which rests all of our institutions, including the home and religion.

It will be difficult for a large number to accept, in full, the preceding statements or conclusions because the objective

sought—the abolition of the right of the individual to acquire and own property—seems contrary to human nature. We are not asking any one, at this time, to accept either statements or conclusions. Before they do either we ask them to read carefully what we have to offer in the following pages to sustain our position.

This book is not presented as a direct attack upon either the New Deal or the present administration at Washington. It is emphatically nonpartisan. We do not hold the Democratic party *per se* responsible for many things that have been done in its name. The truth is, that for a number of years both the Republican and Democratic parties have imposed several socialistic nostrums upon the American people through the channels of legislation. Both parties—and the one is no more responsible than the other—have established boards, bureaus and commissions to put these socialistic proposals into effect. These boards, bureaus and commissions always started modestly and with comparatively small appropriations. Each succeeding year, however, they enlarged their personnel, expanded their functions and secured larger appropriations. As a nation we have been drifting. Slowly but surely, organized agencies have maneuvered us into the swift and destructive current of socialistic thought.

It will be charged, no doubt, by many that we have not supported certain statements and conclusions with sufficient evidence; or that this evidence is incomplete; or that this evidence is weak and not convincing. We have no thought of making this the last word upon the question: rather might it better be termed the first word, since the entire subject has not before been presented as we have undertaken to present it.

Criticism will come, possibly, from two major sources: first, those who are fully aware of the nature of the plan to socialize this country through legislative action; and second, from that large element in our population who do not believe that such a conspiracy as we outline exists. We expect criticism from the former which, no doubt, will be sharp and

severe. If they do not find a few minor sentences or statements upon which to center their attacks we will be greatly surprised. The criticism from the latter, however, will be of a different nature. These critics will brush the whole thing aside, as they have done in the past, with the simple statement, "Oh, I don't believe that tommy-rot; they can't do that in the United States."

Our appeal is to that large number of honest and sincere American citizens—and they are still in the vast majority—who sense that something is wrong, and are ready to heed the warning and willing to make an investigation for themselves.

While the early history of the organized movement to destroy the private property right may seem dull and uninteresting—because we all think in terms of to-day—yet it is highly important, if the disease from which we suffer is to be cured, that the American people be advised as to certain fundamental facts. These facts, we daresay, no one will attempt to controvert, however much they may scoff at the conclusion that the carrying out of the socialist-communist program will be injurious to the American people. While the last few chapters of this book contain what many will hold to be the meat of the story, the preceding chapters contain information which will make the nature of the germ of our trouble obvious.

Any thoughtful and careful businessman, farmer or wage-earner, whether in the so-called independent, salaried or laboring class, before accepting some plan alleged to be for his benefit and profit would gather all the information he could concerning the plan, and that which motivated its advocates. Have we, as a people, done this when it comes to government?

Is it not true that, when certain reforms in our governmental and economic systems have been presented, every one of us, regardless of location, occupation or political affilia-

tion, failed to exercise the common precaution we use when our individual interests appear at stake?

Have we not, in the past, been swayed more by emotion than by common sense?

Is it not time we began a searching inquiry into certain fundamental truths in order that our children may be spared the evil effects of similar errors?

For these reasons we ask the reader to be a bit patient with us in the telling of our story; to read on and on even though a chapter, or a part of a chapter here and there, may appear a bit dull and not related to the subject involved. It is all related, all important, if we are to grasp the true nature of just what this New Deal legislative program means to each of us as individuals.

## *Chapter II*

### SOCIALIST PLATFORM AND NEW DEAL LEGISLATION COMPARED

DURING the past two years the charge has been made many times, both in and out of the Congress, that New Deal legislation enacted since the 4th of March, 1933, does not carry out the 1932 campaign pledges of the Democratic party but, on the contrary, does carry out the 1932 platform pledges of the Socialist party.

Most of these New Deal laws were enacted, in so far as honest Democrats were concerned at least, on the assumption that they would correct the economic ills from which the nation suffered. Although many, both in and out of the Congress, recognized the fact that this legislation was not only restrictive and regulatory but that it was not in harmony with the Democratic platform or the theory of government expressed in the Constitution, very few, at the time they gave it support, grasped the fact that it was, in truth, confiscatory; that it was imposing a tax burden upon the American people which, if carried to its final conclusion, means that the bulk of the property now in the hands of individuals will pass into the hands of government in the settlement of tax bills.

Moreover, those who gave this legislation unqualified support were induced to believe that the nation faced a serious emergency, and that this legislation would successfully meet the situation. They did not recognize the fact that steps were being taken which, if carried to their logical conclusion, would mean the abandonment of constitutional government, and the substitution of a centralized bureaucratic government at Washington.

Since it is obvious that New Deal laws carry out many of the major platform pledges of the Socialist party, not

only as they were expressed in 1932 but in the platforms of the past, there must be a reason. There is.

Surprising as it may be to both Democrats and Republicans alike, the truth is that this legislation is the result of well defined socialist activities. For more than three decades the socialists in the United States have been supplying both parties with reformatory laws. Writing in 1912, the late Morris Hillquit, in his day a leading socialist propagandist, said:

"Such measures of social reform are, as a rule, originally formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thorough-going lines. They become the object of a persistent and widespread propaganda, and finally acquire the force of popular demands. At this stage the 'progressive' and sometimes even the 'conservative' statesmen of the dominant political parties begin to realize the political significance of the proposed measure. The Vox Populi means votes on election day. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

An early platform of the Socialist party (1904), after stating that its aim is to "seize every possible advantage that may strengthen them to gain complete control of the powers of government," gives the following reason for urging reformatory laws:

". . . We are using these remedial measures as means to the one great end of the co-operative commonwealth. Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

Since it is obvious—at least to a large number of thinking persons—that New Deal legislation is designed to place in the hands of a centralized government the regulation of industry, agriculture and labor; that it is confiscatory, and that it provides a system whereby all governmental functions now

<sup>1</sup> "Socialism Summed Up," page 86.

<sup>2</sup> Proceedings National Convention Socialist Party for 1904, page 308. This platform is dealt with more fully in Chapter V.

performed by the States and their political subdivisions, are handled from Washington, there must be a reason. There is.<sup>3</sup>

The theory of socialism and communism—two names for the same thing—is that the ills from which society suffers, social as well as economic, are due to the recognition of the right of the individual to acquire and own property; and that, under the federal Constitution, as well as the constitutions of the various States, the individual is protected and defended in the exercise of this right. One way to weaken, and so ultimately destroy, the private property right is for the government to regulate and restrict the affairs of the individual in the exercise of that right in such a manner that it means neither profit nor benefit to him; in consequence he makes no effort to retain it. Another way to weaken and so ultimately destroy that right, is to so increase the tax levy against whatever property one may attain, that he will find it neither profitable nor beneficial to make any effort to retain that property. One way to put both methods into operation is to establish a centralized government at Washington in the hands of bureaucrats.

By placing the 1932 Socialist party platform in one column and in a parallel column certain New Deal legislation, the connection between the two becomes apparent. One will find no relationship whatsoever between this legislation and the platform declarations of the Democratic party in 1932, or any other year. The parallel follows:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup>The daily papers December 27th and 28th, 1935, carried a story from Washington to the effect that a committee headed by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, recommended the division of the country into ten or twelve districts for "regional social and economic planning." The committee further recommended the establishment of "a permanent national development administration based upon the powers, duties and functions of the emergency administration of public works, the Works Progress Administration, the allotment committee and the Federal employment stabilization office." This, if put into effect, would wipe out state lines and make bureaucratic government supreme.

<sup>4</sup>The comparison here cited was prepared and issued by the League for Constitutional Government, 18 East 48th Street, New York City, early in 1935. It was read into the Congressional Record by Senator Frederick Hale of Maine, and has been used as the basis for a number of newspaper and



*National Platform Socialist Party, '32*

It proposes to transfer the principal industries of the country from private ownership and autocratic, cruelly inefficient management to social ownership and democratic control. Only by these means will it be possible to organize our industrial life on a basis of planned and steady operation without periodic breakdowns and disastrous crises.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND LABOR  
LEGISLATION

1. A federal appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 for immediate relief for those in need, to supplement state and local appropriations.

2. A federal appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 for public works and roads, reforestation, slum clearance and decent homes for the workers, by federal government, states and cities.

3. Legislation providing for the acquisition of land, buildings and equipment necessary to put the unemployed to work producing food, fuel and clothing and for the erection of houses for their own use.

4. The six-hour day and the five-day week without a reduction of wages.

5. A comprehensive and efficient system of free public employment agencies.

6. A compulsory system of unemployment compensation with adequate benefits, based on contributions by the government and by employers.

7. Old-age pensions for men and women sixty years of age and over.

8. Health and maternity insurance.

*The New Deal Answers*

"Redistribution of Wealth"—  
"Planned Economy"—Result: Increase of Government bureaucracy and destruction of the individual property right guaranteed under the American form of Government.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND LABOR  
LEGISLATION

1. The FERA Act of 1933 approved May 12, 1933, stated as its purpose, "to provide for coöperation by the Federal Government with the several states in relieving the hardship and suffering by unemployment." \$950,000,000 for this act appropriated in 1934 and \$3,300,000,000 for National Industrial Recovery appropriated in 1934.

2. The President received a blank check for \$4,880,000,000 in 1935 for this purpose.

3. Covered by the FSHC, Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation, RRA and ECW, Emergency Conservation Works (which directs the Civilian Conservation Corps).

4. Covered in NRA codes, and the Socialistic Wagner Labor Bill which had the support of the Brain Trust.

6. Covered by the Social Security Bill.

7. Covered by the Social Security Bill.

8. Covered by the Social Security Bill.

magazine articles. It is here presented with the permission of the League for Constitutional Government.

11. Government aid to farmers and small home-owners to protect them against mortgage foreclosure, and a moratorium on sales for non-payment of taxes by destitute farmers and unemployed workers.

12. Adequate minimum wage laws.

#### SOCIAL OWNERSHIP

1. Public ownership and democratic control of mines, forests, oil and power resources, public utilities dealing with light and power, transportation and communication and of all other basic industries.

2. The operation of these publicly owned industries by boards of administration on which the wage-workers, the consumers and the technicians are adequately represented; the recognition in each industry of the principles of collective bargaining and civil service.

#### BANKING

Socialization of our credit and currency system and the establishment of a unified banking system, beginning with the complete governmental acquisition of the Federal Reserve Banks and the extension of the services of the Postal Savings Banks to cover all departments of the banking business and the transference of this department of the post office to a government-owned banking corporation.

#### TAXATION

1. Steeply increased inheritance taxes and income taxes on the higher incomes and estates of both corporations and individuals.

2. A constitutional amendment authorizing the taxation of all government securities.

10. Covered by NRA codes, and Brain Trust desires to have the Child Labor Amendment to the Constitution ratified which will regiment the youth of America under Federal control.

11. Covered by the HOLC, FCA, etc.

12. Wagner Bill again. Result: Federal dictatorship of wages.

#### SOCIAL OWNERSHIP

1. Reforestation, PA, Petroleum Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, etc.

2. Covered by the Socialistic NRA, but wrecking civil service.

#### BANKING

To a large degree covered by the new banking law.

#### TAXATION

1. Partly covered by one of Roosevelt's "must bills."

AGRICULTURE

Many of the foregoing measures for socializing the power, banking and other industries, for raising living standards among the city workers, etc., would greatly benefit the farming population.

As special measures for agricultural upbuilding, we propose:

1. The reduction of tax burdens, by a shift from taxes on farm property to taxes on incomes, inheritances, excess profits and other similar forms of taxation.

2. Increased federal and state subsidies to road building and educational and social services for rural communities.

3. The creation of a federal marketing agency for the purchase and marketing of agricultural products.

4. The acquisition by bona fide cooperative societies and by governmental agencies of grain elevators, stockyards, packing houses and warehouses and conduct of these services on a non-profit basis.

The encouragement of farmers' cooperative societies and consumers' cooperatives in the cities, with a view of eliminating the middleman.

5. The socialization of federal land banks and the extension by these banks of long-term credit to farmers at low rates of interest.

6. Social insurance against losses due to adverse weather conditions.

7. The creation of national, regional, and state land utilization boards for the purpose of discovering the best uses of the farming land of the country, in view of the joint needs of agriculture, industry, recreation, water supply, reforestation, etc., and to prepare the way for agricultural planning on a national and, ultimately, on a world scale.

AGRICULTURE

1. Covered by processing taxes, etc.

2. FERA schools, RRA, AAA, etc.

3. Covered by FSRC, Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, AAA.

4. Many legislative proposals would extend varied forms of credit to cooperatives and farmers, also Senate Bill 2367 seeks to turn farm tenancy into ownership and House of Representatives Bill 2066 to alleviate farm indebtedness, the Bankhead Bill, RRA.

5. Covered in part by the new banking law.

6. Does the Government desire to regulate weather conditions? Farm legislation already used to cover losses to farmers from abnormal weather conditions under AAA.

7. Covered by AAA and Government new tariff laws, RRA.

## CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

1. Proportional representation.
2. Direct election of the president and vice-president.
3. The initiative and referendum.
4. An amendment to the constitution to make constitutional amendments less cumbersome.
5. Abolition of the power of the Supreme Court to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress.
6. The passage of the Socialist party's proposed Workers' Rights' amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to establish National system of unemployment, health and accident insurance and old-age pensions, to abolish child labor, establish and take over enterprises in manufacture, commerce, transportation, banking, public utilities and other business and industries to be owned and operated by the government, and, generally, for the social and economic welfare of the workers of the United States.
7. Repeal the 18th Amendment and take over the liquor industry under government ownership and control, with the right of local option for each state to maintain prohibition within its borders.

## CIVIL LIBERTIES

1. Federal legislation to enforce the First Amendment to the Constitution so as to guarantee freedom of speech, press and assembly, and to penalize officials who interfere with the civil rights of citizens.
2. The abolition of injunctions in labor disputes, the outlawing of yellow dog contracts and the passing of laws enforcing the rights of workers to organize into unions.
3. The immediate repeal of the Espionage Law and other repressive legislation, and the restoration of civil and political rights to those unjustly convicted under wartime laws.
4. Legislation protecting aliens from being excluded from this coun-

## CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

4. Already proposed by a Cabinet member.
5. House of Representatives Bill 7997 proposes drastic restriction of the Supreme Court's power, advocated by many New Dealists.
6. Wagner Labor Bill again, Delaware Corps., PWA, NRA.
7. FACA, Federal Alcohol Control Administration.

## CIVIL LIBERTIES

This un-American program illustrates why only 2½% of the popular vote in 1932 was cast in favor of the un-American Socialistic Party Platform.

2.

3.

4.

The Secretary of Labor is doing her part to carry out this program.

*National Platform Socialist Party, '32*  
(Continued)

try or from citizenship or from being deported on account of their political, social or economic beliefs, or on account of activities engaged in by them which are not illegal for citizens.

5. Modification of the immigration laws to permit the reuniting of families and to offer a refuge to those fleeing from political or religious persecution.

THE NEGRO

The enforcement of Constitutional guarantees of economic, political and legal equality for the Negro. The enactment and enforcement of drastic anti-lynching laws.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

While the Socialist party is opposed to all war, it believes that there can be no permanent peace until Socialism is established internationally. In the meantime, we will promote all measures that promise to promote good will and friendship among the nations of the world including:

1. Reduction of armaments, leading to the goal of total disarmament by international agreement, if possible, but if that is not possible by setting an example ourselves. Soldiers, sailors, and workers unemployed by reason of disarmament to be absorbed, where desired in a program of public works to be financed in part by the savings due to disarmament. The abolition of conscription, of military training camps and the R.O.T.C.

2. The recognition of the Soviet Union and the encouragement of trade and industrial relations with that country.

3. The cancellation of war debts due from the allied governments as part of a program for wiping out war debts and reparations, provided that such cancellation does not release money for armaments, but promotes disarmament.

*The New Deal Answers*  
(Continued)

5.

The Secretary of Labor is doing her part to carry out this program.

THE NEGRO

This New Deal legislation was defeated after great effort.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The Socialist Party is a World Party, not an American Party.

2. The New Deal "Brain Trust" put this over.

3. Is the New Deal making any effort to collect War Debts?

4. The entrance of the United States into the World Court.

5. The entrance of the United States into the League of Nations under conditions which will make it an effective instrument for world peace and renewed coöperation with the working class parties abroad to the end that the League may be transformed from a league of imperialist powers to a democratic assemblage representative of the aspirations of the common people of the world.

6. The creation of international economic organizations on which labor is adequately represented, to deal with problems of raw material, investments, money, credit, tariff and living standards from the viewpoint of the welfare of the masses throughout the world.

7. The abandonment of every degree of military intervention by the United States in the affairs of other countries. The immediate withdrawal of military forces from Haiti and Nicaragua.

8. The withdrawal of United States military and naval forces from China and the relinquishment of American extra-territorial privileges.

9. The complete independence of the Philippines and the negotiation of treaties with other nations safeguarding the sovereignty of these islands.

10. Prohibition of the sales of munitions to foreign powers.

4. This New Deal legislation was defeated.

5. A "Brain Trust" hope; will be proposed later.

6.

7.

8.

9.

} More New Deal un-American philosophy.

### *Chapter III*

## SOME OF THOSE IN COMMAND AT WASHINGTON

TO get a clear concept of any great movement, one must take into account not only the nature of the program advanced but the background of those who are in command of that program. You have before you a comparison of the 1932 platform of the Socialist party and the legislation adopted by the New Deal to carry out these planks. Let us now turn to some of those in command at Washington. One finds, upon investigation, that not only is the legislation in question out of harmony with the 1932 platform declarations of the Democratic party, but that the persons selected to administer this legislation are not Democrats.

The primary purpose of this book is to expose a dangerous fallacious philosophy of government and economics; and to point out how, practically unopposed, that philosophy gained followers in the United States. In order, however, to make the case clearer from the start, it seems desirable here to inject the names of a few in appointive positions whose assumed authority appears far greater than the constitutional authority of the members of the Congress elected by the people. Those in the public eye to-day, commonly labeled brain trusters, are mere actors upon the stage, however. When one of them disappears from the scene—as in the cases of Raymond Moley, General Hugh Johnson and Donald Richberg—others step from the wings to take the part thus made vacant.

It will be recalled that in 1924 there appeared in the political arena a third party. Its inception is found in a resolution approved by the Socialist executive committee in 1921. The name adopted for this third party was Progressive, on the

assumption, no doubt, that it would thus attract many of those who followed the late Theodore Roosevelt in a third party movement under that name some years before. The late Senator Robert M. LaFollette, elected to the Senate from Wisconsin as a Republican, headed this ticket as candidate for president. Senator Burton K. Wheeler, elected from Montana as a Democrat, was named for second place.<sup>1</sup>

One is forced to the conclusion, after a careful study of the facts, that what is now termed the New Deal party—and that name is being rather commonly given to the elements in the saddle at Washington—is but the Progressive (Socialist) party of 1924 seeking to conceal its identity by wearing stolen clothing. This conclusion is forced both by the nature of the legislation adopted, and by the personnel of those holding key positions in the federal government. The number of persons who supported the Progressive (Socialist) ticket in 1924 now on the federal payroll is rather impressive.

First and foremost of these is Basil M. Manly, a member of the Federal Power Commission. In 1924 he was the directing genius of the People's Legislative Service, under which name a bloc of Senators and Representatives—some of them elected as Republicans and some as Democrats—operated. Mr. Manly was a member of the executive committee of the National Conference for Progressive Political Action, the name of the organization sponsoring the convention which nominated Mr. LaFollette.<sup>2</sup> A book called "Where LaFollette Stands on Fifty Living Issues" states that it was "compiled by Basil M. Manly" and published by the "LaFollette for President Committee."

This little booklet written, or at least edited, by Mr. Manly, is of special interest at this time, in view of the fact that one of the planks of the platform adopted proposed to put the

<sup>1</sup> A more complete account of this movement and elements involved in its formation will be found in Chapter IX.

<sup>2</sup> More complete data on this organization will be found in a later chapter.



government in the electric light and power business in competition with its citizens, which plank has been fully carried out by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Presumably in hearty sympathy both with the plank in the platform of the Progressive (Socialist) party in 1924, and with the action of the New Deal party since March 4, 1933, Mr. Manly has been made a member of a body that sits in judgment upon the acts of the privately owned utility corporations.

Donald Richberg is another of those who, in 1924, was prominently connected with the Progressive (Socialist) movement. While Mr. Richberg is one of the actors who has been forced from the play—not because his acting was bad but because, it is rumored, temperamentally he did not harmonize with others in the cast—for two years he was one of the leaders of the brain trust. During those years his very word was sweet music to the ears of all who believed that, through the operation of New Deal legislation, the wealth of the United States could be completely socialized.

Mr. Richberg was chairman of the resolutions committee of the Progressive (Socialist) convention. Among the resolutions adopted was one favoring the submission of “a constitutional amendment providing that Congress may by enacting a statute make it effective over a judicial veto.” That means the nullification of a decision of the Supreme Court as to the constitutionality of a law. The socialists, and all who accept their theory, recognized then, as they do now, that the Supreme Court is the one department of government not to be swayed by popular clamor. It is to be presumed that while one of the principal advisors to President Roosevelt, Mr. Richberg was in complete harmony with this plank in the Progressive (Socialist) platform.

Mr. Richberg is—or at least was—a member of the Advisory Council of the Committee on Coal and Giant Power established by the League for Industrial Democracy. This is a socialist subsidiary organization the members of which have sought to make palatable the declaration of Marx, “Abolition

of private property," by changing this slogan to read "Production for use and not for profit."

Frank P. Walsh was among the leading supporters of the Progressive (Socialist) ticket in 1924. His name appeared on the ballot as a LaFollette elector from New York. Mr. Walsh is now one of the active attorneys supporting New Deal policies.

Rex Tugwell, into whose hands nearly a billion dollars of taxpayers' money has been placed to carry out a socialist housing experiment, the very nature of which indicates its ultimate failure, was among the rather large number of professors who supported the Progressive (Socialist) ticket in 1924.

Prof. Tugwell, possibly more than any other member of the brain trust, has made clear its communist connection. The *New York Times* in reporting one of his public addresses, said:

"Mr. Tugwell held that the nation was witnessing the 'death struggle of industrial autocracy and the birth of democratic discipline.' There was no reason to expect that the disestablishment of 'our plutocracy' would be pleasant.

"These historical changes never are pleasant,' he said. 'We have, however, the duty of avoiding violence as the process goes on, and this is why I regard the coming months as among the most critical ones of our history.

"Our best strategy is to surge forward with the workers and the farmers of the nation, committed to general achievements, but trusting the genius of our leader for the disposition of our forces and the timing of our attacks.'" <sup>3</sup>

Shortly after the inauguration of President Roosevelt, Prof. A. A. Berle, Jr., made his appearance in Washington as one of the original members of the brain trust. He later was "loaned" to the LaGuardia "progressive" administration in New York City, evidently to perform the function of a liaison officer. Immediately after adjournment of the convention that

<sup>3</sup> October 28, 1935.

nominated the late Robert M. LaFollette for president on the Progressive (Socialist) ticket, Prof. Berle sent the nominee a congratulatory telegram. In that telegram appeared this language: "We believe that the time has come for a new deal."<sup>4</sup>

J. A. Franklin, Sidney Hillman and Rose Schneiderman, all named as members of the Labor Advisory Administration, were members of the Progressive (Socialist) campaign committee in 1924. Leo Wolman, another member of the Labor Advisory Administration, was a supporter of the Progressive (Socialist) ticket.

Edward F. McGrady, now an assistant secretary of Labor, was a supporter of the Progressive (Socialist) ticket in 1924. The *New York Times* says that Mr. McGrady, returning from a trip to North Carolina, reported that the Federation of Labor of that state "endorsed LaFollette and Wheeler."<sup>5</sup>

There is a large army of lesser lights who, in 1924, supported the Progressive (Socialist) ticket now on the federal payroll. Among those in this army whose names are fairly well known are:

Frederick C. Howe, chairman, Consumers Council, AAA; H. T. Hunt, general counsel of the Federal Emergency Administration; William M. Leiserson, secretary, National Labor Board; Paul H. Douglas, on Labor Board Advisory Committee; Prof. John A. Lapp, on Labor Board Advisory Committee; Prof. Karl Borders, an NRA Research Investigator; William E. Sweet, who has been something of a general propagandist for the New Deal, now connected with the Social Securities Administration; Heywood Broun, Theater Codes Advisor who lost his job when the Supreme Court declared that law unconstitutional, none of whom, it should be noted, has ever been known as an outstanding Democrat.

It would require far more space than is here available to make anything like a complete list of those who, in 1924, supported the Progressive (Socialist) ticket and are now hold-

<sup>4</sup> Undated Press Release.

<sup>5</sup> August 12, 1924.

ing rather important positions in a so-called Democratic administration. Indeed, the compilation of such a list is an endless task since all federal payrolls are not available to the public. The reader, acquainted with political conditions in 1924, may, however, for his own edification, enlarge this list by noting those who, of his personal knowledge, then supported the Progressive (Socialist) ticket and thus aided in the defeat of the Democratic candidate, Hon. John W. Davis, for president.

With the failure of the Progressive (Socialist) party to gain control of government, the plans were changed, but the original Conference for Progressive Political Action which guided the Progressive (Socialist) campaign in 1924, did not fade out of the picture although not operating, at all times, under that name. The leaders of the group with their eyes on the 1932 election and with a plan to "steal" the Democratic Party<sup>6</sup> fairly well outlined, issued a call for a conference in Washington in March, 1931. The call was signed by Senators Norris, as chairman, LaFollette, Cutting, Costigan and Wheeler. It should be noted that the first three elected to the Senate as Republicans supported the candidacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Senator Wheeler was the running-mate of LaFollette in 1924. This conference was composed of 164 delegates according to the *New York Times*.<sup>7</sup> Of this number, eighty-one were openly connected with the Progressive-Socialist movement in 1924 and others may have been. Two of the delegates to this convention were rewarded by seats in the Roosevelt cabinet. They are Daniel C. Roper and Harold L. Ickes.

At least six others seated in this convention—there may have been more—were likewise rewarded by federal appointments. They are: Frank Murphy, made Governor of the Philippines; Isador Lubin, now commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor; Mary Anderson, director of

<sup>6</sup> See Chapter X.

<sup>7</sup> March 12, 1931.

Women's Bureau, Department of Labor; Smith W. Brookhart, named head of the bank established to promote trade with Soviet Russia and which found no trade to promote; Abel Wolman, state engineer, Maryland, for Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, and Leo Wolman, previously mentioned.

In addition to those who were prominent in the Progressive (Socialist) movement of 1924, and those who took part in the so-called Progressive conference in 1931, now holding appointive positions under Franklin D. Roosevelt, are many others of like mind. Among them are: Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture; Henry Morgenthau, jr., Secretary of the Treasury, and at least two of his assistants, Herbert E. Gaston and Miss Josephine Roche; Arthur E. Morgan and David E. Lilienthal, directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority; Harry L. Hopkins, in charge of relief, and a large number of his assistants. With possibly a few rare exceptions, none of these appointees has been known for loyalty to the Democratic party, while some of them have been openly connected with the left wing of the Republican party.

The enactment of New Deal legislation, the naming of those who have been supporters of the socialist theory to key positions in the federal government, the desperate attempt to foist this legislation, regardless of its constitutionality, upon the American people by propaganda, agitation and ballyhoo, is the culmination of more than sixty years of well-designed and cleverly executed work on the part of organized minorities in the United States. Back of it all is a dangerous, destructive, fallacious doctrine which has ever had an appeal to those who are not addicted to personal initiative and whose fondness for work is nil.

The story of a plan to destroy the institution of private property and confiscate the wealth of this nation has never been fully told. It is time it was. The reader may not be impressed with the comparison of the 1932 Socialist platform with New Deal legislation; he may see no connection between

the naming of supporters of the Progressive (Socialist) ticket in 1924 as key men in a so-called Democratic administration, and a well defined program to socialize this country. We ask all such to join with us in considering the nature of the underlying philosophy of socialism and communism; and to journey with us as we follow the effort of proponents of this philosophy to gain political control in the United States.

---

## Chapter IV

### THE PHILOSOPHY OF DESTRUCTION

J. GEORGE FREDERICK who, one is forced to assume from the nature of his writings, is a New Deal advocate, says:

"Always behind a genuine revolution, there is also a basic philosophy and point of view."<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Frederick recognizes two facts which the public at large seem not to realize; first, that the program of legislation initiated by the brain trust is revolutionary; and, second, that the program is not something new but has its root in a basic philosophy. The question, then, is what is that philosophy?

It is the age-old philosophy of destruction as opposed to the philosophy of construction; it is the philosophy of evil as opposed to the philosophy of good. To-day it is best known as socialism and communism. When one starts out to locate the origin of the philosophy of destruction he finds himself delving into ancient history and mysticism. Many students of the subject insist it is presented allegorically in the earlier books of the Old Testament. Others place an entirely different interpretation upon certain language. This much, however, is certain and the record is complete, that some centuries ago—the exact time is not locatable—in the attempt of man to discover the source of evil, the theory was advanced that the cause of human suffering was the natural concomitant of the institution of private property. From this premise the conclusion was logically reached that, abolish this institution, place all property, all wealth and all production, in the hands of society as a whole to be administered for common good, and human suffering would disappear.

Strange as it may seem, the early exponents of this theory

<sup>1</sup> "A Primer of 'New Deal' Economics," *Business Bourse*, 1933, page 151.

were not revolutionists; government and economics were not involved in their program; they were thinking wholly along idealistic lines.

As early as 1516 Sir Thomas More presented his fictional work, "Utopia," the name of a country where this system of community ownership was practiced. Many writers, in later years, pictured similar lands of promise. Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward" and Ignatius Donnelly's "Cæsar's Column" appealed to a great many. A careful perusal of these fictional accounts of the land of Great Promise wherein there is naught but peace, happiness, plenty and contentment, developed the fact that the writers wholly overlooked the existence of certain well known human traits—laziness, shiftlessness, avarice, greed, envy, jealousy, lust, etc.

A number of well-meaning persons tried to put into practice the perfect social order fictionally portrayed by Sir Thomas More and others. None was successful; they all crashed on the rock of human weaknesses.

When it became apparent to those who had accepted the theory mentioned that these experiments were unsuccessful, instead of seeking to locate the fault in the fallacy of the premise, they sought some plausible reason for the failure. It was then that they took the position that, since governments recognize the right of the individual to own property, protecting and defending him in the exercise of this right, the thing to do was first to destroy the government in question, and so abolish the right. This accomplished, they held, would mean that all wealth would go into a common pool and be administered for the benefit of all.

That theory, first presented nearly two hundred years ago, resulted in the formation of a secret group which planned the destruction of the then existing, so-called capitalist governments. This organization, established in Bavaria in 1776, was known as the Order of the Illuminati.

Although short-lived as an open society, because the government detecting its subversive character dissolved it and



arrested a number of its leaders, it continued to operate underground. Some of its leading members took part in the French Revolution at the close of the Eighteenth century. When the good people, not only of France but of the civilized world, began to realize the nature of the doctrine underlying the excesses of murder and rapine, and the character of organizations supporting these excesses, the reaction was so great that the philosophy itself was more or less buried for about a half century. It remained for Karl Marx to resurrect it, cloak it with the idealism of so-called socialists who preceded him, and present it under the name of communism.

While much has been written about Marx being the founder of socialism and communism, the fact remains that he founded nothing, enunciated nothing new, created no new idea. The philosophy he presented was clearly that of destruction. The meat of the entire Marxian program will be found in the battle-cry of Baboeuf, the French revolutionist, "Let everything return to chaos, and from chaos let there rise a new and regenerated world."<sup>2</sup>

Marx was a pronounced plagiarist. Possibly his persistent robbery of others of their ideas encouraged him to urge a policy of robbing every one of their material possessions through a system of confiscation. Until Marx's time, the suggestion had not been made admittedly that force and violence—he called it revolution—should be adopted as a means to destroy the institution of private property, but the idea was nevertheless old.

With force and violence as the keynote of this program, Marx sought to hide its hideousness by cloaking it with idealism and presenting it as a plan for the aid and betterment of the wage-earners of the world.

The sum and essence of the philosophy of destruction as presented to-day and called communism—known by a large element as socialism—is found in the "Communist Mani-

<sup>2</sup> "Contemporary Socialism," John Rae, Scribner's, 1901 Edition, page 18. Name of person cited is spelled several ways. We follow that of Professor Rae.

festo," written and issued by Marx in 1848 with preface by Friedrich Engels, his co-worker and financial backer. Marx writes:

"The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."<sup>3</sup> Lest this language be not sufficiently explicit, he adds, "You reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so: that is just what we intend."<sup>4</sup>

Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw of London College, England, has accurately analyzed the Manifesto upon which is based not only socialism and communism but, in the United States, what to-day is termed New Dealism. He writes: "The fascination of the Manifesto consisted in the facts that,

"(1) it diverted socialism from the policy of creating ideal communities by its own exertions to the more attractive task of seizing property and appropriating institutions already in existence;

"(2) it abandoned the method of secret conspiracy and subterranean operation hitherto practised by communistic coteries—humorously camouflaged as 'Leagues of the Just' or 'Societies of the Seasons'—and openly proclaimed war upon all established creeds and organisations;

"(3) it formulated a philosophy of history which filled the credulous with hope and confidence, for it told them that communism was the next predestined and inevitable phase in social evolution, and that so far from having to fear such failure as had overwhelmed the utopians, they had only to sit still and watch the predetermined development of communism out of capitalism;

"(4) in order that they might assist the fore-ordained and hasten the inevitable, it provided them with a practical programme of great allurements, the keynote of which was 'abolish, confiscate, appropriate';

"(5) it held out a prospect of revenge, destruction, and

<sup>3</sup> Rand School Edition, page 30.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, page 33.

sanguinary devastation—the overthrow and humiliation of thrones, aristocracies, and above all the hated bourgeoisie—that appealed with irresistible attraction to the passions of envy, hatred, and malice which filled Marx and his associates with fanatical and truly diabolical fury.”<sup>5</sup>

The Marxian philosophy, under the name of socialism, was introduced into the United States by a group of refugees from Germany during the '60s of the last century. Marx had been forced to leave the Fatherland, seeking safety in London from which point he continued to issue his inflammatory utterances. His followers, in Germany and central Europe, accepting each of his statements without questioning either their correctness or the sincerity of the man giving them voice, continued to carry on subversive activities. The Imperial Government of Germany was not slow in noting the nature of the Marxian doctrine and, in effect, outlawed those engaged in its propagation. Many of them headed straight for the United States. No objection was made to their entrance; no examination of their physical or mental qualifications. We asked no questions of the immigrant; he volunteered no information.

“Discontented revolutionists came pressing in from Europe . . .,” writes Rowland Hill Harvey. “Verily New York was a hodgepodge of revolutionary sects and nationalities.”<sup>6</sup> “The United States has always seemed to European radicals a promising field for their experiments and ideas,”<sup>7</sup> writes Prof. Norman J. Ware.

The refugees we have mentioned began to arrive in the United States when the nation was torn with civil strife. They were unlike their fellow-countrymen who had preceded them—and many who later followed—in that this refugee

<sup>5</sup> “A Survey of Socialism,” F. J. C. Hearnshaw, Macmillan, 1928, pages 221-2.

<sup>6</sup> “Samuel Gompers,” Rowland Hill Harvey, Stanford University Press, 1935, page 16.

<sup>7</sup> “The Labor Movement in the United States,” Norman J. Ware, D. Appleton and Co., 1929, pages 303-304.

element remained in the cities and began the propagation of the revolutionary theories of Marx. Pretending their purpose was to benefit the workingman, they were not workingmen themselves, but on the contrary, as Prof. Ware states, were "intellectuals and knew no trade but that of propaganda."<sup>8</sup>

Prof. O. D. Skelton calls attention to the fact that they were immigrants, "fighting their Old World battles in the New."<sup>9</sup>

"The intelligent and educated German worker and the idealistic intellectual brought their socialism with them to America," writes Nathan Fine. "Immediately upon landing they set themselves the task of organizing their fellow-countrymen and then reaching out for the native and English-speaking workers. The socialist and free-thinking German immigrant was handicapped by a foreign tongue, however, and was up against an individualistic Anglo-Saxon tradition, a religious people, and relative prosperity and economic opportunity."<sup>10</sup>

In other words, socialism originally presented in the United States as a labor movement, was in no sense advanced by wage-earners. Not only was the founder of socialism, Karl Marx, not a wage-earner, but those who introduced this philosophy of destruction into the United States were not wage-earners, for they "knew no trade but that of propaganda."

". . . it was a thankless task to preach a foreign philosophy of discontent, to attempt to enlist under the banner of internationalism the proud patriots of a new and self-confident country, and to persuade the free-born American that his boasted equality was but a name . . .,"<sup>11</sup> says Jessie Wallace Hughan, a well-known socialist writer.

But these Marxian socialists continued to preach what Miss Hughan calls "a foreign philosophy of discontent," that being

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, page 310.

<sup>9</sup> "Socialism: A Critical Analysis," O. D. Skelton, 1911, page 302.

<sup>10</sup> "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States," Nathan Fine, Rand School of Social Science, 1928, page 90.

<sup>11</sup> "What Is Socialism?" Vanguard Press, 1928, page 127.

as near as we have ever known an admitted socialist to recognize it as the philosophy of destruction. The seed planted in time bore fruit. That fruit, in the nature of restrictive and regulatory legislation, contrary to "individualistic Anglo-Saxon tradition," is now being fed the American people in allopathic doses. A "religious people" have been transformed into an irreligious people, "relative prosperity and economic opportunity" have been changed into a business depression and restrictions placed upon the rights and liberties of the people by legislative decree, as will be established later in reviewing New Deal legislation. These changes, all of which evidence the underlying philosophy of destruction, were not brought about by any fault in our form of government or our economic system. Instead, they are the result of a persistent and continued assault emanating from socialist headquarters upon the institution of private property.

With this brief account of the origin and nature of the philosophy which underlies what is termed New Dealism to-day; and with some understanding of the aims and purposes of those who introduced it into the United States, we turn our attention to the methods employed to advance that philosophy until it became an organized movement sufficiently powerful to force both Republican and Democratic parties to adopt, in part at least, some of its alleged reformative schemes.

## Chapter V

### THE PHILOSOPHY OF DESTRUCTION BE- COMES ORGANIZED IN THE U. S.

IN the period between 1870 and 1900 American workingmen in various crafts were seeking some form of organization that might legitimately secure for them shorter hours, increased wages and better working conditions. As they were all individualists, anything of a socialistic nature was distasteful. They had no thought of an assault upon either the form of government or the system of economics; indeed, they were personally loyal. They did not believe that the men who paid them wages were their enemies; they sought to work in harmony with their employers.

The professional propagandists who had taken refuge in the United States, concealing the true nature of their doctrine by presenting their program as one to benefit the wage-earners, gained the attention of a few American workingmen but others resented the interference of "these foreigners."

The alien socialists, finding they were having little influence with the honest workingman, adopted a system of boring from within all legitimate labor organizations either to capture or to destroy them. It is this system, to which little attention has been paid, that clearly marks the path of socialism from its first appearance in the United States to date. One has but to follow its well blazed trail to note how, step by step, first through boring from within labor unions, then from within farmers' organizations, then permeating colleges and universities, and later penetrating organizations and societies of every kind and nature, the socialists have moved forward all along the line until their final triumph in 1933 when, by "stealing" the Democratic party, they took political control of the nation.

"What they could not capture they were frequently able to destroy," writes Professor Norman J. Ware.<sup>1</sup> When labor unions were captured they were at once officered by clever socialist agitators and propagandists, and although claiming to be legitimate labor organizations were, in truth and in fact, subsidiaries of the international socialist movement. "Their adherents enter into the labor organizations, and edit labor papers which are not avowedly socialistic, and yet advocate what is essentially socialism," writes Prof. Richard T. Ely.<sup>2</sup>

When it was found impossible to capture a labor union, the next step was to turn full attention to attack upon it in order to destroy its effectiveness as an opponent to their program. Every possible move was made to weaken its membership and its leaders were often maliciously and viciously attacked. The theory supporting this method of campaigning was that the public would readily accept and act upon charges of dishonesty or lack of sincerity made against such leaders, a theory which experience of more than four decades has proven correct.

During the '70s and '80s there was much political confusion. Dissatisfied elements, then as now, sought to express themselves through a new political party. The largest of these for the period was the Greenback party. This did not escape socialist penetration, for the party was made up largely of workingmen. "Greenbackism was in the air," writes Norman J. Ware, "and the eastern socialists were beginning their long series of forays into the labor movement with the intent to capture it for the revolution."<sup>3</sup> Referring to a convention held at Pittsburgh, in 1876, which adopted a greenback platform, Professor Ware writes:

" . . . it permitted the New York socialists for the first time

<sup>1</sup> "The Labor Movement in the United States," page 36.

<sup>2</sup> "Socialism and Social Reform," Richard T. Ely, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1894, page 68.

<sup>3</sup> "The Labor Movement in the United States," page 35.

to cross the Alleghenies in force and practice their best trick of withdrawing from any meeting they could not dominate.”<sup>4</sup>

By 1874 the International Workingmen’s Association, the name under which the First International dominated by Marx was known, had thirty affiliated groups in the United States. With possibly two exceptions every one of these was formed, officered and directed by aliens many of whom did not as yet speak the English language.<sup>5</sup>

In 1876 this little group of alien propagandists formed what was termed the Workingmen’s party of the United States, the name of which, in 1877 was changed to the Socialist Labor party. Among those prominent in both conventions were Adolph Strasser and Peter J. McGuire. The former, an ardent socialist, was in part responsible for the formation of the Cigarmakers Union which at that time was composed very largely of socialists. McGuire was just a plain, noisy agitator. “His attack upon private property,” writes Rowland Hill Harvey, “drew down upon his head the wrath of the Church and the anger of his father, who stood upon the steps of a church in New York City and pronounced the words which disowned his wayward son.”<sup>6</sup>

Within the socialist movement in the United States then—and still more pronouncedly to-day—were two factions. One held to the political point of view now called legislative action; the other insisted upon the use of force and violence, largely at that time, through strikes. Both factions, however, as yet, were carefully feeling their way.

The most prominent labor organization, largely local, however, was the Knights of Labor established in 1869 by Uriah S. Stephens. It had attained considerable strength and, above all, a splendid standing with both the public and wage-earner because its methods were those natural to a union composed

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, page 35, footnote.

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix “B” for fuller information on the Internationals.

<sup>6</sup> “Samuel Gompers,” page 19.



almost entirely of American-born. A spirit of fairness was shown in all of its dealings with employers.

Immediately following the formation of the Socialist Labor party, its leaders started an intensive drive to force American workingmen into its membership. The basic philosophy of its platform—the abolition of the private property right—being repulsive to the honest worker, induced him to seek membership in some organization founded on true Americanism. The result was that, in 1878, the Knights of Labor became a national organization. There was nothing socialistic in its program. “In fundamental aim and program the Knights of Labor was opposed to socialism,” writes Nathan Fine.<sup>7</sup>

The organization had no fight with capital. “We mean no conflict with legitimate enterprize, no antagonism to necessary capital,” reads a part of the program. The platform continues, “We shall, with all our strength, support laws made to harmonize the interests of labor and capital. . . .”<sup>8</sup>

The socialists finding that, even though they had vigorously bored from within the Knights of Labor, they could not capture it, planned its destruction. Two methods were to be pursued; the first to bring the organization into disrepute by the commission of some overt unpopular act in the name of the Knights;<sup>9</sup> the other the formation of an opposition union.<sup>10</sup> The opposition organization, formed in 1886, known as the Federation of Trade and Labor Unions, changed its name the next year to the American Federation of Labor. Samuel Gompers, prominent in the Cigarmakers Union, was placed in charge of its activities.

“The Cigarmakers at this time contained many men in

<sup>7</sup> “Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States,” page 147.

<sup>8</sup> “Samuel Gompers,” pages 28-9.

<sup>9</sup> One is forced to wonder if what the socialists are doing in the name of the Democratic party is for the purpose of wrecking that political organization.

<sup>10</sup> The recent action of a large element in the American Federation of Labor in planning the formation of a new labor group to advance industrial unionism—and that seems a nice term to cover its socialist inception—parallels the methods adopted by the socialists in the '80s to wreck an organization they could not capture.

their ranks who had participated in revolutionary political movements in Germany, Austria, or the Scandinavian countries,"<sup>11</sup> writes Mr. Harvey. The dominant figure in this union was Adolph Strasser, born in Hungary and who, to judge from his many utterances, was in sympathy with the force and violence element in the socialist movement.

Strasser, it would appear, became Gompers' mentor. As a cigarmaker, Gompers came in daily contact with the Marxian socialists who, with care and seeming sincerity, expounded their philosophy to him. It evidently made an impression, but it remained for Ferdinand Laurrell, one of the revolutionists above mentioned, to give him a proper socialist background. Peter J. McGuire, the fiery agitator, was another man close to Gompers when the American Federation of Labor was formed.

The Knights of Labor were at the zenith of their glory when the American Federation of Labor appeared upon the scene. Strasser, McGuire, Gompers and many others taking part in the formation of the Federation held membership cards in the Knights.

Stephens, the founder of the Knights, had sensed the possibility of an opposing socialist union some years before. As early as 1879, writing to a prominent member of the Order, he said:

"You must not allow the socialists to get control of your assembly. They are simply disturbers, and only gain entrance to labor societies that they may be in better position to break them up. You cannot fathom them, for they are crafty, cunning and unscrupulous. . . . I have had an experience with them . . . and I warn you against having anything to do with them either individually or as a body. . . ." <sup>12</sup>

In the East, socialist members of the Knights who had bored from within, and had helped form the opposition Federation of Labor, began to declare unwarranted boycotts.

<sup>11</sup> "Samuel Gompers," page 17.

<sup>12</sup> "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States," page 147.

As honest workingmen were compelled to leave their jobs this caused much dissatisfaction and ill-feeling. In the West the force and violence element, most of whom were known as anarchists, inaugurated a reign of terror. Finally they called a strike against the McCormick Harvester Company at Chicago. Day after day crowds of men—there were few, if any, honest employees of the harvester concern among them— assembled in the streets around the plant seeking to prevent men going to work. Workingmen were assaulted and the members of their families threatened. This finally resulted in an open clash. The police interfered to preserve order. A number of persons were killed. A few days later, upon the call of an anarchist editor, a great protest meeting was held in Haymarket Square. While the crowd was being harangued, some one threw a bomb into the police formation. Several officers died as the result of the injuries received. Indignation was so great that those alleged to have been connected with this affair were arrested. A number were convicted and several hanged.

The impression was at once gained, due to socialist propaganda, that the Knights of Labor, in some manner, had a hand in, or was responsible for, the Haymarket affair. The Knights vigorously protested. Their official paper, the *Knights of Labor*, stated that the organization had "no affiliation, association, sympathy or respect for the band of cowardly murderers, cutthroats and robbers, known as anarchists. . . ." <sup>13</sup> Membership in the Order rapidly decreased. The organization had not been captured; it was being destroyed. Unjust boycotts and unsuccessful strikes, forced upon the Knights by the socialists who bored from within, with the culminating Haymarket affair, was the poison that brought death some years later.

For a time all went well within the American Federation of Labor. Its membership increased as that of the Knights decreased. Being of socialist inception the growing member-

<sup>13</sup> "The Labor Movement in the United States," page 316.

ship of American workingmen caused the alien agitators to fear that possibly they may have erected a Frankenstein. Hence they inaugurated a program of control. "The Socialists, having resolved to convert the Federation to their cause, proceeded to bore from within, that is, to push their organizations into the trade unions and work for their program," writes Mr. Harvey.<sup>14</sup>

In the 1890 convention there was a clear-cut issue between the socialist members and the American workingmen. The Socialist Labor party sought to seat a delegate. His right to a place in the convention was denied. This caused the socialists to renew their efforts. In the meanwhile the Socialist Labor party had fallen into the hands of Daniel DeLeon, an ardent Marxist and a bitter opponent. Plans to commit the Federation officially to socialism came from the West. Thomas J. Morgan, an avowed Marxist and secretary of the International Machinists Union, in the 1893 convention offered a resolution to go to a referendum of the members, which resolution contained pure socialist proposals. Among them were:

"The municipal ownership of street cars, and gas and electric plants for public distribution of light, heat and power. The nationalization of telegraphs, telephones, railroads and mines." And then this one:

"The collective ownership by the people of all means of production and distribution."<sup>15</sup>

Although this resolution was adopted by a referendum vote of 2244 to 67, when it came up for approval in the Federation convention in 1894, it was defeated. Referring to this resolution, N. I. Stone, a socialist writer, said that "for the first time in the history of organized labor of America the question of Socialism was put squarely before the rank and file of the American trade unions."<sup>16</sup>

The defeat of this resolution angered the socialist delegates.

<sup>14</sup> "Samuel Gompers," page 72.

<sup>15</sup> "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States," page 142.

<sup>16</sup> "The Volks-Zeitung Library," Vol. 2, No. 3, April 1, 1900, page 5.

Holding Gompers personally responsible, they proposed to teach him a lesson. They defeated him for reelection. Although, a year later, the Old Man was returned to the presidency by the bare majority of eighteen out of a total vote of 2064, the socialists continued to carry on their plan either to capture or destroy the Federation. The system that had proved so successful in the wrecking of the Knights—committing some overt unpopular act and causing the blame to rest upon labor—was planned.

The socialists formed the American Railway Union. Eugene V. Debs, later titular head of the Socialist party, was made president. A strike was called in the plant of the Pullman Palace Car Co., at Chicago. The Federation, while not directly involved, was maneuvered into giving its support. Destruction of property and personal violence followed. Finally trains hauling mail cars were stopped. Grover Cleveland, then President of the United States, ordered out federal troops. Governor Altgeld of Illinois, showing a friendly feeling toward socialists in general, protested this action. The President wired the Governor, in substance and effect, that if it became necessary to move the mails, he would conscript every able-bodied man in America. That broke the strike.

Gompers and the American element in the Federation commenced to recognize the fact that they had a ruthless foe with which to deal, and it soon became the policy, which policy continued down to the break in its ranks at the 1935 Atlantic City Convention, to placate rather than openly to oppose the socialist program. In consequence the Federation has, time and time again, placed itself unreservedly behind socialist legislative proposals, some of the members knowing what they were doing but with the majority of the members not knowing.

Early recognizing the fact that to capture the wage-earners of this nation was not enough to gain control of the government, and so put into operation the complete socialist program, attention was early turned to the agricultural section

of the West. The general program was that of agitation to intensify whatever unrest there might be, and to create additional ill-feeling. This has been carried on persistently to this date. The formation of the People's party, early in the '90s of the last century, enabled the socialists to do a splendid job of boring from within agricultural organizations.<sup>17</sup>

Within the socialist movement there was growing a difference between those who believed in the legislative action system to gain their ends, and those who believed in the force and violence system. This resulted in a split in 1901 and the formation of the Socialist party, the name of the leading socialist political organization to-day. Under the able leadership of the late Morris Hillquit, agitation and propaganda was extended and intensified to secure "the nationalization of all means of production and distribution." This, it will be recalled, was practically the wording of the Morgan resolution offered the A. F. of L. which, while being adopted by a referendum vote, was defeated in the 1894 convention.

The Socialist party, in its 1904 platform, came frankly into the open and set forth in clear and unmistakable language the reason it was urging a large number of reformative proposals. That platform stated that the "socialist movement, therefore, is a world-movement," and one that pledged its "fidelity to the principles of international socialism." It divided the people into two classes—workers and capitalists—stating that, "there can be no possible compromise or identity of interests, any more than there can be peace in the midst of war, or light in the midst of darkness."<sup>18</sup>

The platform declared that, "Socialism means that all those things upon which the people in common depend shall by the people in common be owned and administered."<sup>19</sup> In other words, that no individual shall enjoy the fruit of his

<sup>17</sup> For a more complete account of the socialist connection with the Populist movement see Appendix "C."

<sup>18</sup> Proceedings of the National Convention of the Socialist Party, 1904, page 307.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, page 308.

efforts, no person shall be permitted to acquire any form of property which he can call his own.

Stating that the aim of socialism is to secure possession of, "all those things upon which the people in common depend"—that is, things now produced and owned by individuals such as the products of the farms, the factories, the shops, means of transportation, etc.—the party expressed in clear and unmistakable language, just how the ends desired were to be attained. The platform reads:

"To the end that the workers may seize every possible advantage that may strengthen them to gain complete control of the powers of government, and thereby the sooner establish the coöperative commonwealth" (remember coöperative commonwealth is the technical name for the form of government now operating in Russia), "the Socialist party pledges itself to watch and work" for certain so-called legislative reforms.<sup>20</sup>

Nowhere in the platform, or in the arguments favoring its adoption as printed in the official proceedings, will one find a word urging these legislative reforms because they will, *per se*, cure the ills alleged to exist. On the contrary, the socialists definitely state the reason for urging them is because, if adopted, they "will lessen the economic and political powers of the capitalist"—that is, those who approve of our form of government and our economic system—"and increase the like powers of the worker"—that is, those who accept the socialist formula. The language follows:

". . . we are using these remedial measures as means to the one great end of the coöperative commonwealth. Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry. . . ." <sup>21</sup>

The socialists here frankly state that the purpose of reformative legislation is to establish the coöperative commonwealth,

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, page 308.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, page 308.

which cannot be set up until the present form of government is abandoned. Then certainly the purpose is not, as the people are led to believe, to cure any economic ills from which they suffer.

Some may contend that the platform declarations of the socialists in 1904 do not express their position to-day. A comparison of this 1904 platform with those of 1928 and 1932 reveals no change in the purpose of the Socialist party. The main features of the latter platform are given in Chapter II.

Jessie Wallace Hughan, an official spokesman for the Socialist party, a contributing editor to the *New Appeal*, an official organ of the socialists, writing in 1928, said that, "We find six lines of legislation that must be pursued simultaneously in order to reach the goal."<sup>22</sup> The goal is a pure socialistic state wherein no person is permitted to acquire or own property. In summing up some of her arguments in a chapter captioned, "Methods of Realization," she writes:

"These demands show that the Socialist state is to be brought about automatically by economic forces, and deliberately by legislation of six general types."<sup>23</sup>

The six types to be inaugurated "simultaneously," according to Miss Hughan, which we have paragraphed for a better and clearer understanding, are:

"First, the political, including proportional representation, direct election of President and Vice-President, and abolition of the law-determining power of the Supreme Court;

"Second, measures to insure civil liberties, including the repeal of the Espionage Act and the prohibition of the injunction in labor disputes;

"Third, the international demands, directed to the abolition of imperialism and of war;

"Fourth, the financial, consisting of inheritance, income and other taxes bearing heavily upon superfortunes;

"Fifth, the industrial, embracing various forms of labor

<sup>22</sup> "What Is Socialism," page 103.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, page 114.



legislation, social insurance and pensions, freedom to strike, the minimum wage, and finally the guarantee of employment; and

“Sixth, the collectivist, under which comes the gradual acquiring of the basic industries, beginning with the natural resources and the larger trusts.”<sup>24</sup>

While the right wing of the socialist movement, early in this century, was perfecting a concrete program of reformative laws, all of which are reflected in New Deal legislation, the left wing, or force and violence group, was not idle. Bill Haywood, with his Western Federation of Miners, had spread death, destruction and terror through the western metal mining camps. The success attending his efforts resulted in the formation, in 1905, of a left wing of the socialist movement called the Industrial Workers of the World, but better known as the I.W.W. While the activities of this branch of the movement only incidentally affect the present situation, one should have a fair understanding of the organization. For that reason, a brief history is given in Appendix “D.”

With the formation of the Socialist party, in the hands of those who had made some study of American psychology, definite plans were made to carry on the battle for complete socialization along all fronts. This was aided by the formation of many subsidiary organizations with rather deceptive names, and by an intensive campaign to penetrate the schools and colleges.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, page 114.

## Chapter VI

### THE BIRTH OF THE BRAIN TRUST

WHILE the right and left wings of the socialist movement, the former represented by the Socialist party and the latter by the I.W.W., were having their little internal troubles, the brain trusters of the early Twentieth century imported a new brand of socialism into the United States. It was known as Fabianism, although that name was not commonly attached to it in this country.

The Fabian movement was formed in England in 1884 (some claim in 1883) by Frank Podmore, a well-known spiritualist and prominent with Mrs. Annie Besant in the Theosophist movement. The Fabians were a group of socialists who discarded the garb of the street and dressed in robes of the "upper crust." They rejected a number of the Marxian conceptions, principally the class struggle. While the Fabian movement was composed largely of those who had not joined the Socialist party (this due to its rigid discipline), they did affiliate with the Second International and worked in complete harmony with the many socialist organizations.

The socialist movement in England for many years had been directed exclusively by those who saw no flaw in Marx's writings. Marx introduced the revolutionary idea, that is, the theory that force, violence and acts of terrorism were necessary to attain the ends sought. This the Fabians rejected, moving to the right, taking the position that their aims could be secured through legislative action. This is not only the position of those that may be termed Fabians in the United States, but also of the well-informed element in the whole socialist movement. The end sought by all—and this applies to the communists as well—is the overthrow of all governments

which recognize the private property right, it being their contention that capitalism, which is based on that right, is responsible for all the ills to which man is heir.

Prof. Hearnshaw, referring to the Fabians, uses this language:

"The policy of the Fabians was in accord with their apparently mild and persuasive creed. They studiously avoided the giving of shocks to society; they went about, not in sheepskins and goat-skins, but in silk hats and frock coats, like the most innocent of shopwalkers; they enrolled in their ranks pitiful parsons of all denominations, and got them to assure the religious world—gravely perturbed by the materialistic atheism of Marx—that socialism was really nothing more than applied Christianity; they lived in suburban villas; waxed eloquent in drawing-rooms; made money, invested it, and flourished on the dividends like any ordinary capitalist; drew rents and royalties, and sought differential increases of salaries, just as though they had been normal parasites of the toiling proletariat. . . .

"Their method of attack upon capitalism from their first day to the present has been thoroughly characteristic: it has been the method of sapping rather than assault; of craft rather than force; of subtlety rather than violence. 'Permeation' has been their watchword. Power rather than property has been their immediate quest; but power which will enable them in the end—by peaceful and constitutional means, infinitely more effective and less destructive than communist violence—to possess themselves of property. They have wormed their way, often in disguise, into political clubs, trade-union executives, coöperators' directorates, educational committees, religious conferences, boards of guardians, municipal councils, and other public bodies, and have made it their business to guide and drive them in a socialistic direction. Above all, they have tried to bemuse the public mind into the belief that 'socialism' and 'collectivism' are synonymous

terms; and that all they are aiming at is a harmless and beneficent extension of state and municipal enterprise.”<sup>1</sup>

Tract No. 5, issued by the Fabians some years ago, details the plans and purposes. Prof. Hearnshaw has analyzed this document and in a few terse sentences exposes the scheme. He writes:

“Step by step, land, mines, railways, ships, banks, shops—everything—will be nationalised, municipalised, socialised. Private enterprise will be slowly but completely squeezed out of existence; competition will be imperceptibly but entirely eliminated. And the funds to achieve these ends will not be seized by lawless force; they will be quietly but remorselessly extracted from private enterprise and competitive industry themselves by a graduated system of predatory taxation. Nothing will be confiscated; everything will be purchased and paid for. The members of the possessing classes will, by some ingenious device or other, compensate one another, until (again gradually) their funds run out, when they will, to their great advantage, be compelled to resort to work, even if it be only to ‘earn a precarious livelihood by taking in one another’s washing.’ Meantime the proletariat will rejoice. They will all be servants of the beneficent state; their wages will go up, for they will fix them themselves through their elected representatives; their hours of labour will go down, for they will no longer have to maintain capitalists and landlords in luxury; they will begin to draw large old-age pensions whilst they still have youth and energy to enjoy them; education, medical attendance, amusements, recreations, transport—all will be free and unrestricted. In the end, every one will be a blessed pauper, paying away all his earnings in rates and taxes, and in return being luxuriously maintained (so long as he does not display any recrudescence of individualism) on outdoor relief.”<sup>2</sup>

Tract No. 127 contains this significant statement:

<sup>1</sup> “A Survey of Socialism,” Hearnshaw, pages 298-9.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pages 305-6.

"To the socialist, taxation is the chief means by which he may recover from the propertied classes some portion of the plunder which their economic strength and social position have enabled them to extract from the workers. . . . To the socialist, the best of governments is that which spends the most."<sup>3</sup>

We have given the foregoing citations rather fully for a reason. We ask you now to re-read them, changing the words "Fabian" and "Fabianism" where they appear to "New Deal" or "New Dealism." Professor Hearnshaw wrote what we have quoted in 1928, long before the program of the brain trust was sprung on the people of the United States and yet no man to-day can compress in so few words as complete an analysis of the methods, aims and purposes of the forces supporting the present Administration at Washington.

Fabianism was introduced as an organized movement in the United States in 1905 when a group of intellectuals formed the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. Among those establishing this organization were Harry W. Laidler, Clarence Darrow, Jack London, the late Morris Hillquit and a number of others of the same mental trend. The purpose of the organization was stated in this language: "For the purpose of promoting an intelligent interest in socialism among college men and women, graduates and undergraduates."<sup>4</sup>

While not claiming any direct connection with the Fabians of England, the Intercollegiate Socialist Society adopted, practically in toto, Fabian tactics, aims and purposes. For instance, the society's leaders took the Fabian position that by elevating the theory and causing it to be discussed by the high-brows, they could educate the rising generation to accept its realization as their one and only salvation. Thus they believed they could, within a few decades, have socialist thought sufficiently entrenched in the minds of a powerful and influential

<sup>3</sup> Cited, *Ibid.*, page 306.

<sup>4</sup> "Socialism in Thought and Action," Laidler, page 503.

minority, to gain political control and thereby establish the "new social order" cited by the society as its true purpose.

While it may be giving this organization more credit than is its due, by checking its activities and the spread of its influence from the date of its organization to the present year, one is forced to the conclusion that it, at least, wet-nursed the present brain trust. In 1921, the name was changed to the League for Industrial Democracy, a rather deceptive title. Its purpose was then stated in this language:

"To promote among college men and women an intelligent understanding of the labor movement and of the movement toward a new social order based on production for use and not for profit."<sup>5</sup>

Under that name the socialists have gained considerable standing. They have been able to secure coast-to-coast hook-ups over one of the great broadcasting systems. Dr. Laidler, who is a suave socialist speaker, has appeared on these programs a number of times.

While some of the socialists now prominently affiliated with the League for Industrial Democracy decry parts of the New Deal, due largely to personal pique because their program has been taken over by what is called the Democratic party, socialists generally are for all the reform measures so far presented. The reason is apparent. Dr. Laidler says:

"A majority of socialists . . . believe that, on the whole, social reforms bring the goal of socialism nearer. For these measures have a tendency to undermine the power of the capitalist; to whet society's appetite for further and more effective control over their industrial life; to give to the public servants valuable experience in the control of industrial functions, and to strengthen the working class physically and intellectually, so that they may become ever more powerful in their fight for emancipation."<sup>6</sup>

At the opening of the Twentieth century there probably

<sup>5</sup> "Social Progress," page 284.

<sup>6</sup> "Socialism in Thought and Action," page 190.

was not even one college professor in the United States openly and frankly teaching the Marxian theory to his students. Following the formation of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society the tendency to present socialism as a legitimate subject of inquiry became manifest, and within the past decade or more, many of the leading educational institutions have been more or less dominated by professors who denounce the capitalist system and demand the installation of pure socialism in the United States.

In 1925 the New York *Daily Commercial* ran a series of articles by Ralph E. Duncan entitled "Are Our Colleges Teaching Subversive Philosophy?" They showed extensive research and certainly were informative. Had some attention been paid to what Mr. Duncan said at that time, we might now be spared the menace of a brain trust. The first three paragraphs introducing the series, read:

"Revolutionary radicalism, once a thing of the street corner, is firmly established to-day on the campus of many an American college. The trustees and administrative officers of some of the oldest and largest universities in the country are confronted with a situation unlike anything in the history of education in America.

"The slogans of the 'class struggle' and the catch-phrases of Socialism are upon the lips of a growing host of young men and women in the universities. Vicious, immoral and degrading beliefs are fostered among the 'advanced thinkers' of both the student body and the faculty by organized groups outside the colleges who employ all the arts of propaganda to disseminate false and subversive doctrine on the campus and in the lecture hall.

"Open defiance of the trustees and heads of several institutions by organized groups of the faculty and student body during the last three or four semesters has brought matters to an issue in a score of colleges."

The strategy of the organized socialist agencies in the educational institutions was the same as had been employed

previously by Marxians in an effort to capture labor unions and farmers' organizations—to be controlled for the advancement of socialism. Groups were formed under socialistic leadership outside the institutions and these groups worked in perfect harmony with socialist-minded educators within those departments regarded by socialists as the most useful for their purpose.

When this step proved successful, and in nearly every instance it did so prove because no one was paying the slightest attention to what was going on or, if told, merely laughed it off, the next move was to secure the appointment of educators from their group to strategic professorships. But the plan did not stop with this. There was a practical objective wholly apart from the educational phase of the socialist program. That was the control of state governments and in the end the federal government and industry, by the creation of commissions, boards and bureaus, independent investigating and regulatory agencies, so that the orderly processes of government may be gradually superseded by bureaucratic rule and finally pure socialism. We have reached the bureaucratic control state to-day. To-morrow, if there is no break in the program, will come pure socialism. Professor Harry Laidler, an authoritative socialist writer, quotes Prof. W. H. Hamilton as saying:

“We have created a system of regulations which involves supervising accounts, evaluating property, fixing rates, and standardizing property; which threatens supervision of expenditures and investment; and which tends to limit the railroad to a definite guaranteed return on its investment. Control is very rapidly passing into the hands of the state. The step to the formal assumption of management is but a short one.”<sup>7</sup> This “control” of all industries is one direct objective of the New Deal.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, page 189. Mr. Laidler says to the same end “see Parmalee, ‘Poverty and Progress,’ Pt. III, and Commons and Andrews, ‘Principles of Labor Legislation.’” Prof. Laidler was writing in 1920.

---



Senator L. J. Dickinson, of Iowa, on the floor of the Senate, August 5th, 1935, called attention to the fact that the Senate Munitions Committee employed as their chief investigator one H. S. Raushenbush, prominent as a socialist and so known to be by the members of the committee, according to the Senator. "Mr. Raushenbush," said Senator Dickinson, "is the man who has been given carte blanche authority as the chief investigator for the munitions committee to go into private files where you, Mr. President, cannot go, where I cannot go, and take therefrom any information he may want."<sup>8</sup>

In other words, open enemies of our form of government and our system of economics, men and women who, in public print and speech, frankly admit their one aim is to destroy the institution of private property, are given authority not even in the hands of duly elected representatives of the people, to delve into the private papers of different departments of government. The information thus secured is used to further their plans. And investigating committees have, for a number of years, employed men of the mental trend of Mr. Raushenbush to search the private files of business concerns and secure confidential trade information which is used to wreck the very business of those whose data they thus legally attain.

The blame does not rest wholly on the present administration by any means. Previous administrations, through different bureaus of the government, or certain elements in the Congress, have been unwittingly financing enemies of our form of government. A careful check-up on the mental attitude of the majority of those who have been special investigators for different bureaus or commissions, or for different committees named by one or the other branch of the Congress during the past decade or more, will show that the great majority of them were closely allied with the socialist movement, possibly not in name, but certainly in aim.

It would require a book much larger than this to brief, in part, the extent and nature of socialist activities in our

<sup>8</sup> Congressional Record, page 12912.

educational institutions. That the American Teachers Union, dominating in many of the larger cities, is socialistic is evidenced by the fact that at its recent annual convention the row between the open socialists and the alleged communists caused most of the former to withdraw. No doubt many of the sincere teachers throughout the rural sections of the nation who are members of this organization, do not understand the situation.

During the past few years it has been almost a daily occurrence to read in the press the account of some "protest" meeting, or some form of rioting on the campus of one of our leading educational institutions. In each such instance the ring-leaders were socialists of either the right or left wing faction. Many of these affairs have been positively disgraceful. Heads of such institutions who had taken steps to weed out socialistic elements in the faculty have been maligned and, in some instances, personally attacked. In a number of States substantial citizens, aroused because of the growth of socialistic teachings in the colleges and universities, have entered vigorous protest but action, for some reason, has been prevented.

Recently the State of Illinois named a special committee to investigate communist teachings in its colleges and institutions. Before this investigation was actually under way some powerful influence caused the committee to close all hearings. Enough was developed, however, to cause the serious people of Illinois to do a bit of pondering. Referring to this investigation the New York *American* editorially said:

"No one can read the report of the committee of the Illinois Senate, appointed to investigate subversive Communistic teachings in certain colleges and universities in the State of Illinois, without reaching the conclusion that the University of Chicago deserved all the investigation it got and that it should receive a good deal more. Despite the disclaimers of its President, Robert M. Hutchins, it is manifest to any one who reviews the testimony and the report that

---

the University has connived at Communist speeches and activities on the part of faculty members and has ignored their identification with various Communist organizations.”<sup>9</sup>

The success which attended the scheme to educate the rising generation to socialism by injecting that carefully sugar-coated theory into the schools and colleges, caused socialists to go a step farther. They sought control of organizations of every kind and description from women's clubs to church societies, in some sections not even overlooking the substantial noon-day luncheon clubs.

This plan was intensified after the advent of the communists. There is much reason to hold this intensification came as the result of direct orders from Moscow. At least among the confidential papers unearthed by the government when it raided the communist gathering at Bridgman, Michigan, later referred to, a document was brought to light of special interest in this connection. While it dealt wholly with the colored people, the plan was later extended to cover all elements of society. We reproduce it, in part, dropping the word “Negro” where it appeared in the original text in order to show how the system is generally applied. This confidential communication read as follows:

“1. Nuclei shall be established in all existing . . . organizations such as fraternal, religious and labor organizations, coöperatives, tenant farmers' leagues, etc.

“2. . . . organizers and speakers shall be sent among the . . . (people) in order to inform them and win their confidence.

“3. Newspapers and publications shall be established, or when this is not feasible, news services shall be established by friendly coöperation with . . . newspapers of liberal tendencies.

“4. Friendship of liberal-minded . . . ministers shall be sought, as these men are at the present time the leaders of

<sup>9</sup> July 25, 1935. The National Republic, Washington, during the summer of 1935 ran a series of articles on this subject.

the . . . masses and many of them are earnest, but lack scientific knowledge.

"5. Conferences on the economic conditions among the . . . (people) shall be held from time to time with these ministers, educators, and other liberal elements, and through their influence the party shall aim to secure a more favorable hearing before the . . . masses.

"6. By means of its membership the party shall penetrate the existing forums, literary societies, lyceums, schools, colleges, teachers' institutes, etc., of the . . . people, and establish forums of its own for the enlightenment of the . . . population."<sup>10</sup>

The intelligent citizen who has given any attention whatever to what has been going on in his community, will recognize the fact that the program as above outlined has been made rather effective. Nuclei have been established in many organizations; organizers for New Deal societies have been throughout the land; there is a perfect torrent of propaganda in the press;<sup>11</sup> liberal-minded ministers have been appealed to by the President for their political support; conferences on economic conditions dot the landscape; and no man knows the full extent to which forums, literary societies, lyceums, schools, colleges and teachers' institutes have been penetrated.

In addition to working through existing societies of every kind and nature, the socialists and communists have formed a large number of organizations with names which are deceptive and, in many instances, with expressed aims which have an emotional appeal. "Social Progress, A Handbook of the Liberal Movement," published by the Arbitrator in 1925 listed over a hundred such organizations. "The Red Network"<sup>12</sup> lists several hundred.

<sup>10</sup> Cited in "Underground with the Reds," Fred R. Marvin, page 20.

<sup>11</sup> Let us suggest that those who are interested in following the method employed by propaganda to influence the American people, secure a copy of "Hand Out" by George Michael, Putnam & Sons. It is an enlightening exposé.

<sup>12</sup> Elizabeth Dilling, Kenilworth, Illinois.

When the loyal people had their whole attention centered on the winning of a war upon foreign shores, the right wingers under the guidance of the Socialist party, the left wingers under the direction of the I.W.W., and the Fabians, operating as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, joined in a common assault upon the agricultural sections of the West, inaugurating the scheme to "steal" party nominations which culminated in national success in 1932. We refer to what is termed the Nonpartisan League, the importance of which warrants considerable attention.

## *Chapter VII*

### SOCIALISM AND THE NONPARTISAN LEAGUE

THE Nonpartisan League, which made its appearance as an organized movement in North Dakota in 1916, was the second of the great movements to implant socialism in the minds of the agricultural population of the West. After the passing of the Populist movement, the first, the socialists discovered that while they had been unable to gain any great hold upon the farmers through their system of boring from within, they had found an exceptionally fertile mental soil for additional propaganda and active agitation. In their minds to have permitted this field where discontent ran riot to remain fallow would have been a crime. The railroads remained a standard bogey-man. The socialists added, among many others, two most terrifying ones—Wall Street and Vested Interests. The troubles from which the farmers suffered were greatly magnified; the good they experienced minimized.

While the Populist movement was not originally inaugurated by the socialists, not so the Nonpartisan League. This organization was deliberately and intentionally inspired by well-known socialist leaders, largely from states outside of North Dakota, although the small group within the state which had accepted that philosophy readily became willing supporters. The large number of persons who had used the ballot to gain their ends during the days of Populism gave the clever socialist leaders their clew and they bided their time to put it into operation. Before the Nonpartisan League made its appearance, the plans were well laid to try out, in that state, a complete program of legislative action.

North Dakota is primarily a wheat raising state. The prosperity of all the people of that commonwealth depends upon

the size of the wheat crop and the price received by the farmers for this grain. Anything that adversely affects either crop or price, adversely affects all the people of the state. The population, largely of Scandinavian descent, consisted of loyal American citizens. They were naturally individualists. There was nothing in the philosophy of socialism that would have appealed to them had they known just what that philosophy was. Had they been told it was to deprive them of their right to own and operate their property as they saw fit, they would have instantly rejected it. This fact, however, was carefully concealed. They had their attention directed elsewhere. The socialists took care of that.

While the general feeling of antagonism to the railroads had materially decreased and both Wall Street and Vested Interests seemed far away, to say nothing of being a bit abstract, new enemies had to be produced. They were quickly found.

For several years previous to the formation of the Non-partisan League there had been a persistent, organized campaign in North Dakota to discredit the grain dealers of Minneapolis, Duluth and Chicago, together with their associates, the elevator men. The three were put into the same basket and labeled the Interests.

It mattered not what might adversely affect crops or the price, the Interests were always at fault. They were held responsible for low prices in foreign markets which controlled prices in the American markets; they were responsible if the weather had been such that the yield or standard of crop was not up to normal.

That these so-called Interests had been lax there is no question. Unfair practices on the part of some of them had no doubt created much ill-feeling; but the differences, such as they were, could have been adjusted, and no doubt would have been adjusted, had not this persistent socialist agitation caused resentment on the part of all concerned.

The general nature of the extensive propaganda aimed at

the grain dealers, elevator owners and the railroads, is well illustrated by the contents of a propaganda book, "The Story of the Nonpartisan League," by Charles Edward Russell. Mr. Russell was, at one time, the socialist candidate for mayor of New York City. He was regarded as an able and well versed socialist. He stood high in the councils of his party although he deserted the organization when it took a disloyal position on the War. This book, consisting of 325 pages, is devoted almost exclusively to an attack upon the grain dealers, elevator owners and the railroads. The subject, the Nonpartisan League, is scarcely mentioned in the first half of the book.

It was well known to those who were watching the progress of socialist thought before and during the World War, that there was a renewed effort on the part of socialist proponents to gain the support of the farmers in a number of western states. Early in 1916, the socialist weekly paper, *The Appeal to Reason*, published at Girard, Kansas, called attention to the fact that the socialists, depending for membership in the industrial sections, "realized that most of these hopes are resting on sand." The paper then declared:

"We are going to attract to our movement the farming and rural population of America by printing things they are interested in."<sup>1</sup>

It should here be noted that less than two years later this same publication was printing advertisements for "organizers for the Nonpartisan League," for "Minnesota, South Dakota, Colorado, Idaho, Washington, Montana, Kansas, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Texas, Nebraska and Iowa."<sup>2</sup>

While the Nonpartisan League is said to have been the brain-wave of Arthur C. Townley, evidence shows that Townley was pushed to the front for a reason. Leon Durocher and A. E. Bowen were well known socialists. In a letter answering an inquiry (name of recipient intentionally

<sup>1</sup> February 5, 1916.

<sup>2</sup> November 24, 1917.



deleted), dated March 29, 1920, and signed by Durocher, appears this language:

"In reply to yours of the 22nd, will say that in Sept., 1914 in Golden Valley County A. E. Bowen outlined the League program to me and the method of campaigning which has since been adopted. . . . A. C. Townley was not in on this until sometime in Dec."

The writer then goes on to say that they permitted Townley to assume "credit for the whole thing," because "it pleased his vanity and consequently gave him more incentive to put in his best licks."<sup>3</sup>

Townley had tried wheat farming on a large scale in Colorado. He failed. He tried flax raising in North Dakota on a large scale. Again he failed. Then it was he became a socialist organizer. He, no doubt, was selected to become the "front" for the new socialist game because he early "began to be a critic of the existing order, but with ambitions."<sup>4</sup>

Like most reformers, Townley did not attribute his failure in either of the above instances to any fault of his own but charged it to the activities of the Interests, and he started out to "get" them.<sup>5</sup> In this he followed the system that has been employed by human failures the world over. He saw in the philosophy of socialism that which he was seeking. He became a socialist organizer in North Dakota, but did not make any great headway in securing members even though a rather persuasive talker. Those to whom he presented his straight socialist theory were not easily sold on the idea since they were naturally, and by predilection, individualists. But when he dropped the philosophy and began to talk about how the Interests were "robbing the farmers," he gained their attention.

The idea was presented to him that if some of the socialist

<sup>3</sup> "The Leaders of the Nonpartisan League," Asher Howard, Minneapolis, 1920, page 35.

<sup>4</sup> "The Nonpartisan League," by Herbert E. Gaston, Harcourt, Brace & Howe, 1920, page 47.

<sup>5</sup> See "The Nonpartisan League," Gaston, Chapter VI.

theories, but not using that designation, could be transformed into quick political action on the part of the farmers, these farmers could be induced to follow his leadership. The result was that the Socialist party, as an organization, was abandoned. Its members, together with the well-meaning and conscientious farmers, who thought only in terms of their immediate troubles and a remedy therefor, united in an organization known as the Farmers' Nonpartisan League. Later the word "farmers" was dropped.

Townley started out to enlist members. The persistent and continued propaganda against the grain dealers, elevator owners and railroads had taken root, and to offset this propaganda, these so-called Interests did nothing. As business men have done for more than fifty years, they referred to those advancing socialist thought as a bunch of "nit-wits." Little did they grasp the fact that underneath the cleverly furnished emotional and idealistic preachments, there rested a basic destructive philosophy which, if ever put into effect in this country, would completely overthrow our form of government, wreck our economic system, destroy the institution of property and deprive every citizen of his constitutional rights.

Townley was successful. Organizers were employed and paid a fair compensation for their work. Under the tutelage of able socialist leaders, imported into North Dakota for that purpose, they knew their story well. The organization grew by leaps and bounds, soon becoming a political power in a number of Western states just as had the People's party three decades before.

The socialist boring from within system took the form of "stealing" party nominations in the primary elections. In an affidavit used in the unsuccessful case of Ray McKaig, a Nonpartisan League organizer, against Governor Frank Gooding of Idaho, for libel, Judge L. J. Palda of Minot, North Dakota, referring to Arthur LeSueur, a prominent socialist, said:

---

“... he did many years ago state to me in a conversation, I then being chairman of the Republican Central Committee of this county, that he had a plan whereby they would finally get control; that he had come to the conclusion that he would not get the people to use force; that what they were going to do was organize and steal the prevailing parties in the various states, and steal the organizations in the various states, and in that way gain their end.”<sup>6</sup>

The Republican party of North Dakota was taken over completely by the socialists under the name of the Nonpartisan League. The Democratic party was also “stolen” in a number of other states. The political machinery of the state of North Dakota, thus falling into the hands of those saturated with socialist thought of the legislative action group, proceeded to put into effect the many reforms which Morris Hillquit said originated in Socialist headquarters.

The program, as presented before the election that gave them full power, provided:

- State terminal elevators, flour mills, stock-yards, packing-houses and cold storage plants;
- State hail insurance;
- Exemption of farm improvements from taxation;
- State inspection of dockage and grading (grain);
- Rural credit banks operated at cost.<sup>7</sup>

Not only was this program enacted into law but, in addition, the state went into the building and loan business, established a state bank and adopted a rather long list of socialist proposals.

North Dakota had swung to state socialism. Many of the ablest exponents of the socialist tactics of legislative action hold to the belief that complete socialization can be effected in the easiest and quickest manner through state socialism, either on a local scale, as attempted in North Dakota, or upon

<sup>6</sup> “The Leaders of the Nonpartisan League,” page 10.

<sup>7</sup> “The Story of the Nonpartisan League,” Charles E. Russell, page 213.

a national scale as proposed in the program of the New Deal. It was soon demonstrated, however, that economic ills are not to be corrected through legislation of the character described.

One after another, each of the schemes tried in North Dakota, failed. It became clear to many who had been ardent advocates of the experiments that any business in the hands of politicians, is neither successful nor economical. They always have failed, leaving a debt to be paid by the taxpayers.

In 1922, through the primaries of the Republican or Democratic parties, the Nonpartisan League, with a somewhat expanded program of socialist reform legislation, gained party control in North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, Colorado and Oklahoma. It also secured what might be termed a balance of power in Idaho, Washington, Kansas, Nebraska and some other states. In no state did it seek political preference under its own name. The "steal" party system was found to work very nicely.

By this time, however, not only did many of the farmers who had been induced to join have their eyes opened as to what was back of the movement, but also the bulk of the tradesmen in the rural towns and cities were awakened from their dream of redemption via legislation. Except in a few instances the party "stolen" by the Nonpartisan League failed at the polls. The organization, as such, began to lose strength and membership. In a few years it had, however, implanted certain socialist thought into the minds of a large number of people. That thought remained to germinate in support of what is now called the New Deal program, which is merely the socialist program of North Dakota upon a national scale.

Finally, the Nonpartisan League as a political power disappeared. This was due not alone to the failure of all the reformative laws which cluttered the statute books of North Dakota, but to the fact that outside socialists had practically taken control of the movement. It was said at first to be strictly a farmers' affair. Its parentage, however, was revealed by the attempt to implant socialism in the schools of

the state, and the connection of some of its leaders with the I.W.W. the then left, or force and violence, wing of the socialist movement.

Joseph Gilbert and David C. Coates, both Pacific Coast socialists and both delegates to the convention which formed the I.W.W.; Arthur LeSueur, vice-president of the People's College at Fort Scott, Kansas, who was an attorney for the I.W.W. and signed a letter to a North Dakota comrade, "Yours for the Revolution," the man referred to by Judge Palda;<sup>8</sup> and D. C. Dorman, connected with I.W.W. riots at Minot, North Dakota, to say nothing of a number of lesser lights, were active in Nonpartisan League affairs.

The attempt on the part of these, and other leaders within the ranks of the Nonpartisan League, to force the farmers to enter into an agreement to employ only members of the I.W.W., the refusal to do so meaning the destruction of their crops by fire or other forms of sabotage, opened the eyes of a good many farmers. *Solidarity*, the official publication of the I.W.W., in its issue of June 9, 1917, contained an account of a meeting of the Agricultural Workers section of the I.W.W. In that report appears this language:

"The most important of all the communications, however, was one from Mr. Townley, president of the Non-Partisan League of North Dakota, an organization composed of practically 95 per cent of the farmers of that state, stating the aims and objects of the organization, and that it controlled most of the political offices of the state." The article goes on to say that Mr. Townley informed the I.W.W. convention that the Nonpartisan League, at a convention soon to be held, would name a committee of five to meet with a similar committee from the I.W.W. to decide the question of wages, hours and other working conditions that should prevail in North Dakota that year. The article continues,

"The convention went on record as being in favor of the proposition. . . . If the delegates come to an understanding,

<sup>8</sup> "The Leaders of the Nonpartisan League," page 66.

and there is no reason to believe but that they will, this will mean that none but members of the I.W.W. will harvest the crops of the entire state of North Dakota this year.”<sup>9</sup> That was boring from within with vengeance.

This plan of the legislative action group of socialists to form a close connection with the force and violence wing, caused many well meaning farmers to doubt the good intentions of those who were so busily engaged, not in farming the land, but in farming the farmers.

The philosophy of the Nonpartisan League was the philosophy of socialism. Even those who formed and guided the movement when it was at its height, did not deny this. The reformative laws presented and adopted by the legislature of North Dakota when the League was in political power were “originally formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thorough-going lines.”

Townley, who was pushed to the front in forming the organization, was a socialist. As has been noted, advertisements for organizers were carried in the leading socialist paper circulating in the West. Very early in the movement two able socialist propagandists were imported to North Dakota and went upon the payroll. One of them was Charles Edward Russell, whose book we have already cited; the other, Herbert E. Gaston. In the bankruptcy proceedings of Townley appears the following:

“I remember now, Charles Edward Russell was employed to start the Nonpartisan League. . . . He was an employee of the organization; as I remember, his mission in Seattle was to secure a newspaper man on his way.”<sup>10</sup>

The newspaper man he secured was Mr. Gaston. Gaston probably was more of a professional press agent than a socialist although he later worked for the New York *Daily Leader*, the official organ of the Socialist party. He is now

<sup>9</sup> “Solidarity,” June 9, 1917.

<sup>10</sup> Townley Bankruptcy Proceedings, page 179. Cited, “The Nonpartisan League, Its Birth, Activities and Leaders,” by William Langer, page 1, Introductory.

on the federal pay-roll as an assistant in the office of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau. Mr. Gaston frankly admits the charge was persistently made that the organization was socialist. He writes:

"It has been freely and frequently charged that the League is 'Socialistic,' that it is an organization manned and led by Socialists, that Townley himself is a socialist, and that the whole movement is a plan to foist disguised Socialism onto the states and the nation."<sup>11</sup> Referring to these charges a number of times in this book, Mr. Gaston dismisses them with this sentence:

"The League's defense in general against all charges was to attack."<sup>12</sup> This has been the strategy of the New Dealists. During the first eighteen months of the Roosevelt administration every one who raised his voice in protest was at once attacked and charged with being a tory, a reactionary, a chiseler, the hurler of "dead cats," to say nothing of other names not even so polite.

Before very many people knew anything at all about the Nonpartisan League, socialists of all degrees began to flock to North Dakota. They had no trouble in securing paying jobs as organizers and later, when the state was taken over politically, annexing good state jobs. "Facts and Figures," a document issued by the Joint Campaign Committee of North Dakota in opposition to the Nonpartisan League in 1920, presents the names of 87 well-known socialists actively connected with the Nonpartisan League. Of this number, twenty-one were on the State's payroll. The same little document lists 28 new offices that had been created by the Nonpartisan League-controlled legislature, the payroll of which amounted to nearly a hundred thousand dollars a year.

Gates E. M. Young, League candidate for the United States Senate from Minnesota in 1918, wrote a friend under date of February 16, 1920, as follows:

<sup>11</sup> "The Nonpartisan League," Gaston, page 4.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, page 89.

"It is a fact that the socialist party in N. Dak. has disappeared. That this will be the case in all other states does not necessarily follow. In N. Dak. the socialists were largely the promoters of the N.P.L. . . .

"As a student of the socialist philosophy you understand that the socialist party as such must disappear when (if) socialism becomes a reality. And finally, the industrial state will leave no place for the political parties. The outcome is the abolition of the political state. This is sometimes called, 'industrial democracy.' The N.P.L. is headed in this direction. Its theories though are based rather upon evolution than revolution.

"It is, I must admit, very difficult to define the N.P.L., for it is an opportunist organization. For that reason its tactics may be different in different states. Again it is very difficult to be dogmatic in these days and say definitely what the course of evolution will be. In some states, especially in those states where the socialist party is weak, the socialist party may cease to exist. In other states it will be the deciding factor. You may anticipate a federation of the different liberal and radical forces in the U.S." <sup>18</sup>

And that is just what has happened. A "federation of the different liberal and radical forces in the United States" is now in control of the federal government in the name of the Democratic party, supporting exactly the same socialist philosophy and employing, to a large extent, the tactics of the Socialist party, alias, Nonpartisan League, in North Dakota, a decade and a half ago.

William C. Rempfer, a well known socialist of Parkston, South Dakota, after stating that the League "aims only to socialize that part of the industrial life with which the farmer comes in contact which is easily socialized, viz.: the handling of the farmer's produce after he brings it to market," adds:

<sup>18</sup> "The Leaders of the Nonpartisan League," photostat of letter, pages 96-7-8.



"But the great hope in the League from the Socialist standpoint is that the lesson so learned by the farmer will not be lost, and will eventually induce him to support or at least reconcile him to the general socialization of all industry including his own."

Another sentence extracted from this letter, of special interest in connection with New Dealism is this:

"The League makes it a personal financial inducement for the farmer to join, promising him more for his produce through coöperative handling of his produce. This is the appeal of the League and the secret of its success."<sup>14</sup>

One is forced to ask at this point, is not the inducement of the AAA through the payment of money for crops not produced, "a personal financial inducement" for the support of the farmers? Is not the continuing of this expensive and destructive policy the great hope of the New Dealists? Has not its alleged success so far been due wholly to this "financial inducement" paid by the taxpayers of the nation?

In another letter, under date of April 12, 1920, Mr. Rempfer wrote a correspondent as follows:

"When you realize that the League program is a segment of the pure Socialistic doctrine, you will see that it is not strange that socialists organized the League, or that it is at present dominated by socialists. . . . The league organizers, or at least most of them, are strict Marxians, and believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat."<sup>15</sup>

"Townley . . . made the statement to a prominent Socialist, 'I can take that name Nonpartisan and sugar coat the principles of socialism and every farmer will swallow it and call for more.'<sup>16</sup>

While the Nonpartisan League, inspired, controlled and directed by socialists, did not attain national standing, it did prove to an interested element within the socialist move-

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, page 89.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, page 90, photostat letter.

<sup>16</sup> "Our Socialist Autocracy," Pamphlet, The Independent Voters Association, Fargo, North Dakota.

ment, that the original bore from within method applied to political parties and called capturing or "stealing" promised the way for the final attainment of the ends sought. The fight within the movement—and all elements of it—for the next ten years was between the third party group and the "steal" party group. The latter won in 1932.

Before reviewing these intricate political maneuvers, it is necessary to consider a new alien element injected into American life—the communists.

## *Chapter VIII*

### THE COMMUNISTS ENTER THE UNITED STATES

IN keeping with its revolutionary aims and tactics, the Communist party in the United States came into existence with a bang. The left wing adherents in the Socialist party, the Socialist Labor party, the I.W.W., and many unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, took to the new organization as a duck to water. Here they had something concrete to which they could tie—a successful revolution in Russia. All they had to do was to accept, in toto, the philosophy and tactics of these Russian revolutionists, apply them in the United States and here, too, they would set up a soviet form of government. Their traditional enemy, capitalism, would take the count. They visualized themselves as sitting comfortably in the White House, and in business offices drawing nice salaries, bossing others around.

This element consisted largely of members of foreign "language federations" in the Socialist party.<sup>1</sup> These persons were not in that party because they accepted the legislative action point of view—indeed, many of them did not know what legislative action meant—but were there because, as revolutionists, that was the only congenial company they could find. Many of them did not speak the English language; others were not even American citizens nor desired to be. They came here with revolution in their hearts. They wanted to destroy all that Christianity and civilization had erected during centuries of stress and toil. The destructive philosophy of Marx, as expressed in the "Communist Manifesto," sank deeply into their deficient mentalities.

While the movement gained a considerable following in

<sup>1</sup> "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States," page 330.

the United States, this following continued to be largely foreign-born. The communist with his force and violence method makes no appeal to an idealist, or a humanitarian; the socialist, talking about reform through legislation, does. Not understanding American psychology, those who now guide the communist political and other organizations have attracted very few native-born Americans—certainly none of normal mentality. You can coax the average American into trying everything; you cannot drive him into doing anything. There is where the right wingers have shown marked judgment. By idealistic and emotional appeals they have induced a large element of society to accept their reformatory legislation as desirable. Had they sought by the use of violence and terrorism to gain a following they would have failed.

The Communist party of the United States was the successor to the Russian Socialist Federation, "which was a branch of the Socialist Party of America."<sup>2</sup> This revolutionary organization, formed before the upheaval in Russia, was sufficiently strong in the United States to support an official publication, the *Novy Mir*, printed in New York City. The editor was Nicholas Bucharin,<sup>3</sup> who later took part in the Russian bolshevik revolution and became the writer of official communist literature. Associated with him was Leon Trotsky, known also as Leon Braunstein. Indeed, the plans for the coming revolution in Russia were largely laid in New York City. They "were fully discussed and perfected by revolutionary committees of the Russian Socialist Federation in the United States."<sup>4</sup>

Is it any wonder, then, since we were kind enough to permit this character of plotting against a friendly nation, that the present-day communists feel they have a perfect right to destroy our government as they did the Czar's and become a bit peeved when we enter the slightest protest? The whole

<sup>2</sup> Lusk Report, Vol. 1, page 627.

<sup>3</sup> Also spelled Bukharin.

<sup>4</sup> Lusk Report, Vol. 1, page 627.

socialist movement in the United States, and it matters little what they may now say about it, was, in a measure, responsible for the Russian revolution. Indeed, it probably would be difficult to find a socialist or a liberal supporter who will not insist that the revolution was justified, and that what the communists are now doing in Russia would well fit in with their scheme of things for the United States.

Indeed this liberal element, the element now in and supporting the brain trust, has even shown more vindictiveness in combating individuals and organizations fighting the communist movement than have many of the members of the Socialist party.

Referring to the formation of the Communist party, the American Labor Year Book says:

"Groups were formed throughout the country representing the so-called 'left' elements, whose announced aim was to capture the party for what they conceived as revolutionary Socialism. The preponderant majority of the members who enrolled themselves in these groups were those who belonged to the foreign language federations of the party."<sup>5</sup>

The Socialist party probably would have been captured and its members compelled to adopt the left wing force and violence methods, but for the fact that the executive committee, hurriedly gotten together, expelled a number of local and state branches, thus depriving them of a vote in the coming convention, a system of control which, when exercised by the Democrats in the South to keep the party "white," is bitterly denounced by socialists in general.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> "American Labor Year Book," Vol. III, page 406.

<sup>6</sup> The National Convention of the Socialist Party held in Detroit, Michigan, in June, 1934, as a part of its principles advocated "a proletarian dictatorship, in the event of the complete collapse of the capitalist system and resulting chaos." See *New York Times*, July 14, 1935. This caused the element in the party ready to join hands with "liberals" of all degrees, to force through additional restrictive and regulatory legislation at Washington, to protest. The left wing, within the party organization, demanded the revocation of the charter of the objecting locals. The differences were smoothed over at a meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party in July, 1935.

The Socialist party opened what was termed an "emergency convention," in Chicago, August 30, 1919. The expelled force and violence group met the next day in another room in the same building. In order to demonstrate the superiority of their methods members of the left wing engaged in fistic combat with their brethren of the right wing. The much-abused police were called to prevent more serious trouble.

At first the communists divided into two factions, more over the question of leadership than over that of aims or tactics, but Moscow soon forced them to subordinate personal ambitions for party good.

The open, seditious actions of the communists, claiming to operate as a political party; their utter disregard for American laws and institutions; their close affiliation with the bolshevik régime in Russia, which régime frankly declared that its purpose was to destroy all governments recognizing the private property right—and we recognize that right—caused a campaign to rid us of what, clearly, was a menace. Local, state and federal authorities took action. Many alien communists were deported. Several were arrested and convicted under state laws. The Supreme Court upheld the findings of the lower court where these cases were appealed.

In August, 1922, a secret, illegal communist convention at Bridgman, Michigan, was raided by federal authorities. The participants were charged with violating the Michigan anti-syndicalist law. In the case of William Z. Foster there was a hung jury—six to six. C. E. Ruthenberg, the next placed on trial, was convicted and sentenced to a term in the Michigan penitentiary. The State supreme court upheld the lower court. The case was on its way to the Supreme Court of the United States when Ruthenberg died. His remains were shipped to Russia for interment.

This campaign to rid the nation of subversive elements united socialists, communists, and their so-called liberal affiliates against Americanism. They began an intense campaign of propaganda and agitation to distract attention from the

philosophy of communism, and to center it upon the authorities engaged in an attempt to eradicate the disease. These authorities and every private individual who sought to give the facts were denounced as "seeing red," "unreliable" and "not to be trusted." The charge was made that in arresting communists and deporting those who were still aliens, these persons were deprived of their right of "free speech" and "free assemblage," under the Constitution. In other words, the Constitution which these very forces frankly and openly stated it was their purpose to destroy, was invoked to enable them to destroy it. The astonishing thing about this propaganda is that it was accepted as correct by the great majority of the people. The same socialist and so-called liberal majority is still being given to the communists under the fictitious allegation that they are defending the right of free speech.

While the Communist party as such remained "underground" for some years, late in 1921, in order to gain support and keep the authorities off its shoulders, it set up on the surface what was called the Workers' party. This later became known as the Workers' (Communist) party, "section of the Third International." Notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court, in three different cases, has declared the Communist party an illegal organization, since the philosophy urged is of a subversive and revolutionary nature, yet the Workers' (Communist) party has appeared upon the ballot in a number of states and will, no doubt, so appear in the next general election.

The public, at large, should be sufficiently well informed concerning the extent and character of communist activities in the United States during the past decade, although these activities have been concealed to a large extent under the name of "strikes," "protest meetings," "labor meetings," etc. Like their predecessors, the I.W.W., it would be difficult, indeed, for one even approximately to estimate the property loss communists have caused, or the number of innocent lives they have taken. One is safe, however, in saying that the

value of the property destroyed by them, to say nothing of wages lost by workmen forced to strike, is as great as, if not greater than, the tax bill of several states.

The nature and extent of communist activities designed to destroy our form of government and wreck our system of economics, have been so fully covered by many writers, that they will not be described here.<sup>7</sup>

Our interest remains in the underlying philosophy of destruction and the nature of the methods employed to put that philosophy into operation in the United States. There are a great many who fear that the communist system of force and violence may win, and it may, but not until both the governmental and economic structures are weaker than at present. The weakening process, however, has been rapid since 1932. The carrying out of the restrictive and regulatory legislation already enacted will complete the weakening process unless the agencies set up by the government be restrained by the Supreme Court. The common theory of those of the socialist movement who "are in the know" is that these experiments will prove gigantic failures producing a "complete collapse of the capitalist system and resulting chaos." That will open the way for the left wing to apply force and violence tactics, bring about a bloody revolution, capture control of the nation, and make it a soviet subservient to the parent soviet at Moscow. This is what happened in Russia, first Kerensky, then Lenin; in Hungary, first Karolyi, then Bela Kun, later deposed. In Italy and in Germany the right wing had control but before conditions were made sufficiently bad for the left

<sup>7</sup> "The National Republic," Washington, D. C., is the outstanding magazine in the United States, giving monthly reliable information on communist activities. It should be in the hands of every loyal citizen in this country. The Americanization Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, under the direction of Lt. Victor E. Devereaux, Washington, D. C., also supplies much information along this line as do many of the leading patriotic societies. The Elks recently took up the battle against communism. Leading Catholic organizations, for years, have undertaken to educate their people to the menace of socialism whether appearing under that name or under the name of communism.



wing to step in, strong national leaders appeared upon the scene.

While for the past fifteen years our attention has been centered upon the communists crying aloud at our front door and threatening our lives, we have paid little or no attention to the socialists who, through their system of alleged reformative legislation have been boldly walking in the back door which we so kindly left open for them. To-day they occupy the whole place; to-morrow they may oust the lawful occupant.

The philosophy of destruction is more clearly expressed in the mass of communist literature, circulated in every civilized country of the world under the direction of the Third (Communist) International, than in the published material of their right wing brethren, the socialists. Communists follow the injunctions of Marx who wrote:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."<sup>8</sup> And that was the policy adopted by the communist movement in the United States from its very inception.

It would require a lengthy document even to analyze the thousands of communist books and pamphlets circulated in the United States during the past decade and a half. Much of this is easily attainable. The communists maintain book stores in many of the larger cities for the sale of their own literature, and print a number of newspapers and magazines. The most prominent of the newspapers is the *Daily Worker* of New York City. There are a few documents of interest, however, that are not available to the public because they have not been printed—indeed, when issued, were not intended for the eyes of the public. One such document—and of special interest in the light of what is now going on in Washington under the guidance of the legislative action group—was secured by the government when it raided the

<sup>8</sup> "Communist Manifesto," page 55.

secret, illegal gathering of communists at Bridgman, Michigan, in August, 1922. This, with other proscribed communist data, was hidden in barrels buried in the sands at the meeting place but uncovered by government agents. The document in question, marked "very confidential," brought to the United States by courier, was accompanied by strict injunctions that it was not to be printed even in underground organs. It was signed by N. Bukharin who, as has been noted, at one time edited a communist paper in New York City, K. Radek and O. W. Kusinen for "the Executive Committee of the Communist International."<sup>9</sup>

In view of what has taken place in the United States under the pretext of an emergency, or, as some have been forced to believe, to stay a revolution, this document is of special interest. The emergency was, to a large extent, created by socialist propaganda and agitation over a period of more than six decades, while the very legislation enacted will, if not erased from the statute books, so destroy the morale of the people and weaken the nation economically, that the very revolution it was to stay may become an actuality.

Stating that the document is sent in order to "assist the American comrades in working out and formulating their line of action," it calls attention to the necessity of making use "of the conflicting interests of the various factions of the bourgeoisie." It directs the American organization to bore from within every possible "workers' and farmers' organization" as, "for instance, the existing mass movement of small farmers, . . . and even movements of middle-class farmers under some circumstances." If such groups could not be won to communism they, at least, must be won "to benevolent neutrality in the class war."

That a large element in our population has been won to "benevolent neutrality" is evidenced by the fact that when any

<sup>9</sup> The writer was permitted by the State at the time of the Foster trial to make a copy of this interesting document and the citations here given are from that typewritten copy.

person undertakes to point out the nature of radical activities in this country, he is at once denounced as engaging in "red-baiting," a clever term invented by the communists for the use of these benevolent neutrals.

"The organization of the unemployed is an equally important and difficult task," the document continues. "In this movement, just as much as in all other minor battles, the Communists must select their slogans according to the circumstances, and intensify them as much as possible, from the immediate needs of the day to the general workers' control of capitalist-industry. Right now they must make a special demand for state support of the unemployed. . . ."

Considering the enormous debt already created because of federal "support of the unemployed," it would seem that this injunction was well developed by the American communists. Then there comes this all-important direction:

"The Communist party must remember that it is not its purpose to reform the capitalist state. The purpose of the Communist is, on the contrary, to cure the working masses of their reformistic illusions, through bitter experiences. Demands upon the state for immediate concessions . . . to the workers are formulated, not to be 'reasonable' from the point of view of capitalism, but to be reasonable from the point of view of the struggling workers, regardless of the state's power to grant them without weakening itself. Thus, for instance, a demand for payment out of the Government treasury, of full union standard wages for millions of unemployed workers is highly reasonable from the point of view of the unemployed workers but damaging from the point of view of the capitalistic state. . . ."

Take that statement of action, presented to the newly formed Communist organization in the United States in 1921, and then consider, one after another, the alleged reformative legislation advanced by the right wing element fathering what is called a New Deal, and you establish the connection.

But the Executive Committee of the Communist Interna-

tional did not stop at that. It suggested "a few examples of the type of demands that may be made." This was followed by many we find either being now urged in Washington or already enacted into law. "These and other similar demands must be considered only as starting points for broader, sharper, more universal slogans," the instructions read. "In their agitation the Communists must point out that the problems will not be solved through these measures, but that we support these demands of the masses so that the very course of events itself may unmask the capitalist state . . . and prove to the masses the necessity of the final struggle for power against the capitalist state itself."

The communists are frank enough to admit that reformative legislation, such as we are now experiencing, will not "solve" our troubles. That, says the communist, is not the purpose of such legislation. The socialist wing cover their purpose with assurances that the ills of the nation are to be cured through the enactment of the legislation formulated and presented by them. In the attack upon the capitalist state the instructions direct the communists to "develop a direct attack, brand every mistake, every crime, every refusal of the demands of the toiling masses and constantly demonstrate the solidarity and identity of the capitalist class with the capitalist state."

While force and violence tactics were, by no means, to be abandoned, indeed were to be intensified, the Central Committee of the Communist International directed, "The Communists must participate as revolutionists in all general election campaigns, municipal, state and congressional, as well as presidential . . . in order to use even the election campaigns to revolutionize the workers and lead them forward, to sharpen their class consciousness and to bring them together and unite them under Communist leadership." And then this, which may explain a lot to those who are careful observers:

"In agitation and propaganda Communists can not be satisfied with mere dogmatic presentation of Communist prin-

principles. . . . They must not permit themselves to appear to the masses as fanatic bomb enthusiasts. . . . They must understand how to lead the working masses from the struggle for the satisfaction of their first concrete needs on to such a battle that the struggling masses themselves will begin to believe in success and victory."

Several pages of these instructions were devoted to explaining how the directing organization must, at all times, remain underground because the nature of its activities were such that, if discovered, would result in the arrest and conviction of those engaged in them. This underground and secret organization has been maintained from the first down to this day. The instructions finish with these words:

"It must always be remembered that the real revolutionary party—the American section of the Third International—is the Communist party of America and that the Legal party is but an instrument which it uses to better carry on its work among the masses."

We have given rather liberal citations from this document, first, because the document itself is not available even to students of the subject; and, second, because of the importance of the instructions then given in light of legislation that has been presented the American people since 1932. This does not necessarily intimate that many of those urging this type of legislation are aware of its inception, but it does show how easily the American people, wholly unacquainted with the nature, extent, ramifications and philosophy of the socialist movement, are deceived.

The instructions of the Executive Committee of the Communist International to the American comrades to engage in "all election campaigns" caused a broader and more important turn than was then anticipated. From 1921—or thereabouts—the battle for supremacy along political lines lay between those who believed a third party was the way, and those who maintained that the system of "stealing" party nominations through the primaries, as demonstrated by the

Nonpartisan League, was the better method. The contest is an interesting one.

A brief review of it may enable the American people to visualize the nature of the net woven around them and cause them to break through before it is too late.

## Chapter IX

### THIRD PARTY MOVEMENTS IN THE '20S

IMMEDIATELY following the armistice there was a marked increase in socialist propaganda and agitation. The injection of the communists into the field revived interest in the philosophy of destruction. There was a more or less general belief on the part of those who adopted that philosophy, almost as a religion, that the time was ripe for them to step in and take complete control of the nation. They believed that many of the returning soldiers could be induced to join with them in this effort. But it was the success of the socialists in Russia, more than anything else, that caused renewed socialist activity in the United States.

"When the workers of the world were turning to the left in the epoch-making year of 1919 it was inevitable that those in the United States should also move—a little," is the way Nathan Fine, a socialist, expresses it.<sup>1</sup>

Within the socialist movement there had grown up a third faction, if faction it could be called, for it was, in truth, not out of harmony with the tactics of either the right or left wing. Its members were willing to try anything to get results, and were not demanding either legislative action or force and violence. This faction consisted largely of Fabians, the majority of whom did not attach themselves directly to either the Socialist or the Communist party, or so much as call themselves Fabians. They were commonly known as the "intelligentsia," since they were largely college professors, school teachers, artists, writers, etc. While this group had more faith in the right wing method than in the left, at the same time they were very doubtful of attaining political control of the nation through the Socialist party or any other

<sup>1</sup> "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States," page 377.

third party. They were ready to play along with this idea, however, biding their time and their time came in 1932. This element held to the belief that success lay in entering the primaries of one of the old parties and capturing control and selecting nominees of that party. In other words, profiting by the experience of the Nonpartisan League—and many of the “intelligentsia” took part in the organization work of the League—they were anxious to try out the system on a national scale.

The Intercollegiate Socialist Society, to which reference has been made in its proper chronological place, was the meeting place for the “intelligentsia.” The society made a practice of holding conferences each year where those who talked in a learned way sought to impress the others with their knowledge of the “proletarian movement.” During the war, this organization, as such, said but little although some of its members were not overly loyal. A conference was held at Highland, New York, on June 24-30, 1919.

Shortly after this meeting Woodworth Clum wrote a little document, “Making Socialists Out of College Students,” which was printed by the Better America Federation of Los Angeles. Mr. Clum pointed out that among the prominent persons at the conference was Albert Rhys Williams who had been in Russia, “the confidant of Lenin and Trotsky.”<sup>2</sup> “Williams,” continued Mr. Clum, “is a newspaper writer and was in Russia when the autocracy of the proletariat was established, under Lenin. Williams, with John Reed and Boris Reinstein, constituted the Bolshevik Propaganda Bureau—maintained headquarters in Petrograd, and, of course, were in the pay of the Soviet government.”<sup>3</sup>

A second conference was later held at the headquarters of the American Civil Liberties Bureau (now Union) in New York. Among those present were not only many of the “intelligentsia” and of the Socialist party, but also persons

<sup>2</sup> Page 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, page 6.



prominent in the Nonpartisan League and the I.W.W. An organization was perfected. It was called "The Committee of 48" because it was proposed to have an executive committee consisting of one person from each of the 48 States. A little later a call was issued for a convention to be held at St. Louis in December of that year.

Around 300 names were signed to the call. Among them were 24 professors then actively engaged in teaching in different institutions of higher education. Mr. Clum writes: "I have a letter from Professor John Smertenka of Grinnell College, Iowa, in which he declares that more than two thousand professors in the United States were active in the attempted organization of the Committee of 48."<sup>4</sup>

The "intelligentsia" gathered at St. Louis in response to the call but found they were not enthusiastically welcomed by the citizens. "Realizing the radical purposes of the Conference of the Committee of Forty-Eight leaders," writes Jerry D. Bacon, "a few members of the American Legion in St. Louis took it upon themselves to call the attention of the public to it by entering a protest to the management of the hotel where the convention was scheduled and succeeded in getting it barred against the 'liberals'—as they termed themselves—for 24 hours and securing the attendance of government officials to take a report of the proceedings."<sup>5</sup>

After this little trouble was adjusted the delegates got down to business but were a bit cautious in their language. The general trend of the talks was in opposition to our form of government, our system of economics, with considerable laudatory mention of Soviet Russia.

J. A. H. Hopkins was placed in charge of the publicity work for The Committee of 48. Mr. Hopkins, an efficient propagandist, had been actively connected with the Roosevelt Progressive party in 1912. He sought to make the Committee of 48 the successor to the "Teddy" movement. In a

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, page 9.

<sup>5</sup> "Sovietians," February 15, 1920, page 81.

newspaper release, when Mr. Hopkins, his Committee of 48, and many other socialistic organizations were fighting for the LaFollette-Wheeler ticket, it was stated that, following instructions given Mr. Hopkins by the Progressive party in 1917, he "transferred the name and assets of the Progressive Party to the Committee of 48 when it was formed in 1919; and faithful to its trust the Committee of 48 has this year placed these assets at the disposal of the LaFollette-Wheeler movement."<sup>6</sup>

While the "intelligentsia," operating under the name of The Committee of 48, expected to step in and take political control of all discordant elements, others held different views. The leaders trained in the socialist school had far more political sagacity and energy. They talked less and did more.

An element in the West, under the able leadership of John Fitzpatrick of Chicago who, while a dominant figure in the American Federation of Labor was likewise a dominant figure in the social movement, prepared to form an independent political movement. Fitzpatrick was aided by Max S. Hayes, Duncan MacDonald, Edward N. Nockels and others, most of whom, once members of the Socialist party, had dropped out to pursue their course to the common end along what they believed more efficient lines. In 1919 these, and other men, formed the Labor party, designed, in a way, to take the place of the Socialist party because there was still much ill-feeling against socialists due to their war record.

A convention called by the Labor party, in which The Committee of 48 joined, was held in Chicago in July, 1920. This convention was clearly dominated by the communist element seated as delegates from "labor" unions and other organizations, some of them hastily formed in order to be represented at the convention. The communists had improved their shining hours by doing a bit of boring from within. The "intelligentsia" delegates wanted to nominate Senator Robert M. LaFollette for President. The Senator, who was an astute poli-

<sup>6</sup> Dated September 22, 1924.

ician and ever had his ear to the ground, was not, at that time, ready to play along with any pronounced left wing element, although he readily became the standard-bearer of the right wing group of socialists four years later. Placing himself out of the running was more than satisfactory to the force and violence faction. The result was that the convention named Parley Parker Christensen of Utah, an attorney for the I.W.W., for first place and Max S. Hayes, for the second. The name was changed "to that of Farmer-Labor Party in the hope of appealing to the agricultural producers," writes Nathan Fine.<sup>7</sup> The ticket polled a little over 265,000 votes.

The Farmer-Labor party in 1920 was merely a trial balloon, however. The socialist forces had not had time since the armistice to get their bearings. The militancy of the communists disturbed the "intelligentsia" and yet the same "intelligentsia" gave moral support to the communist organizations and were foremost in their admiration for the Soviet government of Russia. While there appeared upon the surface a rather intense and bitter fight between the right and left wing of the socialist movement, underneath there was an agreement that finally brought forth the LaFollette-Wheeler ticket in 1924.

The various elements within the socialist movement, which included a large number of the "intelligentsia" and others who had become saturated with socialist thought, at once divided into two factions over the question of how best to gain political control of the United States. One faction, headed by the old-time socialists, held to the third party theory. They hoped, or at least they professed to hope, that there would be a revolt against both the Democratic and Republican parties, and an outraged public would sweep them into office.

But the other element—more or less newcomers to the movement and pleased with the affiliation of the "intelli-

<sup>7</sup> "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States," page 394.

gentsia," from which element came the brain trusters—were not so certain about the "revolt" and the "outraged public." They held that the surest way to secure political control was by "stealing" party nominations in the primaries. They pointed to the success that had attended the efforts of the Nonpartisan League along this line and they further pointed out that no third party movement had yet gained any great support from the public. Even the "Progressives" headed by Theodore Roosevelt, probably the best vote-getter of the day, had failed.

For the time being, the third party element in the movement was the strongest and so a number of "intelligentsia" whole-heartedly jumped in and gave support. So far as they were concerned they were not wedded to any plan; what they wanted was control of the government, no matter by what means, fair or foul.

The energy displayed by the force and violence group in boring from within political movements greatly disturbed the legislative action element. Were they to permit their thunder to be stolen? With the coming of the communists, the left wing element in the Socialist party had departed for a more congenial home. That left the Socialist party in the hands of the rigidly legislative action group. But, obviously, they did not have sufficient strength to make any great dent along political lines. They noted the marvelous growth of the "intelligentsia" and wished to annex them. And why not? Were not these "intelligentsia" following the same philosophy of destruction? Did they not get their teaching, their training from socialistic professors and teachers in the colleges and universities?

"Among them were able publicity workers and students of social problems . . .," writes Mr. Fine.<sup>8</sup> "There were also some liberal ministers."<sup>9</sup> If the "intelligentsia" were inclined to reject their parents because they did not like their name, the old-time socialists reasoned the parents should change

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pages 389-390.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, page 384.

their name in order to have the loving and loyal support of their offspring.

The socialist convention at Detroit, June, 1921, adopted the following invitation in the form of a resolution to the "intelligentsia" and certain labor and farmer groups to join hands in a nice family party:

"That the incoming National Executive Committee be instructed to make a careful survey of all radical and labor organizations in the country, with a view of ascertaining their strength, disposition, and readiness to coöperate with the Socialist movement upon a platform not inconsistent with that of the party. . . ." <sup>10</sup> The survey was made. It showed a mental soil similar to that which resulted in the Populist and Nonpartisan League movements, this mental soil extending into the urban groups.

A committee meeting was held in November, 1921, at which it was agreed that any general conference fathered by the socialist party would fail of its purpose. In consequence the call was issued by a number of railroad organizations, drafted into the socialist scheme to nationalize the railroads of the United States through what was called the "Plumb Plan," headed by William H. Johnston, President of the Machinists Union, the largest organization in the railroad strike of 1922 in which William Z. Foster, a leading communist, played an important part. The record shows Johnston was a socialist and an ardent advocate of the soviet form of government.

It was agreed that the new movement, to be effective, must gain the support of the farmers. Two days before the one set by Johnston for a meeting of his conferees at Chicago, a call went out to the various socialist controlled farmers' organizations to meet, also in Chicago. Townley of the Nonpartisan League was present at the gathering. A firm believer in the "steal" party method he urged it upon the delegates. The meeting adopted the name, The United Farmers' National

<sup>10</sup> American Labor Year Book, Vol. IV, page 405.

Bloc, agreed to support the League's methods of dominating one or the other of the old parties, and the following Monday moved over en bloc into the conference called by Johnston.

In this gathering, February 20th, 1922, were to be found delegates from practically every socialistic organization in the United States and while the newspapers reported that the I.W.W., and the communists were excluded, it would appear, from later articles in the *New York Call*, then the official organ of the Socialist party, that they were present, and in numbers. Inflammatory speeches were made. Capitalism was blamed for all economic ills. The man who pays wages was denounced as tyrannical. Soviet Russia was lauded.

The plan originating with the Socialist party, to unite all discordant and disgruntled groups into one political movement, was approved. But no party name was adopted, it being the intention of those present to engage in the "steal" party system during the Congressional elections of 1922. The title adopted for the gathering was the Conference for Progressive Political Action, which was to be directed, until the next convention to be held after the election, by a committee of fifteen. It is interesting here to note that of this committee Joseph Franklin, Sidney Hillman and Frederick C. Howe, as has been pointed out, are now holding federal positions in Washington under what is called a Democratic administration.

The delegates who met in Cleveland, December, 1922, as per agreement, did not exude a vast amount of confidence. The "steal" party group and the third party group were at loggerheads. The "intelligentsia" sat on the fence, for the time being. While favoring the former, they were not yet ready to break with the latter. It was agreed, however, to make the organization permanent and build for the presidential election in 1924.

Whether it was to be the permanent policy of the organization to "steal" party control and nominations or to go it alone was not definitely decided.

---

It was the contention of a few very wise political heads within the socialist movement, especially among the "intelligentsia" or center wing, that the discontent, which was more or less general—and socialists thrive on discontent—could be intensified and used to the detriment of both the old parties. They went vigorously to work to find something that might, through an intensive propaganda campaign, be employed to discredit Democrats and Republicans alike, and so result in the election of a third party candidate to the Presidency. The "scandal" they developed was in the field of oil.

While the Republican administration—and again, we insist, due to an intensive campaign of publicity in the hands of the "able publicity workers" to which Mr. Fine refers—was well tarred, the cleverness and ability of leading Democratic Senators saw to it that their party was in nowise involved. When the people's minds were filled with the belief that, in some manner, they were being robbed of valuable oil lands, the time to strike politically had arrived, so the united elements in the socialist movement believed.

When the delegates to the convention met in Cleveland, July 4, 1924, they found the stage set for the nomination of Senator Robert M. LaFollette for President, and the adoption of a platform that was to embody the policies of a New Deal.<sup>11</sup> The outlook for the socialization of the resources of the United States appeared bright. The Republican party, due to the so-called "oil scandals," had been adroitly placed on the defensive. The Democratic party was held to be too weak to make much of a campaign. It would be a simple matter to brand it as "the tool of Wall Street," and that, they believed, would be sufficient to prevent its candidates securing any considerable number of votes from the agricultural sections.

The convention was made up of delegates from state

<sup>11</sup> This phrase, a "new deal" was used in a congratulatory telegram sent from New York by a group of the "intelligentsia" including Frederick C. Howe, now a part of the administration forces at Washington.

branches of the Socialist party, the socialist-controlled Farmer-Labor party, the Committee of 48 which still remained the resting place for many of the "intelligentsia," and a large number of labor unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, all of which had been successfully won to socialism through the bore from within system.

Among the speakers were Senator Lynn Frazier of North Dakota, presumably a Republican, but elected by the Non-partisan League; Senator Henrik Shipstead, a Farmer-Laborite; Congressman Nelson of Wisconsin, elected as a Republican; and last but not least, Fiorello LaGuardia, once a Congressman elected as a Republican, but at one time a follower of socialism, and now the fusion mayor of the City of New York, with more influence, apparently, at the White House than the Democratic Congressmen from that city.

There was no bickering about a candidate for President. He had, in fact, been selected in advance; indeed the whole scheme of the Conference for Progressive Political Action was to place Senator Robert M. LaFollette at the head of the socialist movement without the tar of the name. The Socialist party met in the same city immediately after the adjournment of the Conference for Progressive Political Action. Many of the delegates who sat in the latter under one designation, sat in the former as pure socialists. Eugene V. Debs, then in prison, wired the socialist convention:

"I think it wise for our party to make no nominations under the circumstances, but at the same time to hold the Socialist Party intact, adhere rigidly to its principles, and keep the red flag flying."<sup>12</sup>

The platform, among other things, declared for:

Public ownership of the nation's water power and creation of a public super-power system;

Promotion of public works in times of business depression;

Retention of surtax on swollen incomes, restoration of the tax on excess profits, taxation of stock dividends, profits un-

<sup>12</sup> American Labor Year Book, Vol. VI, page 134.



distributed to evade taxes, rapidly progressive taxes on large estates and inheritances;

Reconstruction of the federal reserve and federal farm loan systems to provide for direct public control of the nation's money and credit to make it available on fair terms to all;

Adequate laws to guarantee to farmers and industrial workers the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing;

Public ownership of railroads;

Abolition of the tyranny and usurpation of the courts, including the practice of nullifying legislation in conflict with the political, social or economic theories of the judges.<sup>13</sup>

Senator LaFollette made it plain in accepting the nomination that while he felt the candidates of this organization, called the Progressive party, for President and Vice President should have united support of those in harmony with the socialist philosophy—only he did not use the phrase “socialist philosophy”—he did not wish to see candidates for Congress nominated on a third party ticket because, one is forced to assume, he believed the “steal” party system at that time would be far more effective. “. . . he was unwilling to lead any campaign which would hurt those progressives, nominally elected as Republicans and Democrats,” says the American Labor Year Book.<sup>14</sup> The selection of the candidate for Vice President was left to Senator LaFollette. A few days later he named Senator Burton K. Wheeler, then sitting in the Senate as a duly elected representative of the Democratic party of Montana. On the LaFollette-Wheeler campaign committee were 24 known socialists, 14 known “intelligentsia” and 14 unidentified. The socialists put up no candidates, giving the Progressives their undivided and loyal support. But the attempt thus to capture the government of the United States in order to make it a socialized nation failed, and

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, page 125.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, page 123.

rather dismally, for LaFollette carried but one State, his own, Wisconsin.

It would probably be incorrect to say that the members of the "steal" party group in the socialist movement were pleased at the failure. They were not. The results did, however, demonstrate to their minds that their program of action was certain to be more effective. They would have been delighted to have had LaFollette elected because they felt that would give them a chance to sit in "key" positions at Washington and try their many theories on the helpless American public. The Conference for Progressive Political Action had left the door wide open for the "steal" party scheme. In its plan of organization the first sentence reads thus:

*"Purposes: To help nominate and elect to public office only those 'who are pledged to the interests of the producing classes and to the principles of genuine democracy in agriculture, industry and government.'"*<sup>15</sup>

The "steal" party element in the socialist movement, largely of the "intelligentsia" variety, at once set to work to plan for action in 1928. The time, however, was not then propitious. The Republican party was too strongly entrenched in the minds of the voters. But—well it was different in 1932. Then, like their Fabian friends in England, "they struck"—and won.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, page 120.

## Chapter X

### "STEALING" PARTY NOMINATIONS

THE natural and inevitable concomitant of the boring from within system, as applied to labor and farmers' organizations, permeating, as applied to college groups, and penetrating, as applied to societies and clubs of every kind and description, was what happened in 1932 when the great and honorable Democratic party was "stolen" from its old-time and responsible leaders by a group of the "intelligentsia," wedded to the ancient philosophy of destruction.

That this would be the result could have been foreseen by any one giving thought and study to both the philosophy involved and the system employed to gain control. Indeed, attention was called to the situation by several persons more than three decades ago, and by an ever increasing number of persons within the past two decades, but the public, instead of giving heed to their words of caution actually derided them for having the temerity to flash the warning.

As early as 1911 Rome G. Brown, an eminent member of the Minnesota Bar, in a public address, pointed out the destructive features of some of the so-called reform measures of that day. One eastern friend, commenting on the prophecy of Mr. Brown, said that his "time might be better occupied than in combating windmills, mere theories that were impossible of any wide acceptance or any lasting adoption anywhere."<sup>1</sup> Considerably more than three decades ago Peter Collins was sent through the United States by the Knights of Columbus to expose the fallacious theory which culminated in New Dealism. While he may have made some impression upon those of his religious faith, it is certain that others paid no attention to his warnings. He, like Mr. Brown and hundreds

<sup>1</sup> Senate Document No. 260, 66th Congress, 2nd Session, page 4.

of others, were made the “laughing stock” by the blind public which was itself victimized.

Again, it was but natural and logical that the leadership in the movement to impose “a new social order” upon the people of the United States should pass from control of the original foreign-born proponents to a native-born element; and from those engaged in manual labor to those engaged in mental activities—those classed to-day, the “intelligentsia.”

The Fabian way was the only way that could be employed with success in this nation. The founder of this society “found his affinity in the famous Fabius Cunctator,” writes Professor Hearnshaw, “and, having done so, he oracularly informed his fellows: ‘For the right moment you must wait, as Fabius did, most patiently, when warring against Hannibal . . . but, when the time comes, you must strike hard, as Fabius did.’”<sup>2</sup> While Rome contains no record of Fabius having struck hard, those who adopted Fabian tactics, proceeded to wait and watch for the psychological time to act. It came in 1932.

Between March, 1929, when Mr. Hoover was inaugurated as President of the United States, and November, 1932, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected as a Democrat on a platform that declared for sound money, a balanced budget, a reduction in the expenses of the federal government, and the abolition of the many useless boards and bureaus, a great deal happened favorable to the “steal” party program of the socialistic element working largely under the guidance and direction of the “intelligentsia.” These latter did not openly affiliate with the Socialist party although many of them were members of subsidiary organizations, such as the League for Industrial Democracy.

The nation was going through a severe economic depression; millions of persons were unemployed; the prices of farm products were low; business of every kind and nature was in a bad way with many forced into bankruptcy. No sooner had

<sup>2</sup> “A Survey of Socialism,” page 293.

Mr. Hoover been seated than the opposition started what was called a "smear Hoover" campaign in the hands of an old-time Washington newspaper correspondent, one of the ablest publicity men in this country, who knew the ropes perfectly. This campaign was exceptionally successful. While those who conceived the idea congratulated themselves when the votes were counted in November, 1932, some of the old-time Democrats awoke to the fact that their party did not win the election. Since then a whole lot more have had their eyes opened.

To get a clear understanding of the situation, one must return to the LaFollette-Wheeler campaign of 1924 when the same element sought to capture control of government through a third party. This plan was inaugurated, as has been pointed out in the previous chapter, by the socialists operating through what was termed the Conference for Progressive Political Action, the first meeting of which was held at Cleveland, Ohio, in 1922.

Among those who, at that time, apparently believed in the capturing scheme was William Johnston, previously referred to, president of the International Machinists Association, and chairman of the convention that nominated Robert M. LaFollette on the Progressive (Socialist) ticket in 1924. He was quoted by the Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, when the original conference was being held, as stating that "the main purpose of the meeting is to set up active participation of progressive voters in the primaries." "With the success of the movement of Progressive political action in the recent election," he is quoted as saying, "we feel that more can be accomplished by working through present political parties than in the formation of an independent organization."

The conference developed two factions, one taking the position outlined by Mr. Johnston and the other, strict adherence to the third party plan. For the time being the latter prevailed. The New York *Call*, then the outstanding socialist newspaper, editorially commenting on the conference, said that "the division came over the question of whether to organ-

ize a new party or to organize outside of parties and attempt to capture the various primaries."

"To those who uphold the latter point of view," the editorial continued, "the party means nothing—the primary everything. . . . To them a party is neither good nor bad, just as a public office is neither good nor bad; if a worker or a supporter of the workers captures the nomination, the party is 'good.' If they do not, the party is 'bad.'"<sup>3</sup>

It will be recalled that following the success of the Nonpartisan League in "stealing" party nominations through the primaries, there appeared in both Senate and House, a small group, some elected as Democrats, some as Republicans, who formed a bloc of their own and began to agitate for socialistic proposals, such as government ownership and control of certain industries, notably utilities. The Conference for Progressive Political Action had gone into the 1922 elections with this in mind, and in a press release, later issued, stated that, "in the congressional campaign of 1922 the Conference for Progressive Political Action secured a balance of power in Congress."<sup>4</sup> With the failure of the third party movement in 1924, the advocates of the "steal" party system believed their method would thereafter be acceptable to the others.

The way seemed paved for this faction. The try-out of the Nonpartisan League had proven conclusively to their minds that what was done in North Dakota, and a number of other states locally, could be done nationally. They were not concerned with platform declarations; their interest was centered in the election of a man to the presidency who would uphold and effect their philosophy. Furthermore, they grasped the fact that in a Democratic convention they could not very well give notice of their real intentions: first, because the old-time Democrats would not stand for it; and, second, the people would not flock to a candidate, regardless of party brand, who frankly and openly stated that it was his purpose, through

<sup>3</sup> December 14, 1922.

<sup>4</sup> From Progressive Publicity Bureau, Washington, undated.

restrictive and regulatory legislation, to take the initial step to abolish the institution of private property. The only presidential candidate who gave public utterance to this character of thought was the one who headed the Socialist ticket. His support was negligible.

Those who pick up the trail of the socialistic forces supporting the late Senator LaFollette in 1924, and follow that trail down to the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt by the Democratic convention in 1932, will find the connection between these forces and the delegates pledged in the primaries to insist upon the nomination of Mr. Roosevelt. Space permits hitting only a few high spots. By going through the files of the daily press from the opening of 1931 to the date of the convention, those seeking complete data will find a most interesting story.

Let us pick up the story early in March 1931 when a group of "insurgents" in the Congress—men elected as either Democrats or Republicans but who followed the program of neither—issued a call for a Progressive conference at Washington.<sup>5</sup> It will be recalled that the name under which the late Senator LaFollette ran for President, supported by the socialists, was Progressive. Senator Burton K. Wheeler, the running mate of Mr. LaFollette in 1924 was one of the signers to the call.

Five governors, all known for their so-called liberal views, were invited to attend this gathering. Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt headed the list. The others were Gifford Pinchot, Pennsylvania, Julius Meier, Oregon, Phillip LaFollette, Wisconsin, and Floyd Olson, Minnesota.

Mark Sullivan, writing in the New York *Herald Tribune*,<sup>6</sup> said:

"It is evident that Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt has taken pains to show exceptional kindness toward this conference and its leaders. In answer to the invitation extended

<sup>5</sup> This is the Conference to which reference was made in Chapter III.

<sup>6</sup> March 12, 1931.

to him, he made three separate replies. In an early telegram he said he would attend if he possibly could. In a long-distance telephone conversation with Senator Norris he expressed regret that he could not come because of having the New York legislature on his hands. In a final telegram he suggested comparison between the program of the conference and his own policies in New York State, especially his policy about waterpower.”

The conference was composed of 164 registered delegates—men and women. Of these, eighty-one were openly and actively connected with the LaFollette movement in 1924. Two of them, Daniel C. Roper and Harold L. Ickes, are in the present Democratic cabinet. A number of others now hold positions at Washington. Both Senators Borah and Norris attended this conference and both spoke at length, the latter in favor of legislation later enacted by the New Deal party.

While, no doubt, many accepting the invitation and attending this conference were not members of the socialistic group, the list of names as it appeared in the *New York Times* shows that the majority favored the enactment of legislation which would put into effect certain so-called reforms of socialist inception.

A news story in the *Times*<sup>7</sup> says:

“Some of those sympathetic to the Roosevelt candidacy . . . think that the turn events have taken will be an aid to him in the approaching contest. They recalled also that the New York Governor had sent a kindly telegram to the Progressive convention and that there had been considerable applause when it was read.”

Senator LaFollette, a delegate to this conference, following instructions given him, named a committee of seven on “unemployment and industrial stabilization.” Among those on this committee who have been officially rewarded by the Roosevelt régime are Frank Murphy, named Governor of the Philippines, and Leo Wolman, made a member of the Na-

<sup>7</sup> March 14, 1931.



tional Labor Board. The others, Isador Lubin, Jacob Billikopf, Ralph Hurlin, Rabbi Edward L. Israel and Lillian Wald, since March 4, 1933, have been closely connected with the advancement of New Deal policies.

Now let us turn to another element—the more or less strictly Fabians—those who, because of the nature of their activities, have been labeled brain trusters. The unquestioned head of this group was—and probably still is—Professor Felix Frankfurter of Harvard. The *Unofficial Observer*, writing in the *Washington Post*<sup>8</sup> had this to say:

“Prof. Felix Frankfurter’s intimacy with President Roosevelt dates back to the Wilson Administration. . . . Franklin frequently invited Felix to come to Albany for a general gabble and incidental diagnosis of that ever interesting patient known as the state of the Nation. And Felix urged in letters to his friends and in conversation Roosevelt’s nomination for the Presidency, being one of the few liberal intellectuals who saw that Roosevelt was their man.”

The writer adds, “After the nomination Frankfurter organized the Progressives-for-Roosevelt movement in New England, which succeeded in keeping a few college professors from voting for Norman Thomas, and he drummed up a lot of support for the appointment of Frances Perkins as Secretary of Labor, which Roosevelt welcomed, as he had decided to appoint her in any case.”

After stating that “President Roosevelt would have welcomed him (Frankfurter) in almost any position up to, and probably including, the Treasury portfolio or the Governorship of the Federal Reserve Board”—all of which Frankfurter refused—the writer contributes this bit of interesting information: “The most he would do was to accede to Roosevelt’s request that he supply the Administration with a hand-picked group of liberal lawyers.”

Of Raymond Moley, for a time the ace of the brain trusters, the same writer says: “He has had a hand in writing several

<sup>8</sup> March 11, 1934.

of the President's speeches, for, better than any one else in the world, he knows Roosevelt's style and speaking cadence and how to make the most of them." The same writer takes up, one after another, the leading members of the so-called brain trust and shows the influence they have wielded on Mr. Roosevelt. Frank Kent and Mark Sullivan in their syndicate articles have dealt rather fully with this group.

With the more or less skilled politicians connected with the so-called Progressive conference mentioned out in the field "whooping things up for Mr. Roosevelt," and with the trained and skilled band of able strategists sitting at the Governor's elbow, the plan of the socialistic forces, through the use of the primaries to capture the Democratic convention for their favorite, proved successful.

It is true that many old-time and conscientious Democrats supported the candidacy of Mr. Roosevelt in that convention. They believed in him, having accepted his utterances at face value. They knew him to be credited with being an able campaigner, and they saw in him the one man who could retire Herbert Hoover to private life. They did not know then—and many of them do not know now—that the impelling force back of Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy was the old LaFollette machine with its socialistic cohorts, and the little group of Fabians who have since become known as brain trusters. While these old-time Democrats were looking for success at the polls, these others had their eyes on the enactment of a series of restrictive and regulatory acts which would be the initial step to complete abolition of the right of private property.

The campaign was made on the issue of restoring prosperity. The socialistic element remained in the background, permitting the old-time Democrats to take the active lead and to gain the support of the conservative element. Nothing was said by Mr. Roosevelt, or by any Democratic campaigner, that gave even a clew to the details, or nature, of the socialistic

program which this subversive group planned on putting into effect, and which now clutters the federal statute books.

The direct pledge was made by the Democratic candidate that the cost of conducting federal government would be reduced twenty-five per cent. That had a nationwide appeal. The direct pledge was also made that a system of sound money would be maintained, by which the people believed he meant the retention of the gold standard. That also had a nationwide appeal. The direct pledge was made that bureaucracy would be destroyed in Washington, and that likewise had a nationwide appeal. Mr. Roosevelt was easily elected. It was hailed as a Democratic victory. But was it?

No sooner had Mr. Roosevelt been inaugurated than there appeared at the White House, as a sort of mental bodyguard, a group of the "intelligentsia," now termed brain trusters. Old-time Democrats who had labored year in and year out for the party, instead of finding themselves near the pie-counter, were forced to stand outside the window and look in at a lot of men and women, all strangers in Democratic society, comfortably seated before a sumptuous political feast. Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, who for a time was the "cracker-down" for the brain trusters and now the "cracker-down" on them, in the *Saturday Evening Post*<sup>9</sup> says:

"Shortly after election there began to occur one of the cleverest infiltrations in the history of our Government. There was no noise about it. The professor (Frankfurter) himself has refused every official connection. His comings and goings are almost surreptitious. Yet he is *the most influential single individual in the United States.* (Italics in original.)

"His 'boys' have been insinuated into obscure but key positions in every vital department—wardens of the marches, inconspicuous but powerful. Wherever to know, check, influence or control what goes on in Government it would be a good thing for a Big Happy Dog to have a Little Happy Hot Dog planted, there is one there, alert and quietly active.

<sup>9</sup> October 26, 1935.

"In the early days they held obscure juntas in imitation salons, and here much that has developed since to worry and harass and repel business was discussed.

"Two or three infest Henry Wallace. The area in and about the Federal Trade Commission literally writhes with them. The Justice, Interior, Labor and Treasury Departments harbor their quotas. Other hosts for them are PWA, AAA, FERA, TVA and SEC."

The astonishing thing to the old-time Democrats was that many of those who were placed in "key" positions in a Democratic administration were those who, but eight years before, had supported candidates for President and Vice President, opposed to the regular Democratic nominees and who had, on the public platform, and in the press, denounced Democratic policies.<sup>10</sup>

What has taken place in Washington since March 4, 1933, is common knowledge. Of the important promises contained in the Chicago platform, only the one relating to prohibition has been kept. On the contrary, a flood of legislation wholly in opposition to those promises has been forced through the Congress and approved by the President. Some of these acts have been already declared unconstitutional, and others are on the way to the Supreme Court for adjudication. Old-time and conscientious Democrats who think first in terms of national good stand aghast. Many of them in both Senate and House have expressed themselves. Congressman Andrew J. May of Kentucky states it this way:

"I am objecting to a lot of Communists and wild sons of wild jackasses, if you please, capturing the Democratic Party and carrying it into captivity and then demanding the surrender of the great principles taught by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson as a ransom to get it back."<sup>11</sup> And Senator Royal S. Copeland of New York had this to say:

<sup>10</sup> For a list of a number of those connected with the Progressive-Socialist movement in 1924, see Chapter III.

<sup>11</sup> Congressional Record, July 8, 1935, page 11185.

“ . . . if I had it to do over again, I should not vote for the NRA. There are a lot of such things I am not going to vote for now. I do not care if I am the only Democrat, though I know I am not the only one, I am not going to vote for these various measures which in my judgment are doing much to retard progress in America and which are seeking to set aside all those economic laws which are essential to our well-being as a Nation. We cannot make people good by legislation. Neither can we make them prosperous by legislation. This is my apology as regards my vote two years ago on NRA.”<sup>12</sup>

Hon. Alfred E. Smith, one-time candidate for President on the Democratic ticket, in an address before the American Liberty League, at Washington, took a similar position:

“How do you suppose all this happened? This is the way it happened. The young brain trusters caught the Socialists in swimming and they ran away with their clothes. Now, it is all right with me, it is all right with me, if they want to disguise themselves as Karl Marx or Lenin or any of the rest of that bunch, but I won't stand for their allowing them to march under the banner of Jackson or Cleveland.”<sup>13</sup>

Others, notably, Senators Glass, Byrd, Bailey, Tydings, Adams and King, all Democrats, on the floor of the Senate have expressed themselves in clear and unmistakable language. Lewis W. Douglas, who was named Director of the Budget by President Roosevelt, resigned because he could not support the program of the “intelligentsia.” He asks: “Do we as Americans consciously choose to repudiate the things in life for which we have always stood? Do we elect to be beguiled by soft, seductive doctrines into following a course which ends only in the destruction of equality and of liberty?”<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Congressional Record, July 17, 1935, page 11743.

<sup>13</sup> New York Times, January 26, 1936.

<sup>14</sup> Courtesy of D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., from Douglas “The Liberal Tradition,” page 57. This book should be read by every loyal American. It is not written in a spirit of anger but instead is a calm, careful evaluation of the conditions that confront the nation.

And in that word “destruction” one finds the key to the situation. The New Deal program of legislation has been destructive, not constructive. It is clearly founded on the ancient philosophy of destruction and the theory arising therefrom that all economic ills are caused by the institution of private property. It carries out the original program of alien refugees in the United States to capture and destroy.

The Democratic party has been captured. Not even the much-chagrined leaders deny that. A glance at the nature of New Deal legislation confirms the statement. That legislation is so voluminous, so confusing, so contradictory, that it can only be reviewed briefly—very briefly. Let us turn to it, however, for a fair analysis.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Much of the data appearing in this and the previous chapter appeared in a pamphlet issued by the League for Constitutional Government, 18 East 48th Street, New York City, early in 1935.

## Chapter XI

### NEW DEAL LEGISLATION IS DESTRUCTIVE

THERE are many who will vigorously deny that the New Deal legislative program is destructive; that it is socialistic or that it is communistic. Those who take this position divide into two groups. The one is composed of the ultra-idealists and humanitarians, those peculiar individuals who, in the excess of their honest desire to benefit the underdog, set evidence, logic, and common sense to one side and blunder on. The other group is composed of those who, to show their loyalty to party, appear to think that anything bearing the Democratic label must, of necessity, be good. They do not stop to gather the facts and to reason therefrom. Apparently they follow the admonitions of the Southern Congressman who, a number of years ago in a public address on the floor of the House, stated that "there are times when a man must rise above principle."<sup>1</sup>

The question is not what some people think or say regarding this legislation; it is, what are the facts?

For more than sixty years a certain element in our society, originally alien both in birth and thought, has been assiduously working toward a definite objective—that objective being the abolition of the institution of private property. The destructive nature of the doctrine they advance is well described by Prof. Hearnshaw. In quoting him we have inserted, in three places, the term "New Deal" in parenthesis, to bring his statement to date. The professor writes:

"... socialism (New Dealism) runs directly counter to all the dominant human instincts which cause men to produce. In the name of equality it destroys the freedom which is necessary for effective activity; in the name of co-operation it

<sup>1</sup> Cited in "Congress as Santa Claus," Charles Warren, page 2.

puts an end to that healthy competition which is the bracing air of industrial activity, and the main means by which the community secures efficient service; in the name of community it deprives men of the capacity to acquire property, and so removes the chief incentive to labour; in the name of nationalisation it appropriates successful private businesses, and thus damps down energy and initiative; in the name of public assistance it discourages both thrift and self-help; in the name of readjusted taxation it institutes a vindictive spoliation of those who, by diligence and self-restraint, have managed to save; in the name of capital levy it projects an orgy of legalised loot. In short, all the principles and all the devices of socialism (New Dealism) seem to be as carefully contrived as though they had been designed in Bedlam, to depress labour, discourage enterprise, damp initiative, discountenance forethought, prevent the accumulation of capital, encourage recklessness and extravagance, foster parasitism, ruin industry. In the supposed interests of the proletariat, socialism (New Dealism) tends to drag the whole community down to one disastrous level of laziness, incompetence, and destitution.”<sup>2</sup>

One making no more than a casual study of New Deal legislation is forced to the conviction that, carried to its final conclusion, it will destroy individual initiative, thrift, industry, agriculture, freedom of personal action, and constitutional government. While, no doubt, the great majority of the members of the Congress, who so readily acquiesced in the adoption of this legislation, honestly and sincerely believed it would aid in correcting certain economic maladjustments, the results, so far, have caused many of them to wonder if the purpose is not, as Prof. Rae states of socialism, “to destroy.”

The strength of the nation depends upon its economic stability and the morale of the people; in truth, more upon the latter than upon the former. Obviously, then, weaken either, or both, and the nation is weakened; destroy both,

<sup>2</sup> “Democracy and Labour,” page 171.



or even the latter, and the nation is destroyed. The bloody revolution about which the communists prate is wholly unnecessary. No one knows better, or appreciates this fact more, than the clever leaders of socialist thought. The weakening process has been going on for years. It is approaching its climax in the legislative program of the New Deal. Regardless of what may be the stated purpose of this legislation; what the members of the Congress who enacted it believed its purpose; or what a large element of people hold to be its purpose, the fact remains that, if carried to its final conclusion, it will so thoroughly weaken the economic stability and the morale of the people that the nation will easily succumb to any antagonistic force.

*Individual initiative and thrift will be destroyed:* Individual initiative has been responsible for every progressive step from barbarism to enlightenment. The first hunter who conceived the idea of hiding some of the meat of the wild animal he killed to appease his hunger, in case he could not find more, employed personal initiative. "Remember, it is always the individual who is the pioneer and who blazes the way for the multitude," says Guy Morrison Walker. "Kill individual initiative and all progress will cease and civilization die," he adds.<sup>3</sup>

Can the farmer exercise individual initiative in the management and direction of his farm if some board, or bureau, at Washington forces him to follow set rules and orders promulgated by those who, possibly, do not know a plow from a harrow? Can the manufacturer employ individual initiative when some board at Washington, made up of men who know nothing whatever of his problems, directs his affairs? Can the merchant employ individual initiative when another bureau tells him the wages he must pay his employees, the number of hours they will be allowed to work, the sale price he must place on every article, and what articles

<sup>3</sup> "The Things That Are Caesar's," A. L. Fowle, New York City, 1922, pages 44-5.

he may or may not display on his shelves? Can any employer of men and women exhibit his personal initiative when another bureau at Washington directs whom he shall, and whom he shall not, hire and denies him the right to discharge employees for inefficiency, or some act detrimental to his business? The Wagner Labor law in substance and effect does that very thing.<sup>4</sup>

"It is the principle of the continuing extension of regulatory powers over every business activity to which I desire to register my protest," said Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Democrat from Virginia, over the radio. ". . . the average American should be permitted to conduct his legitimate business operations without the fear of criminal prosecution by his Government, or harsh and threatening treatment from autocratic bureau heads. In the face of this assurance in the Democratic platform we see to-day a bureaucracy being rapidly built up here at Washington to control the daily activities of our people such as no one has before even remotely suggested or anticipated. Step by step the bureau chiefs are establishing new power to regiment the American people in all their daily activities."<sup>5</sup>

Thrift is the natural concomitant of individual initiative and of the individual property right. The intelligent exercise of thrift has resulted in the accumulation of what is termed capital. This capital, made available for the development of great enterprises such as railroads and public utilities, came largely from the savings banks and the life insurance companies. They had this money to loan for constructive use because of the thrift of millions of persons. In 1932 there were more than 44,000,000 savings deposits in the United States in banks of various sorts, with aggregate deposits of \$24,000,000,000. At the same time there were 1,545,000 postal savings depositors with total deposits of \$1,185,000,000. In the same year there were about 10,000,000 members of build-

<sup>4</sup> Provisions of the Bill.

<sup>5</sup> From radio address printed in the Congressional Record of May 30, 1934.

ing and loan associations, with assets approaching \$8,000,000,000. At the beginning of that year there were 33,531,000 ordinary life insurance policies in force with face value of \$90,611,000,000. There were, at the same time, 88,228,000 "industrial" policies calling for payment of \$18,274,000,000.<sup>6</sup>

Every dollar of the above is evidence of thrift practiced by the American people. Much of this money has been put to work through proper investments, and in so doing millions of people have benefited. The amount of railroad, utility and similar high class investments now held by the savings banks and insurance companies, is approximately \$14,000,000,000. But for the practice of individual initiative and thrift by the past two generations, is there any one who can say that our material progress would have been the same or that wages and general living conditions would have improved as they did during that same period?

Yet despite the constructive nature of individual initiative and thrift, we find one brain truster actually advocating abandonment of the practice of thrift. Dr. David Cushman Coyle, described by Mark Sullivan as one who when "not on the New Deal pay roll is an 'expert on wind vibration in high buildings,'" is quoted as stating before a group of Pennsylvania women that "everything we were taught in school is exactly wrong; thrift is no longer a virtue, saving for a rainy day makes it rain all the harder."<sup>7</sup> If thrift is no longer a virtue, then by the same token, shiftlessness is no longer a vice!

*Private Industry and all lines of business will be destroyed:* The attack here is upon two fronts. First, through restrictive and regulatory legislation directly and adversely affecting every line of business from the smallest to the largest; and, second, through the levying of excessive and burdensome taxes.

<sup>6</sup> Figures taken from the "National Sphere," June, 1934.

<sup>7</sup> New York *Herald Tribune*, May 13, 1934. Dr. Coyle is connected with the REA.

The NIRA was the initial step to national regimentation, and hence destructive to private-industry and business. The Supreme Court held that law to be unconstitutional. This temporary set-back, however, did not greatly disturb the brain trusters. Instead of attaining their end by one blanket law, as the NIRA would have done, they immediately sought the same objective in another way—special legislation for each industry. The Guffey-Lewis Coal bill resulted. If that is held constitutional, why not similar laws for the steel industry, the packing industry, the milling industry and so on down the line?

But it is in the field of taxation that many of the proponents of the New Deal expect to deliver the knock-out blow to industry and business as a whole. Every additional dollar levied in the form of taxes to that extent weakens industry. Increase these taxes to the point where industry is unable to pay and industry automatically passes into the hands of the state. The use of the taxing power for the final attainment of socialism is fundamental with those who accept the Marxian theory. Marx, in his original manifesto, proposed: "A heavy progressive or graduated tax; abolition of all right of inheritance." Will any one say that this Marxian proposal is not evident in the New Deal taxation program?

Every International from the date of Marx to the present has stressed the importance of increasing the taxes upon the people, on the theory that in this manner socialism can be more easily and more quickly attained. Professor Skelton referring to this plan adds this pertinent comment: "In other words, they would imitate the humanitarian youngster who thoughtfully cuts off the cat's tail an inch at a time, to save it pain."<sup>8</sup>

The Socialist party presented the following plank in its 1912 platform: "The adoption of a graduated income tax, the increase of the rate of the present corporation tax and

<sup>8</sup> "Socialism: A Critical Analysis," page 184.

the extension of inheritance taxes, . . . the proceeds of these taxes to be employed in the socialization of industry.”<sup>9</sup>

It should be noted that the proposal to increase taxes was not that funds might be supplied for the proper maintenance of government, but for the acquisition of funds to be used for the “socialization of industry.”

Jessie Wallace Hughan, a socialist writer, who has previously been quoted, after outlining legislation that was to be “deliberately” urged to bring about the socialization of the nation, writes:

“In finance the Socialists have two aims: to shift the burden of taxation from the poor to the rich, and to provide the national and local governments with resources for the acquisition of industry.” Outlining the nature of excessive taxes that are to be urged, the writer continues: “. . . it is evident that this radical system of taxation can be used as the basis for wide schemes of government relief or as the means of acquiring extensive areas of industry.”<sup>10</sup>

Any suggestion that the tax burden should be lifted from the shoulders of the poor has a direct appeal to a large number of citizens even though many of these citizens are rather heavy taxpayers themselves. No one can seriously object to wealth paying its proper and just share of the cost of government, but when it is proposed that the funds extracted by taxation, instead of being merely sufficient to carry on government, be enormously increased and the added sums thus acquired employed to “socialize industry,” one has a right to enter protest.

Prof. Harold J. Laski, one of England’s brain trusters, and a prominent Fabian socialist speaking before the League for Industrial Democracy at Camp Tamiment, Pa., in 1928, stated that “pressure for higher taxation on unearned and large

<sup>9</sup> Cited, “Socialism Summed Up,” page 72.

<sup>10</sup> “What Is Socialism?” page 105.

incomes is vital" and that the application of the funds thus secured for social purposes "lies at the heart of socialism."<sup>11</sup>

Turn from the stated plan of the socialists to what has been done in Washington during the last three years to tax the people and use the money thus secured for "the socialization of industry." So much has been said and written about the enormous tax burden imposed in a few short years that to cite figures here would be but presenting that which is common knowledge. With a direct promise to the people that, if elected, he would reduce the cost of government 25 per cent, Mr. Roosevelt has so greatly increased that cost that it is shocking. Clearly this added expense levied against property will, if carried to its final conclusion, result in but one thing—the complete destruction of privately owned industry. Can any one reason otherwise, and is not that the reasoning of the brain trusters who have, with consummate skill, induced a Democratic Congress to aid them in the carrying out of their purposes?

*Independent Agriculture will be destroyed:* The assumption that farming can be benefited by the ruthless destruction of crops, or by the limitation of production, when millions of persons in this land are suffering from want of sufficient food, appears the height of absurdity but not so to the brain trusters. Mr. J. George Frederick, referring to the AAA, says:

"If these logical plans fail—and many who know farmer human nature say they must fail—it will become obvious that nothing short of absolute dictatorship, perhaps under martial law, to limit production, will create that artificial 'scarcity' (balance of production with consumption) which alone can prevent farm products from 'glut' and from selling for less than cost of production. And it will serve notice of this fact upon the farmer himself and place the blame for perverse action on his own doorstep."<sup>12</sup>

The conclusion one is forced to draw from the above is that,

<sup>11</sup> "The Socialism of Our Times," The Vanguard Press, page 132.

<sup>12</sup> "A Primer of 'New Deal' Economics," page 56.

if the farmer does not follow the arbitrary ruling of the bureaucrats at Washington a dictatorship under military law will be his portion. And when the whole thing fails it will not be the "experimental attitude"<sup>13</sup> on the part of the brain trust which will be at fault, but the farmer himself! "But," as the same writer later says, "American economic policy is now in 'New Deal' hands which considers nothing too sacred or traditional to change, when there is overwhelming evidence by men of brains that to change will be beneficial."<sup>14</sup>

The "men of brains," in this instance, are not the hundreds of thousands of farmers who have made good but, instead, the theoretical college professors who have had no practical experience.

In Haskell County, Kansas—and this is in a section termed "submarginal" by New Dealists—a Mrs. Amanda Watkins runs a big wheat farm handling from 3,500 to 5,000 acres each year. She has made a success of it. It may be that she does not possess as much "book larnin'" as do the autocrats in the Department of Agriculture, but certainly no one, knowing what she has done, will charge her with lacking brains. In 1932 the House of Representatives named a committee to investigate government competition with private enterprise. Mrs. Watkins was a witness before this committee. She was not impressed with the government interfering in her business for she said:

"I draw the line on the doggone damnable Government interference. . . . I don't want them in my line of business. . . . I want them to kick the devil out of them (she was referring to government boards seeking to direct her in her efforts) and get them out of here. That is what I want."<sup>15</sup> Mrs. Watkins took the position that if she did not have brains enough to manage her business she should get out of it, a position commonly taken by the real farmers of this land.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, page 55.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, page 146.

<sup>15</sup> House Report No. 1985, 72nd Congress, 2nd Session, page 48.

Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, writes:

"... it may be necessary to have compulsory control of marketing, licensing of plowed land, and base and surplus quotas for every farmer for every product for each month of the year. We may have to have government control of all surpluses, and a far greater degree of public ownership than we have now. It may be necessary to make a public utility out of agriculture and apply to it a combination of an Esch-Cummins Act and an Adamson Act. Every plowed field would have its permit sticking up on its post."<sup>16</sup>

*Individual freedom will be destroyed:* The government of the United States came into existence because the people insisted upon freedom of action of which, they believed, the Mother Country was depriving them. When the Constitution was approved the citizens of the various states felt that, in certain phrasing it was not sufficiently clear, and so there was added, at the time of its adoption, ten articles known as the "Bill of Rights." Three of these read as follows:

"Article I. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

"Article IX. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"Article X. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In adopting the Constitution, the people retained all rights not expressly delegated to the Federal government. They retained the right of free speech, free assemblage, freedom of religious belief, freedom of personal action, freedom to move about unmolested, freedom to express themselves upon

<sup>16</sup> "America Must Choose," Henry A. Wallace, published jointly by the Foreign Policy Assn. of New York and World Peace Foundation, Boston, page 11.



any subject so long as they did not urge subversion of State, freedom to direct affairs in their own home, freedom to conduct their business as they deemed best, save and except, of course, in exercising these rights they do not infringe on the rights of others. And they retained for themselves and their progeny, the right to acquire and own property to do with it as they deemed best, again, save and except, they could not use this to the detriment of the general public.

"When the safeguards assuring the sovereignty of the people over government are discarded, both individual and political liberties disappear," writes Charles Hall Davis.<sup>17</sup> And these safeguards are being discarded.

Almost without exception, the many laws now sponsored by the brain trust or already enacted, in some form or other, override the explicit provisions of the Constitution in that they proceed to take away from the individual one or more of his unalienable rights, rights which never were under the control of the government, and which the citizen, at all times, has refused to surrender to government.

Certainly no one will deny that individual freedom is suppressed, when a government tells a farmer how many acres he can plant in a certain crop, and forces him to refrain from planting a particular crop on a portion of his land.<sup>18</sup>

Certainly no one will deny that individual freedom has been suppressed, when a government agency can force a man to close his business and throw his faithful employees out of jobs because that man refuses to discharge these faithful ones, and give their places to those who have engaged in rioting and otherwise have sought to injure him, as in the case of the Harriman Mills in Tennessee.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> "The Menace of Socialism," Grosvenor Dawe Associates, Washington, D. C., footnote, page 27.

<sup>18</sup> See provisions of the AAA and the Potato Control Bill.

<sup>19</sup> Early in 1934 certain employes of the Harriman Hosiery Mills Company of Knoxville, Tenn., called a strike. Many others refused to join. The usual rioting resulted. A bureau set up under the NIRA was called in. It directed the employers to take back the strikers. They refused. General Johnson, then head of the administration of this act, withdrew the Blue Eagle, and a governmental boycott was established to prevent the products of this mill

Certainly no one will deny that individual freedom is suppressed, when some autocratic bureau can fine and imprison a man because he sells his services for a few cents less than this bureau directs he must charge, as in the case of the little tailor in New Jersey sent to jail because he pressed a pair of pants for thirty-five cents when he was directed to charge forty. The fact that the Supreme Court has annulled the NIRA, under which this was done, does not alter intent.

And certainly no one will deny that individual freedom has been suppressed when a bureaucrat at Washington threatens the publisher of a small country newspaper because of editorial utterances of which he does not approve, as in the Alabama case;<sup>20</sup> or when the Radio Commission undertakes to direct the policy of broadcasting stations.<sup>21</sup>

*Our present Constitutional Government will be destroyed* and a "co-operative commonwealth" established in its place. The present government of Russia is a "co-operative commonwealth." That this is a part of the general program of destruction as advanced by both the socialist and communist wings of the movement, has been specifically stated so many times that it seems trite even here to mention it.

"For over half a century it has been the aim of socialism

being sold. The *New York Times*, under date of June 26, 1934, carried in full a letter signed by the attorney for the mills to General Johnson. In that letter appears this language: "You personally told us to discharge present loyal employes and employ strikers in their places. Your personal representative . . . would not restore the Blue Eagle unless we signed a written instrument requiring us to discharge present loyal employes and replace them with strikers." Because of the position taken by administrative officers of the federal government the mill was compelled to close its doors. The financial loss was heavy.

<sup>20</sup> "The Case for the Freedom of the Press," by Robert R. McCormick, 1933, page 19.

<sup>21</sup> On August 14, 1933, the Federal Radio Commission, according to the *New York Herald Tribune* of June 18, 1934, issued the following newspaper release: "It is the patriotic, if not the bounden and legal duty of all licensees of radio broadcasting stations to deny their facilities to advertisers who are disposed to defy, ignore, or modify the codes established by the NRA, Commissioner Harold A. Lafount declared today in a statement." Then this threat follows: "Under the Radio Act the commission . . . has the right to take into consideration the kind of programs broadcast when licensees apply for renewals."

to arouse the discontent of the working classes to the pitch where no less pretentious panacea, no mere betterments of the existing order, would be accepted," writes Prof. Skelton.<sup>22</sup> When this discontent is sufficiently strong and has been properly mobilized, so-called reformatory legislative measures are proposed further to weaken both the economic stability of the nation and the morale of its citizens.

"The practical aim of the Socialist Party," writes the late Morris Hillquit, "moreover, is the capture of the powers of government. . . ." <sup>23</sup> And, he adds, "the principal aims of socialism are not those of local or temporary reform, but of permanent and radical socialist reconstruction," which reconstruction the socialist holds cannot be accomplished under our present constitutional form of government.

Certain members of the brain trust take the same position while others insist that the change to the new can be made "within the shell of the old." They are not as yet ready to jeopardize their program by demanding amendments to the Constitution, but should further decisions of the Supreme Court restrain them in their efforts, there is every reason to believe that their next step will be to secure Constitutional changes.

*The morale of the people will be destroyed:* Legislation already enacted has worked to this end. As much of it restrains the freedom of the individual and jeopardizes his rights under the Constitution, it has caused him to become lax, lazy and indifferent to his duties as a citizen. The many so-called relief agencies have already done much to weaken the morale of a large element of our citizenry. The good intent of the members of the Congress in establishing these agencies, and appropriating vast sums that human suffering might be alleviated, is not here questioned. The purpose expresses the humanitarian instincts of true Americans. While some doubt the constitutionality of this legislation no one

<sup>22</sup> "Socialism: A Critical Analysis," page 15.

<sup>23</sup> "Socialism in Theory and Practice," The Macmillan Co., New York, 1917, page 174.

has raised more than a feeble protest on this point. The harm has resulted from the methods of administration. Official bureaucrats and designing individuals, apparently thinking of their own advancement, not of the welfare of the people in need, have used the money to build gigantic political machines.

During the past six months especially, newspapers from coast to coast have carried stories of waste, graft and woeful inefficiency in administration of public funds. Democratic and Republican editors alike have commented upon the situation. As typical of literally hundreds of such editorials the Sumner (Washington) *Standard* early in September (1935) said:

"To date there has been nothing accomplished, not a project started and not a man employed, save alone, in the 'white collared 10% political appointive class,' but they have swarmed the hive and are deep in the honey. . . . The 'brain trust' of the left wing forces is looting the land."<sup>24</sup>

Americans have so long experienced bureaucracy in the federal government, that extending the system might not bring even so much as a word of condemnation. They have seen many political machines, national and local, built through the use of taxpayers' money, and hence that does not arouse their antagonism as it should. The thing, however, that has caused an uproar—and rightfully—is the established fact that relief agencies in many cities appear to be dominated largely by communists, and that the communists are using the public money they thus secure to carry on their battle to destroy our form of government and our system of economics. General Hugh S. Johnson, sent to New York by the Roosevelt administration to "put men to work," found it necessary to establish a special department to ferret out the large number of communists who "chiseled in" on public funds. He expressed himself rather forcibly on the subject when he left his job. His successor, Victor Ridder, however, according to the press, immediately disbanded this special committee.

<sup>24</sup> Cited, "Business Chronicle" (Seattle, Wash.), Sept. 18, 1935.

Six months previous to the General's charge, a New York City official denounced this system of aiding the communists. Nathan Hale, who holds a post in the city Department of Public Welfare, in a public address reported in the *Times*<sup>25</sup> said:

"I could go further and state that the administration of relief has been the greatest aid that the Communist party and the agitating movements in this country ever had. I have seen hundreds and hundreds of them come in with their tails between their legs begging for a chance to work and support their families, and two weeks after they were carrying banners in front of the Welfare Department demanding all the things that are usually associated with communism."

Had the money appropriated for relief purposes been turned over to the Red Cross in the first place, as was urged by many, not only would a scandal have been averted, but honest citizens receiving aid would not feel themselves charity wards upon a humiliating dole.

But wholly apart from the questioned constitutionality of the legislation appropriating literally billions of dollars from the federal treasury for individual, sectional, or group benefactions; wholly apart from the enormous harm this has done by placing an unwarranted tax burden on the thrifty and industrious citizen; and wholly apart from the woeful mismanagement and gigantic political machine that has been erected, our gravest concern is the great injustice done the nation by weakening the morale of a large element of our citizenry.

Any system of dole, no matter under what name presented, inevitably breaks down individual moral courage and stability. It lessens the self-respect of those who accept the dole. It tends to demoralize society as a whole because it injects into each community a group of beneficiaries who take the position that, since the government is supporting them, there is no need for them to support themselves. Many of our thrifty and

<sup>25</sup> May 25, 1935.

industrious citizens—those whose labors carry the tax burden—seeing one element of society loafing and living on government funds, are rapidly losing the will to continue their struggle. This situation, continued to its logical conclusion, will inevitably result in chaos.

England had its experience with the dole system of relief. Sir Ernest Benn, the well-known English economist and publisher, writing in *Nation's Business*<sup>28</sup> said:

“Three political parties are dependent upon the continuance of unemployment, and an enormous and powerful bureaucracy grows and fattens upon it. . . . It is the system itself which is fundamentally wrong, and abuse is inseparable from it.”

Pointing out the ill effects the dole system has on the morale of the people of England, Sir Ernest writes:

“We shall clear it up. The clearance will come out of the sterling common sense of the working people of this country, who are becoming thoroughly disillusioned. The politicians, as usual, will follow. It is well to remember that modern politicians always follow, they never lead. As they slowly begin to realize that the people do not want bribing with their own money all this trouble will disappear.”

What is true in England is likewise true in the United States. Common sense is characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon people. The correction of the evils resulting from the system we have employed to help those in want, rests upon the general public knowing the truth. Once that becomes clear to them they will do the rest. The troubles engendered by New Deal legislation in the field of relief will disappear.

Every nation, no matter how great its physical resources, how stable its government, how sound its currency, how large its population, in the final analysis depends upon the morale of its citizenry for continued existence. Anything that weakens the morale of the people weakens the whole structure. Destroy the morale completely and the entire structure

<sup>28</sup> October, 1931.

falls. That is a self-evident fact requiring neither evidence nor logic to support it.

It is common knowledge that, in many parts of this country during the past season, the farmers could not find sufficient help to enable them properly to harvest their crops. Thousands of idle men loafed around the towns and villages but disdained to work because the dole they received from the government was as much, or nearly as much, as the farmer could afford to pay them in wages.

From every section of the country comes the same story. The following, from the *Seattle Business Chronicle*,<sup>27</sup> is typical:

"Jobs are going begging in Southwest Washington cranberry fields; and growers are frantically trying to overcome the acute labor shortage. The Washington cranberry crop . . . faces the loss of one-third of the yield through inability to obtain pickers. . . .

"Solicitation of relief agencies has met with failure because indigents say they would find it too difficult to get back on the relief rolls, once the picking job is finished. Bumper fields in some districts will rot on the vines, growers declare. . . .

"Recently there was a heavy loss to the hop harvest because of refusal of men to work. Now it is cranberries. To-morrow it will be something else. So it will continue as long as taxpayers' money is used to put a premium upon idleness."

Late in September, 1935, the President sent a letter to ministers throughout the United States asking for their "advice and suggestion" because of their "wise and sympathetic understanding" of the needs of the people. Many of the leading clergy of the nation, in letters to the President, stressed the harm done by the system of administering dole and so-called relief work. Rev. David M. Steele, rector of St. Luke's Church, Philadelphia, had this to say:

"If you had half the understanding I have of the aforesaid people, you would hang your head in shame at what you

<sup>27</sup> November 6, 1935.

have done to them. You and your administration have utterly ruined them; so that with relief and doles and pensions, all the piffling perquisites that you are handing out, I literally cannot get a man to do a day's work. The community is full of so-called unemployed—until you try to employ them. Then they simply will not work. Why should they? . . .

“The infinitely worse result of your procedure is the pauperizing of so many people, the debauching of labor and the plunging of so large a measure of the population into a low-down state of indolence from which they will not recover. They will never again, during our lifetime, be able to, nor, which is worse, want to go to work.”<sup>28</sup>

“Why make serfs of citizens? Why take away the will to work, the power of individual initiative? . . .” asks Rev. William Carter, retired pastor of the Thorp Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn.<sup>29</sup>

“The greatest injury of all has been the moral injury done to the individual citizens,” writes J. Gresham Machen, professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.<sup>30</sup>

Rev. Charles L. Brooks of the First Methodist Church, Mangum, Oklahoma, and a lifelong Democrat, sums up the evils of the dole and so-called relief methods of aiding the unemployed in these words:

“The ‘dole,’ Federal Relief and Works Program, all alike, have proved to be rich fields for politicians of the predatory type.”<sup>31</sup>

If it be true that New Dealism, carried to its logical conclusion, will destroy individual initiative and thrift, will destroy private industry, will destroy independent agriculture, will destroy individual freedom, will destroy our present Constitutional government, and will destroy the morale of the people, then New Deal legislation is destructive.

<sup>28</sup> *New York Sun*, October 9, 1935.

<sup>29</sup> *New York Sun*, November 11, 1935.

<sup>30</sup> *New York Herald Tribune*, October 1, 1935.

<sup>31</sup> *New York American*, October 27, 1935.



## Chapter XII

### A FINAL WORD

IN the foregoing pages the writer believes he has presented sufficient documentary evidence to prove, beyond reasonable doubt:

1st. That, since the '60s of the last century there has been an organized movement in the United States supporting the theory that human ills can be eradicated only by the abolition of the right of the individual to acquire and own property, the root of which theory is found in the ancient philosophy of destruction, outlined in Chapter IV;

2nd. That, those holding to this theory have, with marked skill, persistency, and much deception, continued their campaign for political control of the nation up to the Democratic convention in 1932, at which time they captured that organization, and named as the candidate for President on the Democratic ticket, one who has proved friendly and sympathetic to their socialistic proposals; and that, many of those advocating the theory mentioned above are now in important administrative offices of the federal government; and,

3rd. That, being in control, anxious to put their theory into operation, they have prepared, sponsored, and forced through the Congress, a large number of restrictive, regulatory, and confiscatory laws, most of which the members of the Congress approved, presumably on the ground that these laws would benefit the nation. These laws, however, really represent the initial efforts to bring about the ultimate socialization of this country.

The question naturally arises: Do we, as a people, wish to continue these socialistic and communistic experiments, the destructive nature of which has already been manifest in many quarters or do we, as a people, wish to restore those

principles of government and economics which have enabled us to grow from a small country of thirteen states into one of the leading nations of the world?

Before the majority of the citizens of the United States commit themselves to a permanent policy of socialism, they should understand two things; first, that seeming immediate benefits, in the final analysis, are certain to prove merely "fools gold"; and, second, that the adoption of such a national policy will eventually mean the abolition of the rights and privileges which we, as a people, have long enjoyed and cherished. The rights and privileges which would thus be abolished are:

1. The freedom of the press;
2. The freedom of speech;
3. The freedom of public assemblage;
4. The right of personal action;
5. Trial by jury;
6. The right of the individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience;
7. The monogamous family; and,
8. The right of the individual to acquire and own property.

The citizen should also understand that our present constitutional form of government, which protects the above rights and privileges, would likewise be abolished.

If the majority of the citizens of the United States do not care to retain the above mentioned rights and privileges, we have nothing further to say; the question is submitted to them for their consideration and action. It is our firm conviction, however, that they do not want any such drastic and destructive change.

Such being the case it remains for them, therefore, to elect to public office individuals, whether Republicans or Democrats, whom they know have opposed, and will continue unalterably to oppose, all legislation adverse to the individual rights and privileges above mentioned; and who are emphatically committed to a constructive policy. In some instances

---

this may mean immediate sacrifices, but one should keep the ultimate good in mind. Political ties, in other cases, may have to be severed, but the preservation of the individual rights we have so long enjoyed—and which apparently, many believe cannot be denied us—should be the first thought of the American electorate.

Having tasted power, these socialistic forces will not be easily dispossessed. They are to be found in both political parties. If they discover the Democratic party is no longer popular with the electorate, it is logical to assume—knowing their strategy—that they will undertake to capture the opposition party.

A wise man once said: "If every person in the land will start to-day reforming himself, giving no heed whatsoever to others, the good results completed at the end of a week will be astonishing." If we could be certain that every individual would strictly adhere to the code of Christian ethics, viz.: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets," our ills, economic, political and moral would soon vanish. That is too much to expect. Christian civilization has, to be sure, made great advancement in two thousand years, but there are still many hurdles to be taken on the road. The church, in its most important duty, can do much to instill in the individual this spirit, if it will but dis-associate itself from subjects political.

Our forefathers fought and died for certain enduring principles. In our original Constitution they sought to protect the great nation they had founded against any departure from those principles. No document of government, no contract between a State and its people or between a people and its State, has ever so carefully guarded the citizen against the destructive philosophy of socialism. But as individuals we have not heeded the warning, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We have departed from the spirit, as well as the letter of our Constitution. We have weakened it by amend-

ment. We have weakened it by the broken promises of those sworn to uphold it.

The Marxian socialist philosophy, to attain its end, proposes the following means:

1. The abolition of government—(that is, those that protect the right to private property);
2. The abolition of patriotism;
3. The abolition of private property;
4. The abolition of inheritance;
5. The abolition of religion; and,
6. The abolition of the family relation—(that is, morality).

These methods are antagonistic to progress and individual advancement. They are ruinous to civilization. They will lead inevitably to slavery under a small alien minority in autocratic control.

We propose that our laws and our citizens adhere to each and every principle the Marxian philosophy would have us abolish, viz.:

1. Adherence to our constitutional form of government;
2. Adherence to patriotism;
3. Adherence to private property right;
4. Adherence to the right of inheritance;
5. Adherence to religion;
6. Adherence to the family relation—(that is, adherence to morality).

And as specific means to bring this about we urge every American citizen to—

1. Demand that our elected and appointed governmental representatives uphold the Constitution.
2. Demand that our representatives in government rescind the laws now on the statute books that break the spirit, if not the letter, of our Constitution.
3. Demand that our primary system of election be changed so that nominations in the future cannot be "stolen."
4. Demand that the amendment to the original Constitution providing for the direct election of Senators be rescinded.

5. Demand a revision of our tax laws to bring them within the original provisions of our Constitution.

6. Demand representation of citizenry rather than of population.

7. Demand deportation of undesirable aliens and the enactment of laws to prevent future unfriendly alien immigration.

8. Demand a banking and currency system wholly national within the original provisions of our Constitution and therefore impossible of manipulation by any foreign interest.

These are fundamentals. We have deserted these fundamentals and so have weakened our state.

Let us no longer treat effects. The cause of our economic and political ills is the destructive philosophy of socialism. Let us forever destroy the cause, and let us discharge from office all those who, following this philosophy, would force upon our nation an alien despotism.

To pursue any other course can end but one way: The treasure we seek will turn out to be "fools gold."

## *Appendix "A"*

### FACTS CONCERNING SOCIALISM THAT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD

THE socialists have inflicted their destructive, fallacious theory upon the American people largely because very few persons understand the true nature of the theory or the ultimate objective of those who, knowingly, propagate it. In this Appendix we present a few facts for the guidance of the student.

Among other things the socialists, and those of all wings, present as basic is the doctrine of the class struggle. They assert that in society there are two major classes, one called the working, often the exploited, and the other the capitalist, often the exploiter. Between these two, it is insisted, there must rage a bitter, relentless battle for supremacy. It being contended that since the capitalist class, at this time, has that supremacy, it becomes the duty of the working class to organize and prepare for a bitter contest in which force and violence, yes, even a bloody revolution if necessary, are held to be justifiable to overthrow the ruling class and install the workers as the rulers, confiscating all that the capitalists have secured through the exercise of thrift, energy, ability, skill, genius, initiative, labor, etc.

This theory of the class struggle is the natural and inevitable concomitant of the conclusion reached some centuries before by those wedded to the philosophy of destruction, to wit, that all human misery is caused by the institution of private property.

The growth of socialism and communism throughout the world, resulting in New Dealism in the United States, is due, not only to the fact that it pretended to be a legitimate labor movement employing deception to induce followers,

but also to the fact that it early took on an effective form of organization known as the International. (See Appendix on Internationals.)

It is all-important that one has a clear understanding of the strategical differences between the two groups having a common purpose. This difference is not over theory, or the underlying philosophy of destruction, but wholly over tactics or methods to attain the common end, whether the most fanatical communist or the suave liberal who hides his connection by claiming adherence to either the Republican or the Democratic party. Those who call themselves socialists, members of the right wing, have adopted as their tactics that which they term legislative action. By this they mean the advocacy of alleged reformatory legislation, usually of a restrictive or regulatory nature, or the advocacy of some constitutional amendment, which legislation, if enacted, or amendment, if adopted, will, in some form or manner, weaken either the existing economic structure or the established form of government, or both. In the early days of the movement in the United States, this system was called political action.

The communists, composing the left wing of the movement, take the position that this method is too slow. They want to attain their ends overnight. They present as their tactics what they term mass or direct action; that is to say, the use of force, violence and acts of terrorism creating a situation which they believe will result in an open, bloody revolution enabling them to capture the government.

While this question of tactics creates the division, the fact remains that the communists have entered the political field in the United States pretending to be anxious to secure legislation that will benefit the workers and farmers, and the socialists also join in protest meetings whenever there is an attack on the communists, whether this attack comes from individuals, associations, or government sources.

In a common assault upon our government and its institutions, the socialists constitute the advance brigade of the army,

the purpose of which is to weaken our position. The communists comprise the reserve forces of the same army that become active when the enemy is weak enough for direct attack. The enemy is the social order of to-day based upon and supporting the institution of private property.

These facts should also be kept in mind: In the first place, socialism is not related to honest social welfare work, "it is the negation of reform"; in the second place, socialism is not a legitimate labor organization, nor is it a movement to aid or benefit the farmers; and in the third place—and this is highly important—one must differentiate between what is termed *socialist thought* and organized groups advancing that thought called political parties.

The impression has been cleverly created that socialism and social welfare are synonymous terms. This is far from correct. True, the majority of those engaged in spending public funds in social welfare work, in the larger cities especially, are socialists; but the spreading of their doctrine is of far more interest to them than rendering lasting benefit to those to whom they administer. Many who have made a careful study of this phase of welfare work are of the opinion that had there never been a socialist in any welfare organization in the United States, the number of persons seeking public aid would be far less and to-day there would be no need for many of these organizations.

This much seems certain: The growth of socialist thought has been more general and lasting among those who come in close contact with settlement-house and social-welfare workers than that of any other group of our citizens. Even those who, when engaging in work of this character are not socialistically inclined, generally emerge saturated with its false doctrines.

Professor John Rae, writing in 1884, when modern socialism was gaining considerable attention on the Continent and in Great Britain, laid considerable emphasis on the fact that what we now term social reform is not akin to socialism. He wrote:



“... socialism is not a feeling for the poor, nor yet for the responsibilities of society in connection with their poverty; it is neither what is called humanitarianism, nor what is called altruism; it is not an affair of feeling at all . . .”<sup>1</sup>

Social welfare work, presumably, is designed to aid and improve certain elements in our society unable to aid themselves; to advance them morally, mentally and even financially; to help them educate their children, to show them how to maintain, improve and make attractive a home, etc. Now all that is praiseworthy. It has a great appeal. But when those who are paid to carry on work of this character undertake to implant in the minds of those to whom they are administering the belief that our form of government is all wrong, that our system of economics is designed only to aid the wealthy, that our public officials are all corrupt, that society is divided into two classes—the workers and the capitalists—that all of the former are enslaved by the latter and that before the worker can emerge from his desperate situation he must change both the form of government and the system of economics—even if a bloody revolution is necessary, it is highly questionable whether legitimate welfare work is being done.

The socialist movement, at least in the United States, is not a legitimate labor movement. Organized labor in this country expresses its aims through the American Federation of Labor, and whether one approves or disapproves of that organization, the fact remains that its objective is the advancement of the wage-earner under our system. While the labor union has been well penetrated by those who would turn it into an organization of destruction, its purposes are legitimate.

The very nature of the socialist creed refutes the claim that it is truly a labor movement if, by labor movement, is meant something designed to aid, benefit and advance those who receive wages or salaries. The American workman is proud of his independence and ready to fight to retain it. He holds

<sup>1</sup> “Contemporary Socialism,” John Rae, page 375.

that he has the right—and the Constitution upholds him in his contention—to work when and where he chooses and to accept such wages as he deems in keeping with the services rendered. Socialism would destroy this right, this independence. The average American workman is ambitious and wants to progress. He visualizes the time when he will leave the class of wage-earner to become a wage-payer. Socialism would deprive him of that opportunity. The average American wage-earner is a believer in our form of government and our system of economics. He is ready to fight to preserve both; he has done so several times. Under the established economic system he has the same right to acquire and own property as has the wealthiest person in the land. He knows from history and experience that the wheel of fortune is ever turning and that he who is the employer to-day may be the employee to-morrow, or, vice-versa.

Again, for those spreading socialist doctrines to contend they are engaged in a work beneficial to the farmers of this nation, is absurd upon its face. The farmer is naturally an individualist. He owns land or, if renting, in time expects to own land. Even though his farm may be heavily encumbered, he calls that land his own. He takes pride in its possession. He cultivates that land and if he is a capable farmer manages to make a fair living, independent at all times of the demands imposed by society upon those in many other walks of life. If a shiftless farmer, he fails just as the shiftless fail in all lines of business. It is these shiftless, these failures, who make up the bulk of those demanding the enactment of socialistic measures for their benefit. Mind you, for *their* benefit—not for the benefit of those who have made good in this world.

It is highly important, if one is to grasp the genesis of what is termed the New Deal in legislation, to differentiate between *socialist thought* and the organized movements advancing that thought such as the Socialist and Communist parties. If the extent of the socialist thought in this country were confined wholly to members of these political organizations

there would be little about which to worry. The reason so few people recognize the existing danger is because they assume that only members of such organizations are interested in advancing the philosophy which underlies their theory. The Socialist party, the Socialist Labor party, the Communist party and others that have sprung up from time to time, came into being wholly to utilize the political arena as a medium for propaganda. There are very few well informed socialists in this country who hold that they will gain control of this government through a third party organization.

The Socialist party has never polled any disturbing number of votes in a presidential election although it has, now and then, captured a local office usually due to the personal popularity of their candidate, contrasted with the personal unpopularity of his opponent. Even the late Senator Robert M. LaFollette, running on a socialist ticket although labeled, for publicity purposes, Progressive, did not make any great dent in the vote of either of the old parties. But while the apparent number of socialists as shown by election returns is small, the number of persons who have absorbed socialist thought is large indeed. They vote either the Republican or Democratic ticket and yet, within these parties, persistently carry on agitation for certain socialistic reform measures. We have some of them in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and we certainly have an abnormal number of them at the present time occupying "key" positions in the federal government.

Literally millions of loyal, patriotic and conscientious American citizens, led astray by propaganda are of the belief that their ills would be cured if the Congress—or in some instances a state legislature—would adopt alleged reformatory proposals. It is simply human nature for a person to support that which he honestly believes will aid him. He is not thinking of the other fellow. If, for instance, a farmer can secure money for not raising wheat, he thinks the idea a mighty good one. He does not stop to reason that some one

must be taxed to supply the money he is to receive for doing nothing. It would be unfair to question his sincerity, loyalty, or mental honesty. He thinks in terms of self-interest. And it is because of this human trait that the sponsors of socialistic schemes appeal first to one group with one plan of action, and then to another group with another plan of action. They are not thinking in terms of the interests of the members of these groups. They are only thinking in the terms of what will be the ultimate result if sufficient discontent is aroused—the abolition of our form of government and the abandonment or destruction of the individual property right.

### *Appendix "B"*

#### THE INTERNATIONALS

THE world socialist movement is a secret, underground organization. Just who guides it is a matter of conjecture. This secret, underground, directing body or council, operates on the surface—that is publicly—through two well-known organizations, thus dividing the activities of its army of followers into two distinct wings or factions.

These two organizations are called Internationals. One is known as the Labor and Socialist International, sometimes the "New," and sometimes the "Hamburg." The other is known as the Third (or Communist) International. The first named constitutes what is known as the right wing of the socialist movement, the followers of which are called socialists. The second constitutes what is known as the left wing of the socialist movement, the followers of which are called communists.

Each of these Internationals, in turn, operates through prominent subsidiaries known as labor Internationals. The one affiliated with the Socialist wing is called the Amsterdam

International Federation of Trade Unions. The one affiliated with the Communist wing, the Red International of Labor Unions.

We, in the United States, interpret the term labor unions in quite a different way than do those of these two wings of the socialist movement. We think of a labor union as an organization, or association, of men and women working for wages who affiliate for the purpose of mutual aid and protection in dealing with their employers. Certainly we do not think of a labor union as an organization of men and women seeking the destruction of our form of government and its institutions. And yet, as the term is used by the Internationals mentioned, that, in effect, is what it does mean.

In the preceding pages we have pointed out how socialist propagandists came to the United States and began at once to bore from within legitimate labor movements. In the study of socialist literature, whether emanating from the right or left wing, one should keep constantly in mind the fact that although the purpose of the movement is alleged to be to advance the cause of labor, the cause of socialism is what is meant. The words labor and socialism are constantly used interchangeably in all socialist literature.

The four major Internationals mentioned, in turn, operate through a number of subsidiary Internationals. Thus we find, on investigation, a web of interlocking groups carefully and completely interwoven into an intricate mesh.

These Internationals are the governing bodies insofar as aims, purposes, objectives, policies, and tactics, are concerned. The decrees, decisions, manifestoes and resolutions of these Internationals guide their followers in every country in which they operate—and they operate in the United States. Independence of thought or action on the part of a follower is not permitted. Those who have the temerity to think or act for themselves are subject to expulsion.

These Internationals hold regular congresses or conventions. Delegates from practically every civilized nation take part in

these gatherings. The United States is well represented in all four, especially the Third (Communist) International and its affiliate, the Red International of Labor Unions. Every delegate taking part in these congresses or conventions, in view of his actions, must be held disloyal to his government, whatever that government may be—save in the case of Russia—because at such congresses or conventions, plans and methods are formulated to destroy all existing governments that recognize the private property right and related institutions, and erect in their stead governments which deny this right and, hence, would destroy all related institutions.

Delegates to these congresses, or conventions, pledge loyalty to their Internationals above allegiance to their respective governments. Where there is a clash between the two, they stand by the International. This was demonstrated in the United States when we were forced into war with the Central Powers. The socialists—save the few who as a matter of fact were only idealists—instead of firmly and loyally supporting the government of the United States, pledged allegiance to International Socialism and gave aid and comfort to the enemy.

Possibly technically it cannot be held that the delegates to the Labor and Socialist International and those to the affiliated Amsterdam International Federation of Labor Unions, are disloyal citizens of their respective countries. Legally, they are not, because, as in the case of the United States, they propose the overthrow of the government and the destruction of its institutions—at least insofar as public utterances are concerned—through legal methods. But those who are delegates to the Third (or Communist) International, and delegates to its affiliated Red International of Labor Unions, certainly are both morally and legally disloyal citizens of their respective governments—except Russia—since they propose the overthrow of the government and existing institutions and the abolition of the private property right, through

a system of force, violence, terrorism, civil wars and revolutions, all of which are illegal.

These two major and two affiliated Internationals enter into, and work in, the United States through two organizations. One is known as the Socialist party. The other, until recently, was known as the Workers (Communist) party. The word "workers," used wholly to deceive the people and give the movement the semblance of legality, has been dropped and the new organization is now out boldly and frankly as "The Communist Party of the United States of America, Section of the Communist International."

*The Eye Opener*, an official publication of the Socialist party some years ago, in its February, 1919, issue defines the Socialist International in this language:

"It is an organization of Socialist Parties and labor organizations meeting periodically in international conferences. In order to be eligible for membership, an organization must meet the following tests adopted by the International Congress of Paris, 1900:

"Those admitted to the International Socialist Congresses are:

"1. All associations which adhere to the essential principles of Socialism; namely, socialization of the means of production and exchange, international union, and action of the workers, conquest of public power by the proletariat, organized as a class party.

"2. All the labor organizations which accept the principles of the class struggle and recognize the necessity of political action, legislative and parliamentary, but do not participate directly in the political movement."

"This definition includes every Socialist Party and propaganda organization in the world and it further takes in those enlightened unions that recognize the need of political action. It excludes conservative unions that do not yet admit the soundness of the principle of the class struggle."

*Appendix "C"*

## THE POPULIST MOVEMENT

THE connection between the socialists and the Populist movement, which swept a number of Western states in the early '90s of the last century, is of special interest. It was largely the experience then gained that enabled the socialists to enter these agricultural sections and carry on their propaganda and agitation which resulted, some years later, in the establishment of the Socialist party under the name of the Nonpartisan League. We have gone somewhat into detail upon this subject because of the value of the information to those who wish to do a bit of studying for themselves in order to link past events with present New Dealism. This data should be of special benefit to those who wish clues to relate socialist activities with the program of the AAA.

A discontented group of people attracts the socialists as cheese does hungry mice. Dissatisfaction, discontent, ill-feeling, class hatred are the mental soils cultivated by the socialists. The fruit is more dissatisfaction, discontent, ill-feeling and class hatred. When this crop is large enough they expect to reap the real harvest—the socialization of the wealth of the nation, "the land, factories, machinery, railroads, mines, etc."<sup>1</sup>

Much is said in the press about the discontented farmers of the West, meaning those in the territory between the Mississippi river and the Rocky mountains. It is true there is discontent there but not as much as in the urban sections of the nation. To every discontented farmer in the nation, probably a hundred discontented persons will be found in the cities.<sup>2</sup> To get a clear understanding of the cause of dis-

<sup>1</sup> "Socialism in Theory and Practice," page 11.

<sup>2</sup> Any one making a careful study of the subject will quickly discover that the degree of "discontent" found at any time, or in any part of the nation, parallels the extent of socialist propaganda at the time, or in that part of the country.



content in the agricultural districts, one must go back to shortly after the War Between the States, and learn how a mental soil, later fertilized by socialist propaganda, was created.

The development of the magnificent empire west of the Mississippi river early attracted the attention of railroad promoters. Even before the War surveys had been run for projected Coast lines. The Union Pacific received its charter in 1862, the Northern Pacific in 1864 and the Atlantic and Pacific, now known as the Santa Fe, in 1866. The promoters of these projects, pointing out their necessity from the standpoint of national development and national defense, gained the attention of the Congress. Large grants of land were made to them to aid in financing. It was the granting of this land that enabled the early day agitator to start a long train of discontent which has continued until the present day.<sup>3</sup>

The building of these roads naturally attracted the nation's attention. The great undeveloped wealth of the territory covered was advertised far and wide. The government was exceedingly liberal in granting land to individuals. Settlers from all parts of the nation flocked to the West and began to engage in farming, some of them well equipped by training and inclination to make good; many of them with no farming experience and lacking the proper temperament to become successful tillers of the soil. With the depression in the late '70s and early '80s when the agricultural prices were low, a large number who had gone to the farms, especially those of the younger generation, turned to the cities.

In addition, a little later the growth in industries attracted many more from the farms. While the dollars they acquired in a year, as wages in some factory or shop, possibly were greater than the income received from the cultivation of soil,

<sup>3</sup> "Western farmers blamed many of their troubles upon the railroads, . . ." says Prof. John D. Hicks, "The Populist Revolt," the University of Minnesota Press, 1931, page 60.

the cost of living was higher, and much of the independence inseparable from farm life was lost.

Just as those who would have made successful farmers left to take jobs in the cities, the ones in the cities who, because lacking in ambition, ability and energy, lost their places in the shops and factories, began to think of "going to the country." These latter turned their eyes toward the West where land was supposed to be cheap with the result that many of the farms were handled by those who, in the first place, knew nothing about farming and, in the second place, were not ready to put forth the energy necessary to make good.

By the time this latter element turned toward the West, the most desirable land had been taken. The real opportunities were gone. These city dwellers, being persons of little financial means, sought the cheap land—"dry farms"—in the western part of the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, eastern Colorado, Wyoming, etc. This is the land which the window-sill farmers, posing as experts in Washington, to-day call submarginal. As it takes a thorough machinist to rebuild a worn-out automobile, or a trained merchandiser to take over a run-down store and place it upon a paying basis, so it takes a real farmer and one who understands the handling of crops to make a success in this territory.<sup>4</sup>

Fully ninety out of a hundred who acquired "dry-farming" land, because it was cheap and in many places open to homesteading, failed. Failing, they began to look around for the alibi. Some charged the government with the blame for ever letting them go West. But since the government was far distant, they sought something nearer home. And there it was almost at their door—the railroads; a way was then found to connect the two. The government was to blame for giving the railroads so much land, and the railroads were to blame

<sup>4</sup> While it is true, as claimed by the "experts" in the Department of Agriculture, that many have failed on this so-called "submarginal" land, others have made a success of it, as any person knows who is intimately acquainted with the conditions in these sections.

for taking it, a fine combination to inspire the activities of agitators—and there were plenty of them.

The fact that the Congress had been equally as liberal with the citizens in the matter of land, was wholly overlooked. Under the various land laws one person could acquire 480 acres at a total cost of approximately \$240.<sup>5</sup> But the belief that the railroads were responsible for all their troubles was fixed in the minds of the people as a whole. Many of the agitators, busy among the farmers, saw an opportunity to make their efforts profitable. They began talking about “competing” railroads, such roads to be built by and remain in the hands and under the control of “the people,” to be financed, if you please, by the people and not by Wall Street or any government subsidy. In that way only could just rates be secured.

Railroads were projected in every direction, some of them starting no place and ending no place. Towns and counties voted bonds to help finance these wild-cat propositions. In many instances, farmers were induced to sign notes for stocks or bonds. The stocks or bonds, nicely engraved, would be delivered, the note discounted at some distant bank, but the road never built. For instance, “in Kansas alone during a single period of sixteen months, from July, 1885, to November, 1886, the total amount of municipal contributions to the railroads reached ten million dollars.”<sup>6</sup>

The failure of promoters to construct their projected railroads, the added taxes assessed against property covered by the bonds, the general hard times, and the inability of many on the farms even to make a living, naturally resulted in much discontent. The agitator was on hand to fan the smoldering spark into a flame. That flame was called the Populist movement which started in 1892 and collapsed with the defeat of William Jennings Bryan in 1896, and the return of

<sup>5</sup> “The Populist Revolt,” page 11.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, page 69.

prosperity evidenced to a marked degree, before the turn of the century.

The People's party, the members of which were known as Populists, was the outgrowth of the Farmers Alliance. This organization, which consisted of two wings, a southern and a northern, was formed much along the line of the old Grange. Its aim was to unite the farmers into a strong group for their mutual benefit and advantage. Its members belonged to the two old political parties from which, they held, would come whatever political assistance was needed.

The socialists' connection with the Populist movement up to the time the People's party was formed, consisted largely of intensifying, through agitation and propaganda, the feeling of discontent. They made it their special business, whenever and wherever possible, to secure some form of declaration or resolution favoring government ownership of railroads. In this way they laid the foundation for later extending the government ownership idea into the complete socialization of the wealth of the nation. But no sooner was this third party formed than they began their boring from within tactics.

In the 1894 national election the Chicago socialists "went along with the populists," under the direction of Thomas J. Morgan whom Nathan Fine terms "a leading borer from within."<sup>7</sup> This is the same Thomas J. Morgan who, the year before, had sought to commit the Federation of Labor to the socialist program and who vented his spite against Sam Gompers that year because Gompers had defeated his scheme.

When the People's party met in convention at St. Louis, July, 1896, and nominated Bryan as its candidate for President, the socialists sought control. "When it came to the nomination for president," writes Nathan Fine, "a group of socialists worked up some enthusiasm for Eugene Victor Debs. The 'machine' in control turned off the lights and adjourned

<sup>7</sup> "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States," page 181.

the meeting when the socialists became too active in their boring from within tactics." <sup>8</sup>

Not only had Debs stepped into the limelight in connection with the Populist movement, but Victor Berger, the leading socialist of the West was not far behind him. Mr. Fine says that Berger and "many of his fellow-socialists of Milwaukee threw in their lot with the People's Party." The writer continues, "The Milwaukee socialists were not the only ones who put their faith in boring from within the populist ranks." <sup>9</sup>

The socialists' connection with the movement is clearly traced by noting the nature of platform demands. Through the West, more particularly than in the East, the socialists had formed a large number of organizations presumably in the interest of the farmers or the wage-earners. Most of these had rather high sounding names although more or less local in character. The whole purpose of these organizations was to provide the proper window dressing for delegates in legitimate farmers' or wage-earners' groups. They managed to get themselves included in all calls for conferences or, if not included, appeared on the scene with delegates just the same. These delegates did not mention the word socialism. They presented the theory cleverly concealed and then offered one or more platform planks favoring some reformatory legislation "originally formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thoroughgoing lines." <sup>10</sup>

The Populist movement attracted to it a motley crowd. Some able and conscientious farmers joined the party although many did not. The merchants in the country towns, as a rule, affiliated as a matter of diplomacy. Orators, seeking a forum from which to display their ability, jumped on the band-wagon without delay. Two noticeable characters were thus annexed—Ignatius Donnelly of Minnesota and Lemuel H., better known as "Calamity," Weller, of Iowa. Both were

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, page 83.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, page 192.

<sup>10</sup> "Socialism Summed Up," page 86.

able men; Donnelly just missed being a genius. Neither of these men, however, openly espoused the doctrine of socialism. Indeed, except in certain labor unions, true Marxian socialism was carefully soft-pedaled because it would not have gone down with individualistic farmers. The Utopian socialism as expressed in Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward" had quite a hold. This book was generally touted by the socialistically inclined. "From this source," writes Prof. Hicks, "came many of the Populist arguments for government ownership."<sup>11</sup> Indeed, the Bellamyites, known as Nationalists, sought shelter under the tent of the Populist party. In 1889 the *Alliance*, an official organ of the farmers, "offered a copy of Bellamy's "Looking Backward" and a year's subscription to the paper for a dollar and a quarter."<sup>12</sup> Donnelly wrote a book along the same line called "Cæsar's Column" which gained standing with the socialists of the nation.

In the campaign of 1892 and again in the campaign of 1894, the Populists gained a number of Governors, Congressmen and Senators. Several state legislatures were controlled by them but it should be said to their credit that, save in a few instances, the men selected proved fairly conservative. Subversive socialism had made no impression on them. The party went to pieces on the silver issue. In 1896 it backed William Jennings Bryan, the Democratic candidate, but could not stomach his Democratic running-mate, Arthur Sewall of Maine, who was altogether too conservative, and so upon the People's ticket appeared the names Bryan and Watson—Tom Watson of Georgia.

While the predominant thought was silver, the socialists did not permit the delegates to overlook their favored public ownership planks. They were expressed in the platform in this language, "Transportation being a means of exchange and a public necessity, the government should own and operate the railroads in the interest of the people. The telegraph

<sup>11</sup> "The Populist Revolt," page 450.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, page 131.

and telephone . . . should be owned and operated by the government in the interest of the people." <sup>13</sup> During the campaign, however, these were largely overshadowed, except by the socialists, for the general cry was, "Give us silver for money," it being the almost universal belief of the people of the West and on to the Coast that, with the free and unlimited coinage of silver, all the ills of the nation would be corrected overnight, and there would be no need for the government to own and manage any private business.

But those who were so earnest in their advocacy of Bryan, and they were earnest in their efforts and honest in their beliefs, were doomed to disappointment. Bryan was snowed under. McKinley was elected. Within a year after his inauguration there was a noticeable improvement in business. The Populist party tenaciously held to life until 1904 when, like the Knights of Labor, since it could not be captured, it just naturally disappeared from the scene.

While the Populist movement was not inspired by socialists, the foundation was laid for a second so-called "farmers' movement," the Nonpartisan League (previously dealt with), some ten years after the demise of the People's party. This swept a number of states, inaugurating the system of "stealing" party nominations which resulted in the rape of the Democratic party in 1932.

Girard, Kansas, was selected as a western socialist headquarters. A weekly socialist paper known as *The Appeal to Reason* was established there. It soon claimed a circulation of 500,000. The printing house became a center for socialist documents of all kinds which began to flood the West. Most of this literature was couched in language which would appeal to the farmers. Any mention of the real intent and aim of the socialist movement was carefully avoided. Idealism and humanitarianism were stressed. Regardless of the nature of an evil affecting the farmer, he was told the government was the only agency that could correct the wrong. He was taught,

<sup>13</sup> "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States," page 78.

through socialist literature, to look to the government for aid when he was in difficulty. "The defences of the pioneer democrat began to shift from free land to legislation, from the ideal of individualism to the ideal of social control through regulation by law," wrote Dr. Turner.<sup>14</sup>

The shift of the farmers of the West from individualism to legislation evidenced to-day by the support given to certain New Deal laws, is unnatural. Those who lived in the West during the days of Populism, and the more recent days of Nonpartisan Leagueism, and who have given the subject some study, recognize the fact that this shift is due largely to socialist agitation and propaganda. This much is certain: the farmers in the agricultural sections of the East where the socialists have been unable to gain a foothold, still remain firm in their adherence to individualism, and still believe their salvation depends upon their own efforts, not upon governmental bounties.

The Populist movement received its death-blow with the defeat of William Jennings Bryan in 1896. Before the turn of the century the country had recovered from the shock of the panic of 1893, and the people, including the western farmers, returned to work and began to produce. A few would-be leaders clung to the shell of the organization for several years but, for want of sustenance, the People's party just naturally expired about 1908.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Cited in "The Populist Revolt," page 405.

<sup>15</sup> Much of the information in this Appendix is based upon personal recollections and experience of the writer although many authorities have been examined to confirm his statements. He was born west of the Mississippi river shortly after the War Between the States. In his younger days he came in personal contact with the city dwellers who sought, without experience or proper temperament, to become farmers. During the days of Populism, as a newspaperman, he covered many local and state conventions and meetings. In 1921 he made a trip covering much of the arid belt to get first hand information as to the cause of the discontent then being intensified, the basis for a series of magazine articles.



*Appendix "D"*

## THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THIS organization, devoted to what it termed "industrial unionism" was the outgrowth of the Western Federation of Miners which, under the leadership of Bill Haywood spread death, destruction and terror through the western mining camps in the '90s of the last century. The Western Federation of Miners was the left wing of the socialist movement. It had the moral support of the right wing, that is to say, members of the right depreciated all efforts on the part of the authorities to curb the bloodthirsty activities of the Federation.

The killing of Governor Steunenberg of Idaho by a half-wit, Harry Orchard, which crime was laid at the door of the Western Federation of Miners, destroyed that organization and left the force and violence group without a home. Then it was that they formed the Industrial Workers of the World, better known as the I.W.W.

"In the fall of 1904 six active workers in the revolutionary labor movement held a conference," writes Vincent St. John, a prominent revolutionist.<sup>1</sup> This group sent out an invitation to thirty-six additional individuals "active in the radical labor organizations and the socialist political movement," continues Mr. St. John, to attend a secret conference at Chicago, January 2, 1905. According to the same authority, only two of the thirty-six declined the invitation—Victor Berger and Max S. Hayes, both of whom were in charge of socialist political organs and held to the legislative action system to acquire control in the United States.

At this secret conference, thirty persons were present. They remained in session for three days working out a plan of

<sup>1</sup> "The I.W.W.—Its History, Structure and Methods," by Vincent St. John, I.W.W. Publishing Bureau, page 3.

organization. This resulted in a manifesto setting forth the proposal of the new "labor" organization, together with a call for an open convention. After presenting, in exceptionally vitriolic language, the fact that the workers were all "wage slaves" and that the remedy for their ills could not be found in craft unionism (The American Federation of Labor), the manifesto declared that to attain their ends—complete control of all industries—the organization to be formed "must consist of One Great Industrial Union embracing all industries," and that it should be "established as the economic organization of the working class, without affiliation with any political party."<sup>2</sup>

Not only were leading members of the left wing extended personal invitations to attend this convention, but the call was printed in the *International Socialist Review* for February, 1905. It is significant to note that those signing this call were all allied with the socialist movement and that a number of them were members of unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

The political power early "fell into the hands of the radical migratory faction allied with the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance, of which Daniel DeLeon of the Socialist Labor Party was the spokesman," writes James Oneal, whose simon-pure right-wing socialism cannot be questioned.<sup>3</sup>

DeLeon, as we have seen, was a pronounced Marxist. Of him David Karsner, writing in the New York *Herald Tribune*, says:

"DeLeon, because of his disciplined mind, his vast knowledge of Marx and political science, and his dictatorial manner, was the chief intellectual force in the founding of the I.W.W., and not Haywood." Mr. Karsner further says that "had the United States gone through a social upheaval in

<sup>2</sup> Official Proceedings of the First Annual Convention of the I.W.W., pages 5-6.

<sup>3</sup> "Current History," Magazine, January, 1925, page 531.

1905, when the I.W.W. was launched, DeLeon would have been the Lenin of America.”<sup>4</sup>

The I.W.W. proved a very effective left wing socialist movement from around 1910, when it had gained a membership of sufficient size to carry out some of its force and violence tactics, until after the World War. It worked largely west of the Mississippi river in the lumber and metal mining camps and agricultural sections, although it entered the shipping, textile and boot and shoe industries in the East. Strike after strike was called. Violence was general. “Storm troops” were massed at the points of attack and honest workmen viciously assaulted, mutilated and many killed. Lumber mills were wrecked and fires started in the heavily timbered areas of the Pacific Northwest.

Farmers who refused to bow to the dictates of the migratory bands of men who consolidated themselves in a division of the I.W.W., known as the Agricultural Workers Industrial Union, found their grain fields fired, their wheat stacks burned and their machinery wrecked. Men would accept employment and then deliberately put matches in a bundle of grain which, in many instances, ignited the straw and burned the threshing machines. In other instances, they put bolts and other pieces of iron in bundles of grain so that the machine would be wrecked. They moved in large bands, intimidating the smaller communities where the police protection consisted of a lone constable.

The I.W.W. was the first socialist organization in the United States to present a clear-cut philosophy of destruction, all preceding it having managed to camouflage the true nature of the doctrine they advanced. The philosophy, to a large extent, was that of syndicalism as practiced in France—that is, open and wanton destruction, sabotage, force and violence to destroy governments.

“The whole philosophy of the I.W.W. is expressed in its Preamble,” writes A. A. Hopkins. “The pamphlets and other

<sup>4</sup> August 22, 1926.

literature circulated by the Organization as propaganda, justify and explain and enlarge upon this philosophy, but do not affect it fundamentally." <sup>5</sup>

The final Preamble, wherein the philosophy of destruction is made clear, reads as follows:

"The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life.

"Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production, and abolish the wage system."

After elaborating many of Marx's fallacious premises, the Preamble concludes with this statement:

"Instead of the conservative motto, 'A fair day's wages for a fair day's work,' we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, 'Abolition of the wage system.'

"It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized, not only for the everyday struggle with the capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old." <sup>6</sup>

Walter B. Odale writes, "The ultimate goal of the I.W.W. is a 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat.' From their literature and speakers we learn that they propose to educate and organize all workers into a body of class-conscious men and women who are to abolish all private ownership of property and take over, by force, all means of production and distribution; to overthrow government as it is now constituted, and substitute therefor committees of industrial workers—to have the indus-

<sup>5</sup> "The Industrial Workers of the World—An Analytical Exposé."

<sup>6</sup> "The I.W.W.—Its History, Structure and Methods," Vincent St. John, pages 8-9.

trial Union serve as a means of the taking over of industry by the workers, and to function as a productive and distributive organ when capitalism shall have been overthrown. They propose, under their industrial administration, to disfranchise all non-workers. . . . The I.W.W. teaches that the world must be reformed by a leveling process. Instead of trying to advance, or permit the individual to advance, they are going to pull all civilization down to their own level.”<sup>7</sup>

One cannot resist the temptation to call attention to the fact that while the program of the present New Deal administration is not predicated on the tactics of force and violence, its methods being those of the right wing socialists, known as legislative action, the aim is the same—the leveling of humanity.

The tactics and methods of the I.W.W. were those of the left wing of the socialist movement. Vincent St. John says:

“As a revolutionary organization the Industrial Workers of the World aims to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ does not concern us.

“No terms made with an employer are final. . . . It aims where strikes are used, to paralyze all branches of the industry involved, when the employers can least afford a cessation of work—during the busy season and when there are rush orders to be filled. . . .

“In short, the I.W.W. advocates the use of militant ‘direct action’ tactics to the full extent of our power to make good.”<sup>8</sup>

William Z. Foster, prominent in the I.W.W. movement and now titular head of the Communist party in the United

<sup>7</sup> “The I.W.W.—Do You Want It?” page 10 of manuscript. Mr. Odale, a police officer of Portland, Oregon, disguised himself, became a member of the I.W.W. and from a position inside gained a vast amount of valuable information which he compiled in a 74-page typewritten form. Unfortunately this is not available to the public.

<sup>8</sup> “The I.W.W.—Its History, Structure and Methods,” pages 17 and 18.

States, about 1910 wrote a book in conjunction with Earl C. Ford, called "Syndicalism," a word used to cover the philosophy of destruction. On the matter of tactics, he writes:

"In his choice of weapons to fight his capitalist enemies, the Syndicalist is no more careful to select those that are 'fair,' 'just' or 'civilized' than is a householder attacked in the night by a burglar. He knows he is engaged in a life and death struggle . . . and considers his tactics only from the standpoint of their effectiveness. With him the end justifies the means. Whether his tactics be 'legal' and 'moral,' or not, does not concern him, so long as they are effective. He knows that the laws, as well as the current code of morals, are made by his mortal enemies. . . . He proposes to develop, regardless of capitalist conceptions of 'legality,' 'fairness,' 'right,' etc., a greater power than his capitalist enemies have; and then to wrest from them by force the industries they have stolen from him by force and duplicity, and to put an end forever to the wages system. He proposes to bring about the revolution by the general strike."<sup>9</sup>

After explaining in detail that the "general strike" is a pure revolutionary movement to cripple all industries and result in an open civil war, Foster admits that one of his left wing kind is "unscrupulous" in his choice of weapons to fight his everyday battles."<sup>10</sup> Further along the same line Mr. Foster says:

"He allows no considerations of 'legality,' 'religion,' 'patriotism,' 'honor,' 'duty,' etc., to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics. . . ."<sup>11</sup>

The legislative action element at first recognized the I.W.W. as part of the socialist movement, but later discovering that those of this left wing insisted upon assuming leadership of the unified army, the right wing repudiated any connection with them. Haywood, who had been taken into

<sup>9</sup> "Syndicalism," page 9.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, page 18.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, page 18.

the right wing camp by being made a member of the executive committee of the Socialist party, was deposed.<sup>12</sup> Debs, who had been active with the I.W.W. for some time, left it to become the presidential candidate of the Socialist party. He had said, however, in speaking of the I.W.W., "I concede that their theory is right."<sup>13</sup> Nathan Fine writes, "Vincent St. John, William D. Haywood, and hundreds of known and unknown members of the I.W.W. led some splendid battles for the organization and betterment of the workers. . . . They kept the red flag flying. . . ."<sup>14</sup>

And, indeed, they did keep the "red flag flying" until the communists came upon the scene when, with few exceptions, the leaders of the I.W.W. flocked to the new left wing socialist organization. Many of the disillusioned membership sought honest work wherever they could obtain it, trying to forget their excursion into socialism.

### *Appendix "E"*

#### SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM SAME THEORY

SOCIALISM and communism are names given to the theory that all human suffering, want, privation and inequality, are caused by the institution of private property which theory finds its root in the ancient philosophy of destruction, hence, by its very nature, is destructive. That which divides the followers of this theory into two factions or wings is the question of tactics to be employed to attain the common end—that common end being the abolition of the private property right.

The following confirmatory citations are from socialist sources:

<sup>12</sup> "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States," page 288.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, page 282.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, page 281.

" . . . there are two Socialist parties in the United States, aside from the Workers' (Communist) Party. . . . The Workers' Party, though Socialist in its philosophy and goal, is Communist in its tactics. . . ." (*What Is Socialism?*, Jessie Wallace Hughan, The Vanguard Press, 1928, page 161.)

"The foregoing analysis thus shows the existence of two distinct wings in the general socialist movement. Both wings have as their ideal some form of industrial democracy; both believe that the workers should use both political and industrial weapons to attain their ends. The left wing, or communist-socialist or communist group, as it calls itself, regards politics merely as a means of propaganda, scorns the immediate demands in the socialist platform, expects that the transition from capitalist to proletarian control will come as a result of industrial rather than of political action. . . ." (*Socialism in Thought and Action*, Harry W. Laidler, The Macmillan Co., 1927, pages 168-9.) Since this book was written in 1927 the communists have become more prominent on the political field and are urging "immediate demands."—Author.

"There is the sharp and bitter division between Socialists and Communists, principally on the important question of method and tactics." (*Why I Am a Socialist*, by Norman Thomas, The League for Industrial Democracy, 1930, page 7.)

" . . . Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were taking the leadership in organizing the modern Socialist movement in Europe by founding the First International which was organized in London in 1864. They had also founded the Communist League in 1847 as a secret society because of the general reaction of that period. They chose to call themselves Communists in order to distinguish themselves from a variety of sects and groups known as 'Socialists.' They sharply defined their views in the *Communist Manifesto* which became a classic statement of the Socialist view. . . ." (*American Communism*, James Oneal, The Rand Book Store, 1927, page 12.)

"Communism is the same as socialism, but better English." (Bernard Shaw, quoted in *London Spectator*, October 24, 1925.)

"Between complete socialism and communism there is no difference whatever in my mind. Communism is in fact the complement of socialism." (William Morris in *Fabian Tract No. 113*, page 11.)



"The ideal of us all, our ultimate aim, is communism." (*Collectivism and Industrial Evolution*, E. Vandervelde, Eng. trans., page 174.)

"That which is generally called socialism is termed by Marx the first or lower phase of communist society." (*The State and Revolution*, N. Lenin, Am. Trans., pages 100-105.)

"The mission of the Socialist Labor Party, the Socialist Party, and the Workers' (Communist) Party was and is still fundamentally the same as when they were first founded: to propagate and establish socialism. And this also was the mission of the individual and organized radicals who introduced and promulgated Marxian socialism for twenty years before the Socialist Labor Party was born in 1876." (*Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States*, Nathan Fine, Rand School of Social Science, 1928, page 88.)

One reading the extensive communist literature now being circulated in the United States will discover that many communist writers use the words socialism and communism as synonymous, although taking great care to denounce the organized socialists of the United States because of their system of legislative action to attain the common end. A few citations along this line will suffice to show the trend of the many:

"Socialism . . . is communism in course of construction; it is incomplete communism." (*The A B C of Communism*, Bukharin and Preobrazhensky, page 346.)

Lenin in his pamphlet, "The Soviets at Work," referring to the problem of thoroughly extinguishing the bourgeois class, says:

" . . . we can have no Socialism until it is solved."

He further states in the same document, that

" . . . a socialist revolution . . . is inconceivable without an internal war." (Several times in this document Lenin uses the word socialism as synonymous with communism, see *Lusk Report*, page 223.)

Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, who was named the unofficial communist ambassador to the United States, and deported by our government, when a witness before the Lusk Committee, in answer to a question regarding the revolutionists of Russia, said:

"Their wish is to change from the capitalist system to the Socialist system." (*Lusk Report*, Volume I, page 237.)

The communist group in Germany late in 1918 issued a manifesto in which is found this language:

"Socialism alone is in a position to complete the great work of permanent peace. . . . If representatives of the proletarians of all countries could but clasp hands under the banner of Socialism . . . peace would be concluded in a few hours. . . . Proletarians of all countries! We call upon you to complete the work of Socialist liberation. . . ." (*Lusk Report*, Volume I, pages 385, 386 and 387.)

In an address before the All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites (this appears to be the communists' New Deal), Stalin spoke for some time. In that address he uses the word "socialism" thirteen times in the first ten minutes of his talk to express the aims and purposes of the present government of Russia. (Speech reported in *Daily Worker*, November 23, 1935.)

The original name given to the government formed by the communists in Russia was "The Russian Socialists Federation of Soviet Russia." This was later changed and stands to-day as "United Socialist Soviet Republics."

In seeking authoritative evidence as to just what the Socialist party stands for, one naturally turns to the writings of Morris Hillquit who was an outstanding figure in international socialism. He was the author of a book entitled "From Marx to Lenin" (The Hanford Press, 1921). In that book he brands the government in Russia as a Socialist government in the following language:

"In Russia the revolution has been accomplished. In other countries it is yet to come. . . . In Russia the Socialists are in possession of the powers of government and their immediate political task is to maintain themselves in power. In the Western countries the bourgeoisie is in political control, and the immediate political task of the workers is to wrest the power from the hands of their opponents." (Page 129.)

"The Russian Revolution is beyond doubt the greatest event in the history of Socialism. . . ." (Page 139.)

"The Russian Revolution has suddenly ushered in a new era in the Socialist movement of the world—the era of direct efforts for the practical realization of the Socialist program. . . ." (Page 140.)

"To the masses of workers and non-workers Soviet Russia is and always will be a practical demonstration of Socialism at work, and the prototype of all Socialist governments. The successes of the Russian struggle will inspire and stimulate the Socialist movement of all countries." (Page 141.)

The following citations showing that socialism and communism are the same in so far as theory is concerned are from non-socialist sources:

"Economic weapons disregarded, the field was divided by the advocates of force and the advocates of political action." (*Socialism, A Critical Analysis*, Prof. O. D. Skelton, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1911, page 256.)

"In an earlier phase of the socialist movement there were distinctions of economic theory between the socialists and the communists. To-day the only differences between them are temperamental. The communist is a socialist in a violent hurry." (*The Economic Consequences of Socialism*, G. W. Gough, page 26.)

"The distinction is not between the economic ends, which are virtually identical, but between means" for communism "signifies the seizure of power by force or violent revolution, as distinguished from constitutional methods; and since such seizure can hardly be prepared for openly, it carries with it the idea of secret conspiracy." (*The Socialist Movement*, Arthur Shadwell, pages 95-6.)

"The difference, then, at the present moment between communism and what still calls itself socialism is almost wholly one of method and of pace. Socialism professes to be evolutionary, while communism is revolutionary; socialism constitutional and parliamentary, communism violent and sanguinary; socialism anxious to convert its opponents, communism bent on exterminating them; socialism aiming at democracy, communism contemplating dictatorship; socialism pacific, communism militant; socialism reformist, communism destructive; and so on, and so on." (*A Survey of Socialism*, F. J. C. Hearnshaw, Macmillan and Co., London, 1928, pages 91-92.)

"Marxian socialism, which in its higher powers becomes communism, has in it more of the definitely criminal than of the merely mad: it is, in the last analysis, not so much (like Fabianism) systematised insanity, as (like syndicalism) rationalised robbery. From what we have seen of Bolshevism in Russia, Spartacism in Germany, Red Revolution in Mexico and elsewhere, we know what to expect when Marxism secures control anywhere. We know that it means an upheaval of the criminal underworld, manifesting itself in an orgy of indiscriminate plunder, reckless arson, bestial debauchery, sanguinary massacre, and fiendish cruelty." (*Ibid.*, page 426.)

". . . one and the same labour leader frequently displays himself as a revolutionary communist on the occasion of a general strike, and a constitutional socialist on the occasion of a general election." (*Ibid.*, page 92.)

"Communism is merely an interchangeable term with socialism. The manifesto of Marx and Engels, of over 70 years ago, although it is written in the terms of communism, is the basis of the socialism of to-day." (Rome G. Brown, *Americanism versus Socialism*, Senate Document No. 260, 66th Congress, 2nd Session, 1920, page 6.)

"While no material difference of opinion existed between the so-called Left Wing elements and the party management as to the ultimate object of the Socialist movement and as to the probable necessity of employing other than parliamentary means to set up the co-operative commonwealth in this country, a very distinct difference of opinion arose over the question of immediate tactics." (*Revolutionary Radicalism*, Report of the Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities, State of New York, Vol. I, commonly known as the *Lusk Report*, page 676.)

"A study of their platforms and official pronouncements (socialist and communist) shows that they do not differ fundamentally in their objectives. These objectives are: the establishment of the co-operative commonwealth in place of the present form of government in the United States; the overthrow of what they are pleased to call the capitalist system, namely, the present system under which we live, and the substitution in its place of collective ownership, and the management of means of production and distribution by the working class.

"These organizations differ but slightly in the means advocated to bring about the social revolution. All are agreed that success can be obtained only through the destruction of the present trade union organizations of the working class, and by creating in their stead revolutionary industrial unions having the power (through industrial action involving the general strike and sabotage) to so cripple the government as to render it powerless to prevent the establishment of the co-operative commonwealth and the working-class rule." (*Ibid.*, page 8.)

### *Appendix "F"*

#### CITATIONS FROM SOCIALIST SOURCES OF INTEREST IN STUDY OF THE NEW DEAL

THE following citations from socialist sources are of special interest in connection with any careful analysis of the New Deal program of legislation:

". . . measures of social reform are, as a rule, originally formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thoroughgoing lines. They become the object of a persistent and widespread propaganda, and finally they acquire the force of popular demands. At this stage the 'progressive' and sometimes even the 'conservative' statesmen of the dominant political parties begin to realize the political significance of the proposed measures. The *Vox Populi* means votes on election day. . . ." (*Socialism Summed Up*, Morris Hillquit, 1913, page 86.)

" . . . we find six lines of legislation that must be pursued simultaneously in order to reach the goal." (*What Is Socialism?*, Jessie Wallace Hughan, 1928, page 103.)

"These demands show that the Socialist state is to be brought about automatically by economic forces, and deliberately by legislation of six general types. These six types, to be inaugurated simultaneously, are: first, the political, including proportional representation, direct election of President and Vice-President, and abolition of the law-determining power of the Supreme Court; second, measures to insure civil liberties, including the repeal of the Espionage Act and the prohibition of the injunction in labor disputes; third, the international demands, directed to the abolition of imperialism and of war; fourth, the financial, consisting of inheritance, income and other taxes bearing heavily upon super-fortunes; fifth, the industrial, embracing various forms of labor legislation, social insurance and pensions, freedom to strike, the minimum wage, and finally the guarantee of employment; and sixth, the collectivist, under which comes the gradual acquiring of the basic industries, beginning with the natural resources and the larger trusts." (*Ibid.*, page 114.)

"When to progressive taxation are added compensation acts, the short working day and week, freedom to strike and the minimum wage, capital is more and more likely to withdraw from these more fully perfected industries, resign them to the public which is already attempting to regulate them, and turn its activities into newer and less developed channels." (*Ibid.*, page 111.)

" . . . we may expect that the Socialist government, as soon as public opinion should render it practicable, would proceed to the deliberate, though gradual, extinction of the bond-holding class. This could easily be done through the progressive raising of the rate of inheritance and income taxes past the confiscation point, until in a generation or two all unearned income should be eliminated." (*Ibid.*, page 113.)

"The concrete and conscious efforts to pave the way for the introduction of a Socialist régime may be summarized under the following three main heads:

"1. The enactment of such social reforms as tend to facilitate the transition from capitalism to Socialism.

"2. The creation of a sympathetic public attitude towards the Socialist aim and program.

"3. The organization of a body of persons, sufficiently numerous, intelligent and trained to accomplish the practical task of social transformation." (*Socialism Summed Up*, by Morris Hillquit, 1913, page 80.)

"Public ownership does not necessarily mean government ownership, and government ownership does not imply centralized administration. In the practical application of the Socialist scheme of industrial organization, it is quite conceivable that certain industries would be operated by the national government. Railroad systems, telegraph and telephone lines are inherently national in their functions, and many other industries are already organized on a country-wide scale and adjusted to centralized operations." (*Ibid.*, page 30.)

"They"—the Socialists—"favor every real progressive measure, and work for such measures wherever and whenever an opportunity offers itself to them. But all the socialist reforms are consistent parts of their general program; *they all tend in one direction and serve one ultimate purpose*," i.e., socialism. (*Socialism In Theory and Practice*, Hillquit, 1917, page 212.)

"The aim of all socialist reforms, on the other hand, is to strengthen the working class economically and politically and to pave the way for the introduction of the socialist state. The effect of every true socialist reform must be to transfer some measure of power from the employing classes." (*Ibid.*, page 209.)

"The Socialist demand for government ownership of industries of a public or quasi-public nature, springs from different motives and contemplates a different system than the similar demands of other parties. The Socialists advocate government ownership primarily for the purpose of eliminating private profits from the operation of public utilities, and conferring the benefits of such industries on the employees and consumers. Their demand for national or municipal ownership of industries is always qualified by a provision for the democratic administration of such industries and for the application of the profits to the increase of the employees' wages and the improvement of the service. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that when the Socialist platform declares in favor of government ownership of certain industries, the Socialist Party at the same time nominates candidates for public office pledged to carry out these measures in the spirit of that platform. In other words, what the Socialists advocate is not

government ownership under purely capitalist administration, but collective ownership under a government controlled or at least strongly influenced by political representatives of the working class." (*Socialism Summed Up*, Morris Hillquit, 1913, pages 73-74.)

"Fabian Tract No. 127, 'To the socialist, taxation is the chief means by which he may recover from the propertied classes some portion of the plunder which their economic strength and social position have enabled them to extract from the workers. . . . To the socialist, the best of governments is that which spends the most.'" (Cited, *A Survey of Socialism*, Hearnshaw, 1928, page 306, footnote.)

"The next legislative series lies in the field of taxation. The tariff must go, as the bulwark of special privilege and fomentor of international jealousy. Heavy taxation of the speculative element in land values must partially take its place. Beginning immediately and continuing more drastically as public opinion demands it, must come the reform of the income and inheritance taxes, raising the taxable minimum to relieve the skilled and professional workers, and bearing more and more heavily upon the super-incomes until the triumph of socialism sees their complete extinction." (Jessie Wallace Hughan, speaking before a meeting of the League for Industrial Democracy, book form, *The Socialism of Our Times*, Vanguard Press, 1929, page 127.)

". . . that the weapon of taxation is at his disposal for this end." (Harold J. Laski, speaking before a meeting of the League for Industrial Democracy, book form, *The Socialism of Our Times*, Vanguard Press, pages 131 and 132.)

"*Taxation for Social Purposes*: Pressure for higher taxation on unearned and large incomes is vital; the amount so raised to be used as grants-in-aid for social purposes, e.g., education to the states. The idea of the grant-in-aid is fundamental to the idea of the national minimum; and this, in its turn, lies at the heart of socialism. The same thing applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to state taxation of income and inheritance." (*Ibid.*, page 132.)

"In the national field, socialists have forced through social legislation, the eight-hour day, safety and hygiene measures in the factories, workers' control, social insurance, etc. They have compelled the governments to obtain an increasing amount of their



total revenue from progressive income and inheritance taxes, in conformity with the slogan, 'to take the money from where it resides.' They have undermined the excessive power of the banks by such legislative measures as the creation of state and municipal banks." (Mr. Franz Longville, at a meeting of the League for Industrial Democracy, book form, *The Socialism of Our Times*, Vanguard Press, 1929, pages 148, 149.)

### Appendix "G"

#### CITATIONS IN RE SOCIALISM APPLICABLE TO NEW DEAL

THE following citations from well-known writers are especially applicable to New Deal policies. To make the connection perfectly clear, we have inserted in parentheses the term New Deal, New Dealism or New Dealists but it should be understood that where these terms appear they are no part of the original citation:

"The attraction of socialism (New Dealism) to the masses lies in its promise of the spoliation of the rich and the general division of their wealth." (*British Socialism*, Ellis Barker, 1908, page 471.)

"Socialism (New Dealism) wishes to destroy the upper classes simply to take their place and secure possession of their wealth." (*Psychology of Socialism*, Gustave LeBon, Eng. trans., 1899, page 333.)

Socialism (New Dealism) "is in its essence a raid of the *have nots* upon the *haves*, and its moving spirit is class hate and love of plunder." (*Democracy and Capital*, W. B. Faraday, 1921, page 236.)

"The main Socialist (New Deal) appeal is directed to men who are temperamentally envious of the good fortune of others, and who think that their shortest cut to prosperity is to transfer to themselves other people's property." (*Economic Liberty*, Harold Cox, 1920, page 18.)

"All forms of socialism (New Dealism) are based upon the same root idea—viz., that the capitalist and the private employer are *per se* exploiters and the natural enemies of the working class." (*The Industrial Dilemma*, P. Kerr, 1926, page 10.)

"Socialists (New Dealers) regard enterprise in the individual as a crime; self-reliance as a form of priggishness; and thrift as a piece of 'selfishness.'" (*The Conservative Mind*, H. Begbie, 1924, page 150.)

"The force which gives vitality to socialistic (New Deal) doctrine is the primitive instinct of predatory self-interest." (*Syndicalism and Labour*, A. Clay, 1911, page 212.)

Socialism (New Dealism) "is an appeal to natural appetites and passions . . . however lofty the motives of its promoters may be, it is actually an appeal to cupidity, envy, and hatred." (*The Communist Movement*, Arthur Shadwell, 1925, page 23.)

". . . any body of subversive dogma (New Dealism is such a dogma) which emphasises the claim of the lazy and inefficient many to live at the expense of the industrious and capable few" is folly. (*A Survey of Socialism*, F. J. C. Hearnshaw, 1928, page 107.)

"Socialism (New Dealism), indeed, is a disease which flourishes only in times of adversity and unrest. It perishes naturally in seasons of sanity and success. Its more determined and remorseless advocates, recognizing this fact, even go so far as artificially to foster misery, in order that they may extend its ravages and hasten the sanguinary revolution in which it is to culminate." (*Ibid.*, page 153.)

In connection with the above citation the following statement by Dr. William A. Wirt in referring to the New Dealers is of special interest:

"I was told that they believed that by thwarting our then evident recovery they would be able to prolong the country's destitution until they had demonstrated to the American people that the government must operate industry and commerce. I was told that of course commercial banks could not make long-time capital loans and that they would be able to destroy, by

propaganda, the other institutions that had been making our capital loans. They said:

"Then we can push Uncle Sam into the position where he must make these capital loans. And of course when Uncle Sam becomes our Financier he must also follow his money with control and management." (*America Must Lose*, pages 33-4.)

"However effective socialism (New Dealism) may be in seizing wealth produced by others, in expropriating landlords and capitalists, in confiscating, taxing, and levying; however successful it may be in dividing up existing property among its devotees and disciples; however fruitful it may be in the creation of a population of parasites and paupers dependent upon Joles—when it comes to the work of producing wealth; work that requires energy, intelligence, sacrifice of pleasure, co-operation and co-ordination of effort, punctuality, diligence, thrift; then socialism (New Dealism) breaks down." (*A Survey of Socialism*, F. J. C. Hearnshaw, 1928, page 327.)

"No political propaganda (propaganda of the New Deal) which leads men to covet can be approved; no legislation which leads men to look upon other people's property as a mine of wealth for themselves can be wholesome." (Marquess of Salisbury in the *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1925, cited in "A Survey of Socialism," page 396.)

"The success of socialist (New Deal) agitation depends not merely on the existence of serious industrial evils, but on the readiness of the masses of men to hearken to a gospel of discontent." (*Socialism, A Critical Analysis*, Prof. O. D. Skelton, 1911, page 16.)

The socialist (New Dealist) "has thrown the undivided blame for all the world's misery and failure on social institutions, on the tools men use, rather than on the limitations of the purely human men who use them." (*Ibid.*, page 41.)

The socialist (New Dealist) "cannot see the woods for the few decaying branches on the trees. His ear is attuned only to inharmonies. He sees the reeking fester of the slum, but is blind to the millions of homes in city and town and country where hard work brings forth its fruits of modest comfort and life is held well worth the living." (*Ibid.*, page 42.)

"This very vastness of the plan (New Dealism) stimulates the imagination and makes possibilities seem real to dreamers." (*Communism and Socialism*, Theodore D. Woolsey, Scribner's Sons, 1880, page 15.)

"Socialism (New Dealism) could not live and thrive without agitation. To foster and increase the agitation, the line between the operative and the employer must be widened and rendered more precise; the feeling of wrong must be intensified. The capitalist must be looked on as a thief." (*Ibid.*, page 152.)

". . . the socialist (New Dealist) is too pessimistic with respect to the present. He sees all of the starvation, misery, luxury, and extravagance, but he passes by the millions of comfortable homes scattered throughout the land. He does not see that the world is full of opportunity for the rising generation, that even if the chance for the ownership of a large independent business for the ordinary man is smaller, the things which he can enjoy, if he is of average intelligence and energy, are really much greater in amount and variety than ever before in the world's history. The socialist (New Dealist) underestimates the importance of *individual responsibility*. To-day a man is confronted by the stern necessity of making his own way, and this must have some good effect upon character." (*Outlines of Economics*, Prof. Richard T. Ely, Macmillan Co., 1924, pages 608-9.)

"By the selection only of what suits their (New Dealists') purpose, by the omission of all facts, however certain and relevant, which would contravene it, and by lavishness in exaggeration, the past and present of the labouring classes are so delineated as to embitter their feelings and pervert their judgments, while their future is portrayed in the colours of fancy best adapted to deepen the effect produced by the falsification of history and the misrepresentations of actuality. . . ." (*Socialism*, R. Flint, 1895, page 105.)

"Assertions the most untrue (New Deal methods), yet which are sure to be readily believed by many, and which cannot fail to produce discontent as widely as they are believed, are boldly and incessantly made in all ways and forms likely to gain for them acceptance. I refer to such assertions as these: that the labourers do all the work and are entitled to all the wealth of the world; that the only reason why they require to toil either long or hard is that they are plundered by privileged idlers to the extent

of a half or three-fourths of what is due for their services; that capitalists are their enemies; that mechanical inventions have been of little, if any, benefit to them; that they are as a class constantly growing poorer, while their employers are constantly growing richer. . . . Vast discontent may be produced by such procedure and teaching, but it can only be a most dangerous and destructive discontent. It is a false discontent, because founded on falsehood." (*Ibid.*, pages 105-6.)

## Appendix "H"

### SOCIALISM WOULD DESTROY RELIGION

WHILE the rabid socialists of the left wing type frankly admit that among the aims of the movement is the complete destruction of all religious faiths, the more discrete and diplomatic of the right wing try to conceal this fact with the statement that

"The Socialist movement is primarily an economic and political movement" and hence "is not concerned with the institutions of marriage or religion." (*Proceedings National Convention of the Socialist Party*, 1908, page 193.)

Regardless of this declaration the Socialist convention of 1912 officially declared that

"The ethics of socialism and religion are directly opposed to each other." (*Proceedings*, page 248.)

The Michigan socialists in 1919 took the position that

"A Socialist who understands the materialistic conception of history cannot have faith in superstition of any kind. In other words, a religious or Christian Socialist is a contradiction of terms and the statement that religion is a private matter (allusion to the 1908 plank) is a lie." (*Lusk Report*, Vol. I, page 1128.)

Robert Owen, who was not a socialist in the sense that philosophy is known to-day, but instead more of an idealist, declared that

"The religions of the world are horrid monsters and real demons of humanity which swallow up all its rationality and happiness." (*Life of Robert Owen*, by himself, page 207.)

Sargant quotes Owen as saying:

"The fundamental notions of every religion . . . have made man the most inconsistent and most miserable being in existence. By the errors of these systems he has been made a weak, imbecile animal. . . ." (*Life of Robert Owen*, by Sargant, page 129, Cited in "World Revolution," page 100.)

Ferri, in his "Socialism and Positive Religion," says:

"Socialism tends to substitute itself for religion. It knows that the absence of lessening of belief in God is one of the most powerful factors in existence." (Cited, *The Conspiracy Against Religion*, Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., London, England, page 4.)

Friedrich Engels, himself a "capitalist" who was the financial backer of Karl Marx, in the introduction to "Socialism, Utopian, and Scientific," wrote:

"Nowadays in our revolutionary conception of the Universe there is absolutely no room either for a Creator or a Ruler." (Cited, *Ibid.*, page 5.)

Liebknecht, a former leader of the German socialists, wrote:

"It is our duty as Socialists to root out the faith in God with all our might. Nor is anyone worthy of the name who does not consecrate himself to the spread of atheism." (Cited, *Ibid.*, page 5.)

W. Marr, an early Marxist, in his book on Secret Societies in Switzerland, said:

"We make war against all prevailing ideas, of religion, of the State, of country, of patriotism. The idea of God is the keystone of a perverted civilization. It must be destroyed. The true root of liberty, of equality, of culture, is Atheism." (Cited, *Contemporary Socialism*, John Rae, page 136.)

Bebel, an outstanding socialist authority, wrote:

"Christianity and Socialism stand towards each other as fire and water. Christianity is the enemy of liberty and civilization. It has kept mankind in slavery and oppression." (Cited, *The Conspiracy Against Religion*, Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., London, England, page 5.)

Bakunin, an early Russian bolshevist, said:

"We declare ourselves atheists. We seek the abolition of all religion and the abolition of marriage." (Cited, *Ibid.*, page 5.)

Dr. John Robison of Edinburgh, Scotland, who visited Bavaria when the Order of the Illuminati was active, secured much information on its program. In his "History of A Conspiracy," he said:

"Their first and immediate aim is to get the possession of riches, power, and influence, without industry; and to accomplish this they want to abolish Christianity. . . ." (Cited, *The French Revolution*, by Nesta H. Webster, page 496.)

Anacharsis Clootz, a Prussian, and a prominent member of the Order of the Illuminati, who went to France and aided in engineering the revolution the latter part of the Eighteenth century, and who paid for his subversive activities with his life, prided himself with being "the personal enemy of Jesus Christ." He said:

"Religion is a social disease which cannot be too quickly cured. A religious man is a depraved animal." (Cited, *World Revolution*, by Nesta H. Webster, page 100.)

Dealing with this attack upon religion, Mrs. Nesta H. Webster writes:

"Beginning with Weishaupt, continuing with Clootz, with Büchner and with Bakunin, hatred of religion, above all of Christianity, has characterised all the instigators of world revolution, since it is essential to their purpose that the doctrine of hatred should be substituted for the doctrine of love." (*The French Revolution*, page 496.)

Practically all well versed writers on socialism, both for and against, admit that harmonious relations between religion and socialism are impossible. Professor John Rae, presenting his exhaustive study in a book titled, "Contemporary Socialism," more than fifty years ago, stated that,

"Socialists . . . have discarded all belief in the possibility of effecting any social regeneration except by means of political authority. . . ."

and to attain this end

"attacks on religion, patriotism, the family, are very usual accessories of their practical agitations everywhere." (Pages 2 and 5.)

Prof. Arthur Shadwell says that,

"the vast majority of Socialists are definitely anti-Christian," adding, "there is obviously no room for any moral or spiritual element whatever in this (the Socialist's) view of life." (*The Socialist Movement*, Vol. II, pages 156-7.)

Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw, one of the ablest writers on the subject of socialism, says

"Socialism is a menace to religion . . . it is impossible for socialism to exist side by side with an organised church. . . . Whether rightly or wrongly, socialists regard religion as the natural ally and bulwark of the things that they hate, as, for example, of monarchy and private property. They look upon it as a reactionary force, conservative of the established order generally. Hence they condemn it to destruction as an inherent part of the capitalist system. . . ." (*A Survey of Socialism*, pages 383-4.)



Prof. O. D. Skelton calls attention to the fact that there is a close relationship between the opposition of the socialists to the private property right and their organized movement against religion. In their open averments he finds subterfuge. He says that

“the party officially protests neutrality, while the official publishing houses issue anti-religious pamphlets by the score.” (*Socialism, A Critical Analysis*, page 247.)

Since the evidence is overwhelming that the New Deal legislative program is based upon the doctrine of socialism which, in turn, is the old, old philosophy of destruction, the following citations are presented as of possible interest to those who wish to pursue this line of inquiry further:

“It is in history and religion and other controversial subjects that the actual instruction is positively harmful.” (*Principles of Social Reconstruction*, Bertrand Russell, chapter on Education, page 149.)

“The *Sozial Democrite*, May 25th, 1880, in an article entitled ‘Social Democracy and Christianity,’ blurted out the truth: ‘As a matter of simple fact, it must be candidly avowed, Christianity is the bitterest foe of Social Democracy. Just as so utterly dun-derheaded a religion as Christianity could only strike root at all two thousand years ago in a humanity that had completely degenerated, so ever since its efforts have always been directed, not, as one might suppose, to rid the world of misery and destitution, but rather to use them for its ends, and as a cloak for its other vices and enormities.

“‘When God is driven out of the brains of men, the whole system of privilege by the Grace of God comes to the ground. When heaven hereafter is recognized as a big lie, men will attempt to establish heaven here. Therefore, whoever assails Christianity, assails at the same time monarchy and capitalism.’” (*The Conspiracy Against Religion*, page 3.)

“The Manifesto of the International Congress, held at Geneva in 1868 (states): ‘God and Christ, these citizen-Providences, have been at all times the armour of Capital, and the most sanguinary

enemies of the working classes. It is owing to God and to Christ that we remain to this day in slavery. It is by deluding us with lying hopes, that the priests have caused us to accept all the sufferings of this earth.

"It is only after sweeping away all religion and after tearing up even to the roots every religious idea, Christian and every other whatsoever, that we can arrive at our political and social ideal. Let Jesus look after his heaven. We believe only in humanity. It would be but to fail in all our duties were we to cease, even for a second, to pursue the monsters who have tortured us. Down, then, with God and with Christ! Down with the despots of Heaven and Earth! Death to the Priests! Such is the motto of our grand crusade." (*Ibid.*, page 6.)

The communist, or left wing, faction of the socialist movement are perfectly frank in stating that they are out to destroy all religious faiths. It is their position that so long as the people accept a spiritual basis for their actions, they are not liable to make good revolutionists. Karl Kautsky's statement to that effect has been cited previously. Since, then, religion and especially Christianity, in so far as the United States at least is concerned, stands as a barrier to a successful revolution, it must be destroyed. Every effort has been made to eradicate it in Russia where communists are in full control of the government. A few citations from their authorized literature are illustrative of all upon this subject:

"Many weak-kneed communists reason as follows: 'Religion does not prevent my being a communist. I believe both in God and in communism. My faith in God does not hinder me from fighting for the cause of the proletarian revolution.' This train of thought is radically false. Religion and communism are incompatible, both theoretically and practically." (*The A B C of Communism*, page 256.)

"The same theory has demonstrated that the very idea of God and of supernatural powers arises at a definite stage in human history, and at another definite stage begins to disappear as a childish notion which finds no confirmation in practical life and in the struggle between man and nature." (*Ibid.*, pages 256 and 257.)

"In practice, no less than in theory, communism is incompatible with religious faith." (*Ibid.*, page 257.)

"A communist who rejects the commandments of religion and acts in accordance with the directions of the party, ceases to be one of the faithful. On the other hand, one who, while calling himself a communist, continues to cling to his religious faith, one who in the name of religious commandments infringes the prescriptions of the party, ceases thereby to be a communist." (*Ibid.*, page 257.)

"The struggle with religion has two sides, and every communist must distinguish clearly between them. On the one hand we have the struggle with the church, as a special organisation existing for religious propaganda, materially interested in the maintenance of popular ignorance and religious enslavement. On the other hand we have the struggle with the widely diffused and deeply ingrained prejudices of the majority of the working population." (*Ibid.*, pages 257 and 258.)

"For the communist, the church is a society of persons who are united by definite sources of income at the cost of the faithful, at the cost of their ignorance and lack of true culture." (*Ibid.*, page 258. See also *Ibid.*, pages 261-5.)

### *Appendix "I"*

## RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND AUTHORITY OF THE GOVERNMENT

THE following citations dealing with certain rights of the individual and the authority given the government by the individual citizen under the Constitution, have been kindly compiled by Charles Hall Davis, the eminent constitutional lawyer of Petersburg, Virginia:

### *The Inherent and Unalienable Rights of Man:*

"All men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into

a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity." (*Virginia Bill of Rights, Section 1.*)

*The Purpose of Government, the Source of Its Powers, and the Rights of Its Creators:*

"All men . . . are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, . . . to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . . . Whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." (*Declaration of Independence.*)

*The Unalienable Sovereignty of the People:*

"In our system, while sovereign powers are delegated (to) the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom, and for whom, all government exists and acts." (*The Supreme Court of the United States in Yick Wo. v. Hopkins, 118 U. S., 369-370.*)

"All power is vested in, and consequently derived from the people; magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them." (*Virginia Bill of Rights, Section 2.*)

"The supreme power resides in the people, and they never part with it." (*James Wilson in the Pennsylvania Ratifying Convention.*)

*The Establishment of Fundamental Principles of the Basis of Just Government. Their Controlling Effect:*

"There are certain vital principles in our free Republican governments, which will determine and overrule an apparent and flagrant abuse of legislative power." (*Supreme Court in Calder v. Bull, 3 Dall. 387.*)

"The government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men. . . . The people have an original right to establish, for their future government, such principles, as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness. . . . The principles . . . so established, are deemed fundamental. . . . To what purposes

are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed in writing, if these limits may, at any time be passed by those intended to be restrained? The distinction between a government with limited and unlimited powers is abolished, if those limits do not confine the persons on whom they are imposed." (*Chief Justice Marshall in Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch, 137 at 163, 176.)

*Special Privilege Prohibited:*

"No man, or set of men, is entitled to exclusive or separate emoluments or privileges from the community, but in consideration of public services." (*Virginia Bill of Rights, Section 4.*)

*Nature of a Written Constitution:*

"A written Constitution is, in every case, a limitation upon the powers of government, in the hands of agents." (*State v. County Court*, 60 West Va., 339, 345, 55 S.E., 382, quoting from *Hamilton v. County Court*, 15 Mo. 5, 13.)

*Necessity for a Written Constitution:*

"In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution." (*Thomas Jefferson.*)

*Inviolability of The Constitution. To Suspend Any of Its Provisions in Times of Exigency Leads to Anarchy and Despotism:*

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism. . . . The theory of necessity on which it is based is false." (*Supreme Court in ex parte Milligan*, 4 Wall. 1.)

*The Inherent Right of the People to Change The Constitution:*

"As the people are the only legitimate fountain of power . . . it seems strictly consonant with the Republican theory to

recur to the same original authority . . . whenever it may be necessary to enlarge, diminish, or new-model the powers of government." (*James Madison in Federalist 48.*)

"The people may change the Constitution whenever, and however, they please. This is a right of which no positive institution can ever deprive them." (*James Wilson in the Pennsylvania Ratifying Convention.*)

"Whenever any government shall be found inadequate or contrary to these purposes (i.e. "the common benefit, protection and security of the people, nation or community"), a majority of the community hath an indubitable, inalienable and indefeasible right to reform, alter or abolish it." (*Virginia Bill of Rights, Section 3.*)

#### *Congress Cannot Change The Constitution:*

"The Congress . . . cannot by legislation alter the Constitution." (*Supreme Court in Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 206.*)

#### *The American Plan of Limitations on Government:*

"In the compound Republic of America, the power surrendered by the people is first divided between two distinct governments, and then the portion allotted to each subdivided between distinct and separate departments. Hence a double security arises to the rights of the people. The different governments will control each other, at the same time that each will be controlled by itself." (*Alexander Hamilton, in Federalist 50.*)

#### *Constitutional Limitations on Our National Government:*

"The Government of the United States is one of delegated powers alone. Its authority is defined and limited by the Constitution. All powers not granted to it by that instrument are reserved to the states or the people." (*Supreme Court in U.S. v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542.*)

#### *Government in America is an Agent:*

"Government is an agent, and, within the sphere of the agency, a perfect representative, but outside of that is a lawless usurpation. The Constitution . . . is the limit of the authority of . . . Government." (*Supreme Court in Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270.*)

*The Supreme Court's Definition of the Meaning of "The Pursuit of Happiness," as Used in the Declaration of Independence:*

"The right to pursue any lawful business or vocation, in any manner not inconsistent with the rights of others, which may increase their prosperity or develop their faculties, so as to give them the highest enjoyment." (*Slaughter House Cases*, 111 U. S. 746.)

*Source of Federal Powers:*

"The powers of the general government are made up of concessions from the several states; whatever is not expressly given to the former, the latter expressly reserve." (*Supreme Court in U. S. v. Hudson and Goodwyn*, 7 Cranch 32, 33.)

*How The Constitution Was Established:*

"The Constitution was established by the ratification of the people of the several states, in separate conventions of representatives, whom they elected in the respective counties." (*From statement of Justice Baldwin on "Origin and Nature of the Constitution and Government of the United States."* 11 Peters, Appendix, 9 L. Ed. 902.)

*Powers of the Federal Government:*

"It (the United States Government) can neither grant nor secure to its citizens any right or privilege not expressly or by implication placed under its jurisdiction." (*Supreme Court in U. S. v. Cruikshank*, 92 U. S. 542.)

"The Government of the United States . . . can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution." (*Supreme Court in Buffington v. Day*, 11 Wall. 113.)

*Necessity of Preserving States Rights:*

"The preservation of the states, and the maintenance of their governments are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the national government. The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States." (*Supreme Court in Texas v. White*, 7 Wall. 700; decided in 1869; *Opinion by Chief Justice Chase who was Secretary of the Treasury in Lincoln's Cabinet.*)

"The States *disunited* might continue to exist. Without the states in Union there could be no such political body as the United States." (*Supreme Court in Lane Co. v. Oregon*, 7 Wall. 7.)

"The people of the several States are absolutely and unconditionally sovereign within their respective territories. . . . It can never be maintained in any tribunal in this country that the people of a State, in the exercise of the powers of sovereignty, can be restrained within narrower limits than those fixed by the Constitution of the United States." (*Supreme Court in Ohio Life Ins. & Tr. Co. v. Debolt*, 16 Howard, 428-9.)

"With us the authority of the States was not conferred, but retained. . . . The States continue as reservoirs of power reserved, not conferred. . . . Encroachments upon State authority, however contrived, should be resisted with the same intelligent determination as that which demands that the national authority should be fully exercised to meet national needs." (*Chief Justice Hughes in Address before American Bar Association in August, 1930—American Bar Association Journal for October, 1930*, pp. 627-8.)

#### *Nature and Scope of the Federal Bill of Rights:*

"In almost every convention by which the Constitution was adopted, amendments to guard against the abuse of power were recommended. These amendments demanded security against the apprehended encroachments of the general government." (*Chief Justice Marshall in Barron v. Baltimore*, 7 Pet. 250.)

"Long before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, certain principles affecting the life and liberty of the subject had become firmly established . . . that were deemed vital to the safety of freemen."

"The original amendments had their origin . . . in the belief of many patriotic statesmen . . . that, under the Constitution, . . . the national government might disregard the fundamental principles of Anglo-American liberty."

"The amendments introduced no principle not already familiar to liberty-loving people. They only put in the form



of constitutional sanction, as barriers against oppression, the principles which the people of the colonies, with entire unanimity, deemed vital to their safety and freedom." (*Supreme Court in Twining v. New Jersey*, 211 U.S. 79.)

"They are purely restrictions upon federal power, intended to prevent interference with the rights of the States, and of their citizens." (*Supreme Court in Fox v. Ohio*, 5 How. 434.)

"The ten amendments first engrafted upon the Constitution had their origin in the apprehension that, in the investment of powers made by that instrument in the Federal government, the safety of the states and their citizens had not been sufficiently guarded." (*Supreme Court in Withers v. Buckley*, 20 How. 84.)

#### *Separation of Legislative, Executive and Judicial Functions:*

"When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty. . . . There would be an end of everything were the same man, or the same body, . . . to exercise these three powers,—that of enacting Laws, that of executing the public resolutions, and of trying the causes of individuals." (*Montesquieu, Spirit of Laws, Bk. 2, Chap. 6 quoted with approval in Western Union Telegraph Company v. Wyatt*, 98 Fed. 348.)

"The legislative, executive and judicial departments of the State should be separate and distinct." (*Virginia Bill of Rights, Sec. 5.*)

#### *Jefferson's Definition of Despotic Government:*

"The concentration of these (i.e. the legislative, executive and judiciary powers of government) in the same hands is precisely the definition of despotic government." (*Jefferson in his "Notes on The State of Virginia."*)

#### *Congress Cannot Delegate Its Legislative Power:*

"A delegated authority cannot be re-delegated." (*Legal Maxim.*)

"Congress cannot delegate legislative authority to the President." (*Supreme Court in Field v. Clark*, 143 U.S., 649, 36 L. Ed. 310.)

"That no part of this legislative power can be delegated by Congress to any other department of the Government . . . is an axiom in Constitutional law, and is . . . a principle essential to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution." (*Id.*—36 L. Ed. 311.)

*Danger of Unlimited Power Over the National Income:*

"We are told the sword and purse are necessary for the national defense. The junction of these *without limitation* in the same hands, is by logical and mathematical conclusions, the description of despotism." (*Patrick Henry in the Virginia Ratifying Convention.*)

*Unjust Taxation Is Robbery:*

"To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation." (*Supreme Court in Loan Association v. Topeka*, 20 Wall. 655.)

*Lincoln's Remedy for a Betrayal of a Governmental Trust:*

"The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and Courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution." (*Abraham Lincoln.*)

# INDEX

(For General Topics Refer to Table of Contents)

- A B C of Communism, 171  
 Adams, Alva B., Senator, 102  
 Advisory Council of the Committee  
 on Coal and Giant Power, 18  
 Altgeld, Gov., 38  
 American Civil Liberties Union, 81  
 American Federation of Labor, 34,  
 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 68, 83, 89, 130,  
 147  
 American Railway Union, 38  
 American Teachers' Union, 51  
 Amsterdam International of Trade  
 Unions, 133, 135  
 Anderson, Mary, 21  
 "Appeal to Reason", The, 57, 144  
 Arbitrator, The, 53
- Bacon, Jerry, 82  
 Bailey, Josiah W., Senator, 102  
 Barker, Ellis, 162  
 Begbie, H., 163  
 Bela Kun, 73  
 Bellamy, Edward, 25, 143  
 Bellikopf, Jacob, 98  
 Benn, Sir Ernest, 119  
 Berger, Victor, 142, 146  
 Berle, A. A., jr., 19  
 Besant, Mrs. Annie, 43  
 Borah, Wm. E., 97  
 Borders, Karl, Prof., 20  
 Boring from within, 31, 34, 35, 39,  
 56, 59, 66, 88, 134, 141, 142  
 Bowen, A. E., 58  
 Brain Trust, 46, 70, 98, 100, 112,  
 114, 116  
 Brookhart, Smith W., 22  
 Brooks, Charles L., Rev., 121  
 Broun, Heywood, 20  
 Brown, Rome G., 92, 157  
 Bryan, William J., 140, 143, 145  
 Bucharin, Nicholas, 69, 75  
 Bureaucratic government, 9, 10, 117  
 Byrd, Harry F., Senator, 102, 107
- "Cæsar's Column", 25, 143  
 Carter, Wm., Rev., 121
- Christensen, Parley P., 84  
 Cigarmakers' Union, 33, 34  
 Class Struggle, 43, 75, 127, 136  
 Clay, A., 163  
 Cleveland, Grover, 38  
 Clum, Woodworth, 81  
 Coates, David C., 62  
 Collins, Peter, 92  
 Copeland, Royal S., Senator, 101  
 Costigan, Ed. P., Senator, 21  
 Cox, Harold, 162  
 Coyle, David C., 108  
 "Committee of 48", 82, 83, 89  
 Communism, 9, 23, 26, 72, 152, 154  
 Communist International, 75, 76, 77,  
 78  
 Communist Manifesto, 26, 68, 74  
 Communist party, 68, 80, 118, 131, 150  
 Communists, 43, 51, 52, 67, 133  
 Conference for Progressive Political  
 Action, 87, 89, 90, 91, 94, 95  
 Cutting, Bronson, Senator, 21
- "Daily Leader", 63  
 "Daily Worker", 74  
 Darrow, Clarence, 46  
 Davis, Charles Hall, 114  
 Davis, John W., 21  
 Debs, Eugene V., 38, 89, 141, 152  
 DeLeon, Daniel, 37, 147  
 Democratic party, 4, 8, 16, 30, 47,  
 60, 61, 65, 84, 88, 90, 92, 101,  
 124, 128, 144  
 Dickinson, L. J., 50  
 Donnelly, Ignatius, 25, 142  
 Dorman, D. C., 62  
 Douglas, Paul H., 20  
 Duncan, Ralph E., 48  
 Durocher, Leon, 57
- Ely, Richard T., Prof., 32, 165  
 Engels, Friedrich, 27, 153, 167
- Fabian, 43, 44, 45, 46, 80, 91, 93,  
 98, 99, 110  
 "Facts and Figures", 64

- Farmer-Labor party, 84, 89  
 Federal Power Commission, 17  
 Fine, Nathan, 29, 34, 80, 84, 85, 88,  
 141, 142, 152, 154  
 Fitzpatrick, John, 83  
 Flint, R., 165  
 Force and violence, 26, 33, 35, 39,  
 43, 62, 69, 71, 73, 77, 85, 128,  
 149  
 Foster, William Z., 71, 86, 150  
 Frankfurter, Felix, Prof., 98, 100  
 Franklin, J. A., 20, 87  
 Frazier, Lynn, Senator, 89  
 Frederick, J. George, 24, 111  
 French Revolution, 26
- Gaston, Herbert E., 22, 63  
 Gilbert, Joseph, 62  
 Glass, Carter, Senator, 102  
 Gompers, Samuel, 35, 38, 141  
 Gooding, Frank, 59  
 Gough, G. W., 156  
 Greenback party, 32  
 Guffey-Lewis Coal Bill, 109
- Hale, Nathan, 118  
 Hamilton, W. H., Prof., 49  
 "Hand Out", 53  
 Harriman Hosiery Mills, 114 (foot-  
 note)  
 Harvey, Rowland Hill, 28, 33, 35,  
 37  
 Hayes, Max S., 83, 84, 146  
 Haymarket Square, 36  
 Haywood, William D., 42, 146, 151  
 Hearnshaw, F. J. C., Prof., 27, 44, 45,  
 46, 93, 104, 157, 161, 163, 164,  
 169  
 Hicks, John D., Prof., 143  
 Hillman, Sidney, 20, 87  
 Hillquit, Morris, 8, 39, 49, 60, 116,  
 155, 158, 160, 161  
 Hoover, Herbert, 93, 99  
 Hopkins, A. A., 148  
 Hopkins, Harry L., 22  
 Hopkins, J. A. H., 82, 83  
 Howe, Frederick C., 20, 87  
 Hughan, Jessie Wallace, 29, 41, 110,  
 153, 159, 161  
 Human traits, 25  
 Hunt, H. T., 20  
 Hurlin, Ralph, 98  
 Hutchins, Robt. M., 51
- Ickes, Harold L., 21, 97  
 Illuminati, Order of the, 25, 168  
 "Industrial Democracy", 65  
 Industrial Unionism, 146  
 Industrial Workers of the World, 42,  
 43, 54, 62, 63, 68, 72, 82, 146  
 Intelligentsia, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86,  
 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 100  
 Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 46,  
 48, 54, 81  
 International Machinists' Union, 37,  
 94  
 International Socialist Society, 46  
 International Workingmen's Assn., 33  
 Israel, Ed. L., Rabbi, 98
- Johnson, Hugh S., Gen., 16, 100, 117  
 Johnston, Wm., 86, 94
- Karolyi, 75  
 Karsner, David, 147  
 Kautsky, Karl, 171  
 Kerensky, 73  
 Kerr, P., 163  
 King, Wm. H., Senator, 102  
 Knights of Columbus, 92  
 Knights of Labor, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38,  
 144  
 Kusinen, O. W., 75
- Labor party, 83, 84  
 Labor & Socialist International, 133,  
 135  
 LaFollette, Phillip, 96  
 LaFollette, Robert M. (the late), 17,  
 83, 88, 89, 90, 91, 94, 96, 97, 132  
 LaFollette, Robert M., Jr., 20  
 LaGuardia, Fiorello, 19, 89  
 Laidler, Harry W., 46, 47, 49, 153  
 Lapp, John A., Prof., 20  
 Laski, Harold J., Prof., 110, 161  
 Laurrell, Ferdinand, 35  
 League for Industrial Democracy, 18,  
 47, 93, 153  
 LeBon, Gustave, 162  
 Legislative action, 4, 30, 38, 39, 44,  
 60, 61, 63, 68, 73, 74, 75, 76, 85,  
 94, 99, 128, 132, 136  
 Leiserson, William M., 20  
 Lenin, N., 75, 81, 102, 154  
 LeSueur, Arthur, 59, 62  
 Lilienthal, David E., 22  
 London, Jack, 46  
 Longville, Franz, 162

- "Looking Backward", 25  
 Lubin, Isador, 21, 98  
 Lusk Report, 154, 155, 157
- MacDonald, Duncan, 83  
 McCormick Harvester Co., 36  
 McCormick, Robt. R., 115 (footnote)  
 McGrady, Edward F., 20  
 McGuire, Peter J., 33, 35  
 McKaig, Ray, 59  
 Machen, J. Gresham, Prof., 121  
 Manly, Basil M., 17  
 Marr, W., 167  
 Martens, Ludwig, C.A.K., 155  
 Marvin, Fred R., 53  
 Marx, Karl, 18, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33,  
 37, 44, 48, 66, 74, 102, 110, 125,  
 143, 149  
 May, Andrew J., Congressman, 101  
 Meier, Julius, 96  
 Michael, George, 53  
 Moley, Raymond, 16, 98  
 More, Sir Thomas, 25  
 Morgan, Arthur E., 22  
 Morgan, Thomas J., 37, 141  
 Morgenthau, Henry, jr., 22, 64  
 Morris, Wm., 153  
 Moscow, 52, 71, 73  
 Murphy, Frank, 21, 97
- National Conference for Progressive  
 Political Action, 17  
 National Republic, The, 51, 72  
 Negro, 52  
 New Deal (New Dealism), 3, 4, 7,  
 8, 9, 16, 18, 22, 24, 27, 30, 42, 46,  
 49, 53, 61, 64, 66, 76, 88, 97, 98,  
 103, 104, 112, 119, 121, 127, 131,  
 137, 158  
 Nockels, Edward N., 83  
 Nonpartisan League, 54, 55, 56, 57,  
 61, 62, 64, 65, 81, 82, 85, 86, 95,  
 96, 144  
 Norris, George W., Senator, 21, 97  
 North Dakota, 56, 58, 59, 95  
 "Novy Mir", 69
- Odale, Walter B., 149  
 Olson, Floyd, 96  
 ONeal, James, 147, 153  
 Owen, Robert, 167
- Palda, L. J., Judge, 59, 62  
 People's Legislative Service, 17
- People's party, 39, 59, 141, 144  
 Perkins, Frances, 98  
 Philosophy, destructive, 3, 21, 22, 24,  
 59, 62, 65, 66, 71, 73, 74, 85, 89,  
 102, 104, 125, 148, 152  
 Pinchot, Gifford, Gov., 96  
 Podmore, Frank, 43  
 Populist movement, 55, 137, 142  
 Private property right, 2, 3, 9, 19,  
 22, 25, 34, 44, 50, 71, 107, 133,  
 135, 148, 152  
 Progressive party, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21,  
 22, 23, 82  
 Pullman Palace Car Co., 38
- Radek, K., 75  
 Radio Commission, 115  
 Rae, John, Prof., 105, 129, 168  
 Raushenbush, H. S., 50  
 Red International of Trade Unions,  
 134  
 "Red Network, The", 53  
 Reed, John, 81  
 Reinstein, Boris, 81  
 Rempfer, William C., 65, 66  
 Republican party, 4, 30, 60, 61, 84,  
 88, 90, 123, 128  
 Richberg, Donald, 16, 18  
 Ridder, Victor, 117  
 Robison, John, Dr., 168  
 Roche, Josephine, 22  
 Roosevelt, F. D., 1, 2, 21, 22, 64, 93,  
 96, 98, 99, 100, 111  
 Roper, Daniel C., 21, 97  
 Russell, Charles Edward, 57, 63  
 Russia, 68, 69, 73, 80, 81, 115, 135  
 Russian Socialist Federation, 69  
 Ruthenberg, C. E., 71
- Schneiderman, Rose, 20  
 Second International, 43  
 Senate Munitions Committee, 50  
 Shadwell, Arthur, Prof., 156, 163,  
 169  
 Shaw, Bernard, 153  
 Shipstead, Henrik, Senator, 89  
 Skelton, O. D., Prof., 29, 116, 156,  
 164, 170  
 Smertenka, John, Prof., 82  
 Smith, Alfred E., 102  
 Social Welfare, 130  
 Socialism, 8, 23, 27, 29, 39, 46, 47,  
 48, 49, 51, 57, 58, 59, 60, 64, 70,  
 131, 136, 152, 153, 154, 158, 159

- Socialist, socialists, 23, 32, 33, 34, 35,  
 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48,  
 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58,  
 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 69,  
 73, 74, 75, 77, 84, 85, 86, 87, 91,  
 92, 96, 98, 102, 109, 110, 111,  
 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134,  
 135, 136, 141, 144, 146, 151, 171  
 Socialist Labor party, 34, 37, 68, 132,  
 136, 152  
 Socialist party, 8, 34, 38, 40, 41, 42,  
 43, 54, 58, 63, 64, 65, 68, 70, 71,  
 83, 89, 116, 131, 136, 152, 154  
 Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance,  
 147  
 "Solidarity", 62  
 Stalin, J., 155  
 "Stealing" parties, 32, 59, 60, 61, 66,  
 78, 86, 87, 90, 91, 93, 95  
 Steele, David M., Rev., 120  
 Stephens, Uriah A., 33, 35  
 Steunenberg, Frank, Gov., 146  
 St. John, Vincent, 146, 149, 150  
 Stone, N. I., 37  
 Strasser, Adolph, 33, 35  
 Sweet, William E., 20  
  
 Tennessee Valley Authority, 18  
 Third (Communist) International, 72,  
 74, 133, 135  
 Thomas, Norman, 98, 153  
 Townley, Arthur C., 57, 58, 59, 62,  
 63  
  
 Trotsky, Leon, 69  
 Tugwell, Rexford G., 19  
 Tydings, Millard E., Senator, 102  
  
 "Underground with the Reds", 53  
 United Farmers' National Bloc, 86  
 "Utopia", 25  
  
 Vandervelde, E., 154  
 Veterans of Foreign Wars, 73  
  
 Wagner Labor Law, 107  
 Wald, Lillian, 98  
 Walker, Guy Morrison, 106  
 Wallace, Henry A., 22, 101, 113  
 Walsh, Frank P., 19  
 Ware, Norman J., 28, 29, 32  
 Warren, Charles, 104 (footnote)  
 Watkins, Mrs. Amanda, 112  
 Webster, Mrs. Nesta H., 112, 168  
 Western Federation of Miners, 42,  
 146  
 Wheeler, Burton K., Senator, 17, 21,  
 90, 96  
 Williams, Albert Rhys, 81  
 Wirt, Wm. A., Dr., 163  
 Wolman, Abel, 22  
 Wolman, Leo, 20, 22, 97  
 Woolsey, Theodore D., 165  
 Workers' (Communist) party, 72, 136  
 Workingmen's party, 33  
  
 Young, Gates E. M., 64