
THE NEW DEAL GOOSE STEP

By
CARL H. MOTE

1939

DANIEL RYERSON, INC.
155 EAST 39TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

**COPYRIGHT, 1939, BY
DANIEL RYERSON, INC.**

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Preface

THE PREPARATION of this manuscript was inspired by an increasing similarity between the methods and objectives of the New Deal, as they could be assembled into a completed pattern from the public utterances and undertakings of the new bureaucracy, and the program devised by Marx, Engels, Lenin and their lesser disciples to accomplish world "revolution." That some of the final objectives of Mr. Roosevelt and his confederates have to be inferred, in the absence of candid admissions, is no less convincing than categorical evidence since the inferences are inescapable. But there is also an abundance of categorical evidence to prove conclusively the New Deal purpose to attain a socialized state and the abolition of the private ownership of property.

Since the country has made some progress in catching up with Mr. Roosevelt's past, he has learned to sneer in fits of emotional heat. When his attention was called to the activity of certain women to purge the paupers from the ballot, he Hyde-Parked¹ to the correspondents his antipathy for outmoded standards of freedom in Virginia which collects a poll tax from voters. His sudden heat subsided when Senator Glass turned the hose on him. Senator Glass pointed out that the poll tax has no important bearing on voting in Virginia since only half those who pay the poll tax actually go to the polls.

The shibboleth of Mr. Roosevelt is "Democracy." The shibboleth of Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, and most of the political pedagogues is "more Democracy." The shibboleth of *The New Republic*, *The Nation*, all the "Liberals," Progress-

¹ The author salutes the *Chicago Tribune*.

sives and Labor racketeers is "Democracy." The shibboleth of John L. Lewis and the C.I.O. is "Democracy." Referring to "Judaism," Rabbi Louis I. Newman asserts² "Democracy furnishes its most congenial environment." Curiously enough, the shibboleth of enrolled Communists and their "fellow travelers" is also "Democracy." Lenin was an ardent advocate of more "Democracy."³ There is such a unanimity in this choice of a shibboleth that the unanimity can hardly be dismissed as a coincidence. Lewis journeyed to Mexico City in September, 1938, to proclaim the virtue of "Democracy," attack Fascism and fraternize with a labor group that is wholly Communist.

In the introduction to Nietzsche's "Antichrist,"⁴ H. L. Mencken, who translated it, asserts that Nietzsche saw clearly a generation ago that what is called Bolshevism (i.e. Socialism and Communism) is only "democracy in another aspect," a variation of "the endless struggle of quantity against quality, of the weak and timorous against the strong and enterprising, of the botched against the fit."

New Deal reverses in the 1938 elections, however, may tend to chill the enthusiasm of the Left Wing for "Democracy" and before he finishes his term Mr. Roosevelt himself may be arguing that suffrage be limited strictly to members of his bureaucracy, the WPA and the relief contingent.

It is not difficult to determine the sympathies of one who pretends that the disclosures of the Dies Committee create prejudice against peace, the rights of labor and collective bargaining, as, for example, Prof. Halford E. Luccock of the Yale Divinity School did⁵ in a New York sermon on September 11, 1938. Nor when the same com-

² "Biting on Granite" by Rabbi Louis I. Newman, *Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1938.

³ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" (Vanguard Press) p. 193.

⁴ "The Antichrist" by Frederick W. Nietzsche with an Introduction by H. L. Mencken (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) p. 25.

⁵ *New York Times*, Sept. 12, 1938.

mittee is attacked by the head resident of Hull House⁶ in an address before a council of welfare workers is there any doubt about the speaker's high regard for Moscow and its reigning czar. The pinnacle of intellectual arrogance was attained by Max Lerner who took over the department of political science at Williams College for Moscow in the fall of 1938. The insolence of Left Wing strategists, an advanced stage of earlier pooh-poohing, is illustrated by Lerner's phrase-making in a potpourri of Polish Judaism and Yale dialectics: "the fantastic attempts of the Dies Committee to smear the New Deal by tying it up with 'Red' activities."⁷ Similarly, when Mr. Roosevelt attacked the Dies Committee prior to the 1938 elections, he betrayed his own attachment to the hammer and sickle. Likewise, when the news commentator of a radio chain glibly asserts⁸ the national purpose to "consolidate the social gains" of the New Deal, the influence of the Washington bureaucracy is apparent. No speculation is required properly to tag such obvious deception.

There is a sustained effort in the American Left Wing which seems to be part and parcel of universal strategy to establish as an important fact the hollow pretense that it is necessary to favor Fascism in order to condemn and oppose Communism. Any one who points out the imbecilities of Communists and Communism or who even seeks to label these self-styled patriots of the Left Wing, these self-appointed successors to Washington and Lincoln, is promptly called a "red baiter" and Fascist.

Any pretense by or on behalf of Mr. Roosevelt of a purpose to *save* or *preserve* the *status quo* of private ownership is so much nonsense. The pretense is only a screen to hide real objectives.

What is equally important is that if the New Deal is allowed to attain its objectives, the United States of

⁶ Miss Charlotte Carr, *Indianapolis Star*, November 4, 1938.

⁷ "Epistle to the Right" by Max Lerner, professor of political science at Williams College and formerly editor of *The Nation*. *The American Mercury*, January, 1938.

⁸ Gilbert V. Seldes, *Columbia Broadcasting System*, November 13, 1938.

America shortly will find itself in a situation identical with that of Russia, Germany and Italy today—dominated and controlled by a revolutionary dictatorship. A socialized state or a communistic society is a chimerical objective, impossible and unattainable, except under the heel of a Stalin, a Hitler, a Mussolini. That some of the New Deal counsellors recognize this fact is evidenced by their present feverish operations for strictly personal gain.

Many newspapers and magazines, it ought to be said, have done a remarkable work in the past year in the delineation of human depravity in the New Deal era. The exposition has been accomplished with restraint and uniform dignity.

One element, it seems, has been lacking, i.e., an interpretation of passing events in terms of the *ultimate*. It has seemed that most writers pretend to believe—regardless of what they actually do believe—that there is a way out of the jungle, if only Mr. Roosevelt will veer slightly to the right.

The author has no such opinion for the reason that the masses who have already enjoyed the bounties of the state for five years are badly spoiled and will use their political power, which universal suffrage and our party system invite, to prevent any major abatement of the bounties. No way of escape from steadily increasing bounties has been divulged and we only save ourselves now from the misery of contemplating our *ultimate* disaster—and the abyss—by practicing the ways of an ostrich in a sandstorm.

While a shift in the metaphor is necessary, a shift from the jungle to the sea, Euripides is the source of an observation once more pertinent:

"So great a sea of troubles do I see,
That to swim out from it does seem impossible."

A rereading of much history which the author seemed to remember in spite of its challenge by present day oracles, New Deal model, has been adequate compensa-

tion for the daily necessity to endure each new atrocity of the new bureaucracy.

The continued political success of the New Deal is a dependable harbinger of increasing ills and assures the New Deal objective, the confiscation of private industry on a large scale. The New Deal has prepared this way with sentimental attention to detail, though it leads us farther into the jungle. Those who would avoid the confiscation of their lands and chattels and the further loss of their liberties and who are still optimistic enough to believe they may retain them have not to exceed one more chance to vote accordingly, namely, November, 1940.

Such persons are at a great disadvantage. A political Juggernaut of gigantic proportions and directed from the White House is operating full time in every voting precinct in America to complete the destruction of constitutional government and pierce the jungle to its final objective—a socialized state and a dictatorship. Hundreds of thousands will follow the Juggernaut in total ignorance of its objective but their aid will be no less effective because they are sincerely unsuspecting.

The author's prejudices are intuitive and for them no apology is made. The reader may agree or disagree, either of which reactions is beside the point that New Deal phenomena possess peculiar values in the field of revelation. They disclose weaknesses in our civilization that heretofore were not generally suspected. Superficial thinking is apt to result in attaching major importance to the banalities of the New Deal whereas, in their true perspective, they are mere symbols hallmarked by the time element in our processes toward decadence.

In the late twenties, it was argued that the established rules of barter and sale had been abrogated by new elements of industrial expansion; that enterprise was firmly established on a new economic level; that the sale of equities for fifty times their value on a current earning basis was a justifiable discount which shrewd investors,

who could correctly anticipate the future of American business, were willing to pay.

Now, in the late thirties, it is argued with equal vehemence that the collapse of the stock market in 1929 marked the end of Capitalism and the private ownership of property; that, finally, the world is on the threshold of a "new life" or "more abundant life," depending upon whether one prefers the language of Lenin or Roosevelt, the socialization of private enterprise being just beyond the threshold; that the pioneer ideals of private and public conduct, emphasized, for example, in "Kidd's Elocution" are now obsolete.

No country, no people, no nation, no culture in the known history of mankind has long existed without some acknowledged distinctions between individuals and groups, which distinctions have separated the ignorant from the wise, the lazy from the industrious, the indifferent from the ambitious, the unfit from the fit. The wise, the industrious, the ambitious and the fit in fulfillment of natural instincts have accumulated property the more effectively to secure themselves and their posterity a continuation of the personal independence derived from possessions. The "right" to own and enjoy property, it must be remembered, is one of the corner stones of the American Bill of Rights in spite of its neglect by the New Deal. Envy and jealousy have moved a multitude to assail the established structure of society, and particularly this corner stone, only because of a failure to understand the importance of individual possessions or because of inherent unfitness to acquire and retain them.

There is no more futile undertaking than the promotion of the "class struggle." There is no more chimerical objective than the abolition of "classes."

By "classes" are not meant those social distinctions established as protective devices by "old" and decadent families to set them apart when wisdom, industry, ambition and fitness have disappeared and only money remains. Such social distinctions which linger a while

with the offspring of worthy parents and which are expressed in the stupidities and inanities of polite dinner gossip and recorded in the social register are meaningless. The "classes" which have any real meaning comprise those recruits from the farm, the office and the shop, from anywhere and everywhere, whose careers are in the ascendancy, whose pulse-beats are rising not waning.

That Karl Marx, as a Jew, was embittered by the "ex-tant social order" and pined for a "social movement" or "revolution" that would terminate in the "abolition of all classes" and result in a "new society" he fully betrayed in the Communist Manifesto. His arbitrary division of society into only two classes, even though it shows a weakness in sociology, is understandable. He was striving to raise up a numerous army which, at some future date, would do the fighting for all Jews who felt as he did. The so-called "oppressed class," the proletariat, were his most likely recruits, only the "oppressed class" in a capitalistic society have a way of *emerging* into the free atmosphere of economic independence. When the "oppressed class" practice a bit of self-denial and some measure of self-control, they are sure to emerge, except in those times when Marxian disciples get possession of the political controls and create artificial obstacles, as they have lately done in America. In normal times, when one of the "oppressed class" emerges, Marx thereby loses a recruit and his tocsin of the Communist Manifesto, "Proletarians of all lands unite!" is sounded in vain.

The country seems always to be so completely occupied with its *present* that any long-range and serene contemplation of events, is not to be expected. The periodical and book marts suffer a traffic jam from the very pious and learned endeavors of forward lookers and world uplifters, turned scribblers, to support theses in political economy that are shot through with fallacies and absurdities. The pen, poised at the multitude, belabors itself to outdo the sword in the new-found might of propaganda. The radio surges with all manner of

subtleties in propaganda, as for example recitals of all the aches and pains plus the uniform "democratic" conduct of our First Family. The lecture platform also adds its bit to promote the "class struggle."⁹

No man deserves to be called an American who denies the continuing obligation of the country to feed the hungry, clothe the naked and shelter the homeless, provided it is first established that they are Americans, secondly, that no work is to be had and lastly, that the obligation can be discharged. Similarly, no man deserves to be called an American who wastes the resources of the country in the relief of our unfortunates or who injects politics into an undertaking so closely related to human misery. Finally, the will to seize upon the distress of a country as an opportunity to imperil the freedom of its citizens and to prevent their economic recovery requires the cruelty and cunning of a Mephistopheles. Yet if anyone doubts the sinister designs of the New Deal those doubts are dissolved by a mere superficial examination of the "planned economy" and the "new social order" advocated by its sponsors. "*Business*," said former Assistant "Commissar" of Agriculture R. G. Tugwell on the beginning of the New Deal in 1932, "*will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis; it is literally meant.*"¹⁰

When the five-year career of the New Deal is fully contemplated, including the variance between promise and performance, the surprise projects leading to absolutism undertaken from the White House, the shifting panorama of a nation under the lash, the obvious deceptions practiced on a country too weak to resist or too proud to acknowledge its humiliation, both the means

⁹ Of the six speakers engaged to address the Indianapolis Jewish Center Community Association during the 1938-39 season, five were very certain to stress the failure of Capitalism to usher in the millennium and this preponderance of Left Wing propaganda cannot be dismissed as accidental. It betrays the ideals and processes of Jewish thought.

¹⁰ Address before American Economic Association, "The Principle of Laissez Faire," published by *Association*, January, 1933.

and the ends, the methods and objectives of Communism, as taught by Karl Marx, are clearly discernible.

Ferrante, who was king of Naples in the fifteenth century, was "recognized as one of the most powerful political minds of the day"¹¹ and "extreme measures became part of his daily policy."¹² Burckhardt is silent with respect to the exact nature of his "*extreme measures*" but the inference is warranted that they have a modern parallel in Mr. Roosevelt's "*extreme measures*" to regiment the United States Supreme Court, business, industry and the farmers of America.

During Ferrante's reign, the government alone dealt in oil and wine and shared the profits from foreign commerce with a single private merchant to produce the necessary revenue to support the king's domestic struggles and his external wars. Such policies were not unlike those of the New Deal when it penetrates private industry to engage in the production and sale of electricity, in housing, in agriculture, in manufacturing and banking. Devoid of a navy which his caprice for frequent vacations could convert into a fishing fleet by a simple order, King Ferrante practiced hunting "regardless of all rights of property," so Burckhardt says.¹³

King Ferrante's eldest son, Alfonso, the Duke of Calabria, enjoyed a "kind of co-regency with his father" similar to that enjoyed by Son Jimmie in the later years of the New Deal. The son avowed his contempt for religion and its usages, lived in the closest intimacy with Jews and was accompanied by one, Isaac Abranavel, when he fled the country.¹⁴

Had a free choice been available, the author would have preferred to live in times other than those of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, John L. Lewis, pump priming and the C. I. O. While the author has no confidence in

¹¹ "The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy" by Jacob Burckhardt, eighth edition, (The Macmillan Company) p. 36.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

his own ability to change men or events, there has been an effort in this volume at a rather broad hint that no change will be effected by any or all of the world-improvers or witch doctors, either in the New Deal or Republican party, who are now at work.

This study of current happenings in terms of the *ultimate*, in terms of the real objectives of the New Deal was undertaken merely as a personal attempt at self-expression. It is not superior to or even different from what many others have written, save perhaps in one respect only, that it is a venture at interpretation of passing events in terms of our *ultimate* fate.

Indianapolis, Indiana

CARL H. MOTE

Contents

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE	iii
I "SOCIAL PROGRESS," NEW DEAL MODEL	1
II BACKGROUND OF THE NEW DEAL	18
III MORE BACKGROUND	35
IV LORD MACAULAY FORECASTS NEW DEAL	46
V LABOR RACKET IN HIGH GEAR	54
VI UNIVERSAL EDUCATION TO THE RESCUE	64
VII CHAOS IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY	80
VIII THE JEW AND THE NEW DEAL	93
IX KEEPING UP WITH THE JONESES, AND ROOSEVELTS	125
X NEW DEAL MORALS	134
XI MRS. ROOSEVELT ADDS THE FEMININE TOUCH	149
XII THE DICTATOR MARCHES ON	159
XIII NEW DEAL CORRIDOR BELOW THE RIO GRANDE	163
XIV PRESENT PHASES OF NEW DEAL	171
XV FUTURE OF THE NEW DEAL	186
XVI CONSTRUCTIVE HINTS LOOKING TO LIQUIDATION	202
XVII FINAL LIQUIDATION OF NEW DEAL	216
EPILOGUE	227
APPENDICES	236
INDEX	249

CHAPTER I

"Social Progress," New Deal Model

*Franklin I Takes to Art, Paints a "Broad Picture"
With Dark Background and Makes Numerous
Promises to the "Folks" Whereupon
Old Phaedrus Raises His
Head and Reflects.*

"The fack can't be no longer disguised that a Krysis is onto us."—*Artemus Ward.*

SINCE THE Economic Royalists failed to co-operate further in the consummation of Mr. Roosevelt's ambitions to draw and quarter them and throw their carcasses over one of the TVA dams; since the "recession" became acute and industry ceased to persevere, Mr. Roosevelt's vocal organs, except for oracular divinations at press conferences, the occasional fireside chats and the outpourings of his summer junket in behalf of the purge of Democratic primaries, have not been overworked.

The sermon on Chapel Hill, December 5, 1938, at the University of North Carolina by our most famous "devotee of scrambled eggs" for breakfast repeats the pronoun "I" twenty times, "democratic" and "democracy" eight times and "liberal" seven times. The "greater glory of God," to which all New Deal undertakings were definitely committed in the Chapel Hill sermon, is reminiscent of "Onward Christian Soldiers" when Roosevelt I was in a death grip with the "interests" in 1912. As a matter of fact, recourse to the wisdom of Oyster Bay by the "maverick" branch of the family is occurring more frequently probably than the survivors of the former branch welcome.

The "veray parfit gentil knight," standing before the microphone on Chapel Hill, overwhelmed the co-eds with proof of New Deal achievements by resort to daring methods. He quoted at length an "old friend" from Georgia, who was otherwise unidentified, but he omitted equally convincing testimony by Major Hoople and Little Red Hiding Hood. The stock market had already discounted the general confidence of the country in the President's declaration that he is a "believer in the Capitalist system" by selling off during four successive days, preceding the speech.

No doubt Mr. Roosevelt felt himself in a friendly atmosphere on Chapel Hill since Frank S. Graham, president of the university, was one of numerous "Liberals" who had telegraphed a petition asking the President to intervene in behalf of John Strachey, the English Communist, whose visa had been cancelled in London and who was being denied admission to the country.¹ Later when Strachey had been released on bond, pending an appeal, he said that ² "my chief regret is that I cannot now express my support of the New Deal."

One of Mr. Roosevelt's last important speeches was made when the "recession" was still called a "pause." An aura of emotional bewilderment has overcast subsequent appearances. On September 17, 1937, he made a night speech near the Washington Monument, on the Constitution. The speech left much to be desired as an example of clear thinking. It was overcast with the egoistic assumption that whatever he proposes as a program of social progress is not debatable.

There was some thought given to phrase making, however, in his statement that "modern men and women will not tamely commit to one man or one group the *permanent* conduct of their government." The dictatorships of Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini are altogether too permanent to suit the Economic Royalists of this coun-

¹ *New York Times*, October 14, 1938.

² *New York Times*, October 26, 1938.

try and it is quite certain that a militant minority in this country wants nothing to do with a dictatorship, even for a *temporary* period. He argued that a dictatorship is impossible in this country because it "threatens civilization." Such reasoning might appeal to a level of intelligence slightly above that of morons. Otherwise, it has no validity. Nero's reign was none the less a fact in spite of its threat to civilization. Similarly, dictatorships in Russia, Germany, Italy and many other countries are no less facts because they threaten civilization. Those persons who sincerely believe the reigning bureaucracy threatens to destroy our government may have believed it impossible to fasten such a multitude of grafters to the public payroll but Mr. Roosevelt has shown them how far wrong they were.

It may be considered fortunate that Mr. Roosevelt has not been able to market quite all his own panaceas for "social progress." There are not a few taxpayers who believe in social progress but who maintain, strangely enough, that the widespread use of public funds to win elections; the wanton waste of the taxpayers' money is building palaces for negro voters; the attempted destruction of private industry from the building of gigantic power projects at public expense, which private capital was too wise to undertake; the regimentation of large sections of our population against their will and contrary to their wishes, are not exactly landmarks of social progress but the projects of a demagogue who has lost his reason.

Every invasion of the field of electric production and distribution by the New Deal has been dramatized by Mr. Roosevelt as an undertaking to provide "cheap power." This slogan has been repeated so many times in the past five or six years by Mr. Roosevelt, by "Liberals," by Socialists, by Communists, that engineers and other experts who fully understand its absurdity and always have, now ignore its continued use. They quite realize the futility of facts when facts are being managed by

adroit politicians who are wanting in intellectual honor.

Theoretically, the TVA involves flood prevention, navigation and electric production and distribution. Practically, flood prevention and navigation are incidental and unimportant, yet, in apportioning the Federal Government's "investment" among the three purposes, the New Deal bookkeepers will reduce the "investment" for electric production and distribution to zero, if necessary to show a profit from the sale of electricity at the prevailing rates. The ousted Dr. Morgan already has pointed out this juggling of the books.

Moreover, the whole country is being robbed to build these gigantic projects of strictly local concern. Mr. Roosevelt, however, may believe the political benefits of a good slogan to himself personally are worth the cost, particularly since the cost is provided out of other people's money. The Socialists and Communists get their cue to applaud the TVA from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Stuart Chase, *The Nation*, *The New Republic* and *The New Masses*.

The most celebrated rascals of all time had a flair for politics and raved most about democracy. Danton, Marat and Robespierre are notable examples. Not long ago Hitler reaffirmed his passion for democracy. Yet the true feelings and real motives of tyrants, actual or potential, are reasonably apparent at any time and clearly so when they overstress "those of us who still believe in democracy," as Mr. Roosevelt so frequently does and as he did in his 1937 speech on the Constitution.

The President very plainly was vexed with lawyers, that is, with all lawyers save himself. Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt doesn't consider himself much of a lawyer. Could it be possible that lawyers, trained to think quickly and rather accurately, discover off-hand in Mr. Roosevelt's fireside and other chats certain outstanding fallacies which are not apparent to George W. Babbitt, the WPA, Jim Farley and many of the Washington correspondents?

The President's phrasemaker was on the job in the

September speech. His invention was the "odd man" on the Supreme Court. If Mr. Roosevelt was peevish because he had no "odd man" on the Supreme Court, that is, one he could call his very own, this cause for his bad temper was removed in his odd appointment of the very odd Mr. Black, of Alabama. In fact, Mr. Black, as a member of the Supreme Court, is so unusually odd that certain artists depicted him on the Supreme Bench wearing a nightshirt and a white hood.

The "crisis in American affairs which demands action now" also has a familiar ring. The conspirators who laid siege to the Bastille, who organized the march on Versailles, who planned the invasion of the Tuilleries and later beseiged it, who organized the wholesale massacres of September, 1792, and conducted the French Reign of Terror in the first decade following the adoption of the American Constitution, in each instance, also acted because of a "crisis" in the affairs of France, or so they blatantly declared. Hitler has overwhelmed himself with "crises."

What was the "crisis in American affairs which demands action now"? Many respectable citizens who are not on the public payroll and who still support their families, in spite of government interference with their business and taxation that amounts to extortion, believe there is a continuing "crisis" of misgovernment and that the person most responsible for the present saturnalia of misgovernment is Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt is under the suspicion of cherishing motives and purposes that extend far beyond the evil he has already wrought. Our "internal difficulties" are admitted and fairly well understood but what about "external difficulties" to which he alluded? Were conditions so desperate *internally* that Mr. Roosevelt is leading us into *external* complications in order to cover up our *internal* pathology? Is he so doggedly determined to take a place beside Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini that he will stop at nothing whatever? In other words, is Mr.

Roosevelt carefully preparing the ground to plunge the country into war later on? Are we to be sold out utterly? What "*action now*" does Mr. Roosevelt propose? Congress has given him and so has an unpacked Supreme Court substantially everything he has asked: Money in heretofore unheard sums and laws, laws, laws and more laws. The nation's gizzard was already turned upside down and inside out from convulsions of the New Deal.

No one who has closely observed the Machiavellian-Chief of the New Deal for the past five years and who has become acquainted with his moral standards can doubt his purpose to provoke a foreign war if that is believed necessary to maintain himself in power. It is significant that avowed Communists no longer denounce war as the strategy of Capitalism. Their opposition to war has softened noticeably. There is one solitary reason why the New Deal will end without a foreign war, namely, that the Country will stubbornly refuse to become embroiled in foreign entanglements.

In his speech of September 17, 1937, he called his future program a "broad picture." Thereupon he spoke of perspective, in the thought, apparently, that only a "broad picture" has perspective. Except that he may have meant a "broad picture" is one of generalities and lacks detail, his meaning was not clear. Even so, one would scarcely expect to find perspective in a "broad picture." It appears that the White House artists were a little careless with their brushes on certain paragraphs of the President's speech.

No doubt Mr. Roosevelt thought to reassure the Economic Royalists with the promise that in the future whatever may occur to him or whatever may be suggested to him by the mercenary crackpots of the New Deal, as entitled to a trial at the taxpayers' expense, will be solemnly consummated "*under the constitution.*" * In September, 1937, his "reorganization" proposals were not generally known. His determination to seize com-

* Our italics.

plete dictatorial power, no longer doubtful, then had to be inferred.

Bearing in mind fruits of the New Deal that have ripened since March 4, 1933, especially those nourished in spending to save and from priming the pump, it is a little sickening to Economic Royalists to contemplate Mr. Roosevelt's operating *outside* the Constitution. Economic Royalists have long been allergic to all known fruits of the New Deal, *under* the Constitution.

Shortly after the twenty-first of September, 1792, Messrs. Danton, Marat and Robespierre having organized a convention to supersede the legislative assembly, under a constitution accepted by Louis XVI one year previously, proclaimed a Republic in plain violation of, but under the existing constitution. Just a little later in a three-day orgy, they inaugurated the Reign of Terror with a wholesale massacre of priests, nobles and ordinary citizens personally conducted by their own hired assassins. Still later, they beheaded their king and queen as an incidental diversion, but *under the constitution*.

Nor did they find it necessary in their own peculiar program of social progress to revoke or even amend the constitution, except as a belated gesture. In fact, the terror proceeded with unabated fury *under a constitution* until Marat was murdered, and Danton and Robespierre lost their own heads. Somehow, the assurances of the same gentleman who ran for office in 1932 and whose solemn pledges made in that campaign are still remembered, of an intent to act *under the constitution*, do not have quite the same weight they had then. A promise by Mr. Roosevelt to try any and all new experiments *under the constitution* lacks something.

Phaedrus put the case succinctly: "Whoever has even once become notorious by base fraud, even if he speaks the truth, gains no belief."

Undoubtedly, many American citizens would like to believe that Mr. Roosevelt lost the court fight; that the appointment of Hugo Black, kkk, was unimportant; that

Mr. Roosevelt *must* operate *under* the constitution as it existed on January 1, 1937; that Charles Evans Hughes is a worthy successor of John Marshall.

In spite of a natural inclination to optimism, there is a growing suspicion in an expanding circle that such beliefs and such hopes are unfounded and that the Supreme Court of the United States has surrendered its independence and has become the rubber stamp which Mr. Roosevelt intended.

At any previous time in the history of the Country, the National Labor Relations Board would have been inconceivable and its high-handed proceedings since it began to function would have ended in its prompt abolition by Congress and the incarceration of its membership in a madhouse because only such relief would be equal to the tyranny the board has practiced. Meantime, Congress slumbers and the Supreme Court affirms the board's decisions.

The decadence of the country is fully revealed in the complete want of any popular response to the volumes already printed in the newspapers and magazines with respect to the board's insolent despotism. The ghastly details of the tyranny, moreover, have not been omitted. Until the 1938 elections, the country seemed to be due for a torrent of "social progress," New Deal model, and *under the constitution*, as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court, rejuvenated and restored to active consciousness by Mr. Roosevelt and his "odd man."

As a matter of technique, perhaps Mr. Roosevelt calculated on occupying all the time of the Economic Royalists with their immediate problems so that they shall have no time to read and reflect. Indictments for restraint of trade, citations by NLRB, tedious trials, the confiscation of their plants by extortionate taxation and sit-down strikes, an avalanche of new laws, orders and regulations touching every phase of their business, worry because of diminishing profits or increasing deficits leave them no

time to consider how far the New Deal has dragged them towards Caesarism.

Men who are being assailed front and rear and on each flank are not likely to have the time to read, much less consider, the cheerful philosophy of "social progress" conceived by Marx, Engels and Lenin and intended for the entertainment and amusement of Economic Royalists throughout the world.

Mr. Roosevelt, however, has near at hand among his idolators in his newly created bureaucracy and the pedagogues with whom he maintains intimate contact the sources of complete formulae and final patterns for every step in the social revolution as Marx, Engels and Lenin have prescribed them. Possibly Lenin would consider some of the professors³ "vulgar economists" or⁴ "opportunists" or⁵ "jingo Socialists" or Kautskyites but Lenin now speaks only through his scant writings which Economic Royalists don't read and which New Dealers may interpret as they please.

It might be helpful to the Economic Royalists, first, to familiarize themselves with the Marx-Engels-Lenin program and, second, to appropriate a modest sum from the treasuries of what Lenin calls "monopolistic capitalism" for the enlightenment of their natural allies—farm owners, merchants, home owners, salesmen and all factors in the distribution of commodities—with respect to the seeds of Caesarism, erroneously called Communism, in the New Deal.

Lenin wrote "Imperialism" in 1916 and "The State and Revolution" in 1917. After reading the first, which term he defines as⁶ "capitalism in transition" or⁷ "dying capitalism," it is easy to understand why all large enterprises are under suspicion by New Dealers and why Mr.

³ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 197.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

Roosevelt organized an assault on what he calls "monopoly." According to Lenin every large enterprise is necessarily monopolistic. "The birth of monopolies," he said,⁷ "as a result of the concentration of production, is a general and fundamental law of contemporary capitalist development." Hence the Roosevelt message on "monopoly" and the creation of an investigating commission by a servile Congress in the closing weeks of its last session show complete familiarity by the New Deal oligarchy with Lenin's program. This commission is expected to unmask a new chamber of horrors out of the business world (which will be useful in political campaigns) and to lay the foundation for expropriations and confiscations. *The Nation* labeled this investigation⁸ a "prelude to economic planning" which is Lenin's third step towards Communism. The railroads now appear to have top rank in the list of enterprises to be seized by the Washington government.⁹ *

⁷ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 9.

⁸ *The Nation*, July 16, 1938.

* See Appendix I.

⁹ An ex-pedagogue, a former law professor at Yale, the present head man in Mr. Roosevelt's pursuit of "monopolies," Thurman Arnold, in the sanctum of his library, has invented an ingenious syllogistic contraption to confound the Economic Royalists and to inspire all Marxian "workers." Its outlines hardly could have been possible except from the inspiration of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and not less than a quart of pre-war liquor.

The syllogistic contraption, (*New York Times Magazine*, August 21, 1928) stripped of unnecessary verbiage, may be stated thus:

i. Because Economic Royalists are "monopolists" and stupid, they lay off employees when they are unable to sell their product.

ii. The New Deal puts said employees on relief or to work for the WPA (on condition, however, that they furnish a power of attorney good until the next election), work being used in the figurative sense.

iii. THEREFORE, and thereby the government subsidizes the Economic Royalists, i.e., the "monopolists," who fail to pay employees to produce merchandise they can't sell, and the "public" (excluding the Economic Royalists, or "monopolists") are taxed to provide the subsidy.

It is no surprise that the author of this syllogistic contraption has a grievance against the accumulation of "a surplus to protect the security owner" and is worried about the low price paid for waste paper and the low value put on what he calls "the technique of this industry" by a minor Economic Royalist who buys the product for resale.

It is perhaps safe to assume that those who object to "a surplus to protect the security owner" never owned many securities. It is also safe to assume that those on the New Deal or "Communist" front who denounce "monopolies"

In a discussion of banking, Lenin observes that¹⁰ "Capitalism, the development of which began with petty usury, ends in the gigantic usury of high finance."

Since March 4, 1933, the "gigantic usury of high finance" in America has been displaced almost altogether by a new variety of "high finance" which originates in and is conducted by the Treasury of the United States. Madame de Stael, in her "Memoirs," relates that while she was an exile in Austria "a man was hanged for forging notes at the very moment when the government had reduced the value of the old ones; he called out, on his way to execution, that it was not he who had robbed, but the state."

Lenin emphasized the investment of capital in foreign countries, the growth of the electrical equipment industry, the colonial possessions of the world powers and concludes that¹¹ "the *tendency* * to stagnation and corruption which is characteristic of monopoly continues to make itself felt." In the United States, he says,¹² "the economic development of late years has been far quicker than in Germany, and just *thanks to this* has brought into high relief the parasitic character of modern American capitalism."

In 1916, Lenin had no apparent reason to hope that in less than twenty-five years, were he alive, he would witness a relentless assault on "modern American capitalism" or "monopoly" by his American disciples whom Macaulay anticipated by eighty years and whom he identified as "Huns and Vandals" produced by our "own institutions."

What is the cure-all for "Imperialism," for "dying capitalism"? Lenin quotes Saint-Simon:¹³

are hankering for some better job than a professorship in law at Yale and will continue the barrage until they get it, in which event the waste paper industry is certain to be neglected.

¹⁰ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 40.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 105.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

* Our italics.

"Production will be directed not by chiefs of business independent of each other and ignorant of man's economic needs but by a special institution. *The central committee of control*,* being able to consider the large field of social economy from a *more elevated* * point of view, will regulate it in such a way that it will be useful to the whole of society, will be able to put the means of production into *suitable hands*,* and above all will occupy itself more particularly with maintaining *constant harmony* * between production and consumption."

The names given to Lenin's "planned economy" in America under the New Deal were NRA, TVA, FHA, HOLC, etc., etc. After Lenin, in Russia, it was the five-year plan. Under Cárdenas in Mexico, it is the six-year plan. Our own *central committee of control* * now consists of the firm of Cohen, Roosevelt and Corcoran with Son Jimmie as a roving member. The New Deal judges, by virtue of the power they will exercise in bankruptcy and receivership cases, should be able to divert the "means of production" in considerable measure to "suitable hands" while the "central committee of control" looks on from a "more elevated point of view," and the country awaits the "constant harmony between production and consumption."

It was in Lenin's second book that he really let himself go. Walter Windell of Markleville, Madison County, Indiana, who owns and farms a quarter section of land can get a very good idea of what is just around the corner, what Lenin calls¹⁴ the "overthrow of the capitalist class" and what Mr. Roosevelt calls "social progress" in the Lenin housing program. Lenin quotes Engels as saying¹⁵ that the proletarian state will "hardly allot houses without pay" at any rate "during the period of *transition*." * The New Deal is housing negroes in great numbers at

* Our italics.

¹⁴ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 222.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

half pay already. The next step in the program is¹⁶ "a *transition* * to a state of affairs when it will be possible to let houses without rent." The third step is¹⁷ "by the expropriation of their present possessors and by settling in them the homeless workers who are now living in overcrowded houses." Certainly, the third step would dispossess and oust Mr. Windell, since he owns a most attractive house. The late Mr. Lenin, otherwise known as Vladimir Ilyitch Ulianow, thereupon quotes Mr. Engels as saying that the third step¹⁸ "as soon as the workers win political power . . . will be as easily carried out as *all other expropriations and commandings. . . .*" *

A fairly accurate notion of the sequence of events as prescribed by Lenin may be got from phrases he uses which are selected from the volume and arranged in orderly sequence.

1. "*Monopolistic capitalism*":¹⁹ This is what we have now according to Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Arnold, and Mr. Lenin.

2. "*Coming Crash of capitalism*":²⁰ This is contemporaneous with the period²¹ "when Socialism has shortened the working day, raised the masses to a *new life*." The wages and hours bill was intended to be helpful in raising the masses to a *more abundant life*, which phrase is more picturesque than Lenin's.

3. "*Overthrow of the capitalist class*":²² This is the "first phase of Communism" during which Lenin thinks²³ "it will be impossible to seize as private property the means of production, the factories, machines, land . . ." Apparently, he overlooked the possible aid of New Deal

¹⁶ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 165.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 222.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

judges and the cheerful results to be had from sit-down strikes.

4. "*Revolutionary dictatorship*":²⁴ This is the present status of Russia and approximately the status of Germany and Italy, regardless of labels. Spengler appears to doubt whether the present Western Culture will go beyond this step which is defined politically as "Caesarism," and the end of our culture.

5. "*Dictatorship of the proletariat*":²⁵ This is accomplished by "revolution" which Lenin defines as an²⁶ "act in which part of the population forces its will on the other part by means of rifles, bayonets, cannon . . ." This is the "direct action" which Gasset defines as the²⁷ "Magna Charta of barbarism." Undoubtedly, the afore-said Mr. Windell and Elmer Hardy, who owns a hardware store in Markleville, Indiana, and Elza Clem, who lives near Windfall, Indiana, and who owns a farm near Anderson, Indiana, will enjoy little peace of mind during the gun play of the proletariat. There are other steps.

6. "*Destruction of bourgeois parliamentarism*":²⁸ Messrs. Windell, Hardy and Clem may get an idea of this step in "social progress" from Lenin's observation that²⁹ "when once the proletariat has won political power it must utterly break up the old machinery of the state, and substitute for it a new machinery of organized, armed workers, after the type of the commune." In another place he says:³⁰ "While the state exists there can be no freedom. When there is freedom there will be no state."

7. "*Reconstruction of society*":³¹ Lenin had full and complete faith that human nature could be changed, as

²⁴ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 166.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

²⁷ Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses" (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 82.

²⁸ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 22.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

elsewhere shown, by increasing the³² "rights" of individuals and classes (the workers) to make up for their deficiencies in mental and physical fitness.

That every prior experiment in Communism has failed, in America, in Mexico among the Indians, on the shores of the Dead Sea among the Essenes, in Russia where the dictatorship of Stalin is relentless and merciless, has no bearing on the faith of uplifters, world improvers, New Dealers, who continue steadfast in the belief that the way to the "new life" of Lenin or the "more abundant life" of Roosevelt can be charted with mathematical precision in accordance with their preconceived formulae and patterns.

André Maurois quotes André Gide³³ as saying: "The masses are unhappier today in the U. S. S. R. than they have ever been before, unhappier and less free than in any other country," which as a warning to America, is entitled to serious contemplation.

In the century-old barrage on capitalism, nobody seems to have thought out Socialism, no one save Spengler, who does not dispute the trend but who accurately identifies Socialism as "end" phenomena in our culture. Wherefore, Norman Angell, in his brochure on "Socialism and Communism" misses the point entirely in his chapter, "Socialism *or* Catastrophe." A proper title would be "Socialism *and* Catastrophe." The latter is the inevitable consequence of the former, a proposition that Socialists ignore and most non-Socialists have not discovered.

No one denies that Capitalism has failed to provide palaces for the one-third of the population which votes solidly for Roosevelt but anyone who expects Socialism to provide them is a fool. Socialism will soon convert the palaces of those who now occupy them to ruins and Roosevelt's "one-third" will have much less than they now have. Assuredly, they will not live very long in the

³² "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 196.

³³ "The Tragic Decline of the Human Ideal," *New York Times Magazine*, June 19, 1938.

palaces Lenin promised and Roosevelt has built and every other man will be lucky to live at all. Socialism will fail, somewhat for the same reason that Capitalism is considered a failure, because of human selfishness, greed, ignorance, incompetence and biological unfitness to survive under any system. There is this difference. The failure of Socialism will not be a debatable issue, in the sense that its failure will be doubtful.

Norman Angell's brochure, written in 1931, quotes "an economist of authority—Mr. R. G. Tugwell," who is no other than the Cardinal Woolsey of the New Deal, in behalf of applying "the controls of society . . . at the places and at the times which are strategic" which, as Angell says, is "another name for Socialism." Lenin's "central committee of control" and Tugwell's "controls of society" are identical.

While John Strachey, the noted English Communist, was being held at Ellis Island in October, 1938, pending an appeal from the cancellation of his visa, Blas Roca, whose real name is Francisco Calderio and who is secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba, slipped into the country. Calderio gave out an interview⁸⁴ when safely through the port at New York in which he said that Mr. Roosevelt is "regarded in Cuba as a symbol of world democracy and the democratic aspirations of the Cuban people." The "world democracy" to which he referred, of course, was that advocated by Karl Marx and the Bolsheviks of Russia, particularly Lenin and Trotsky.

Undoubtedly, Calderio has been in close touch with events in the United States and unquestionably he did not fail to read Mr. Roosevelt's letter of September 2, 1938, to the publisher of the *Brooklyn Eagle*⁸⁵ in which Mr. Roosevelt, using the vocabulary of the Communists, referred to the current political economy in America as "the present transition." This term is used widely by

⁸⁴ *New York Times*, October 21, 1938.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, September 7, 1938.

Communists to designate the interval between Capitalism and Communism.

The common usage by Communists of fictitious names has been disclosed repeatedly by the Dies Committee. Membership in the party is held under fictitious names in order that the membership may be denied when it becomes embarrassing to admit it.

CHAPTER II

Background of the New Deal

Robespierre and Company Provided Useful Patterns for New Deal Reformers in French Revolution During Which Attempt to Change Human Nature Anticipated
Stuart Chase.

"Caesarism grows on the soil of Democracy, but its roots thread deeply into the underground of blood tradition."—*Spengler*.¹

CONTEMPORARY WESTERN Culture, that is, the political phase, is comparable roughly with the Classical culture and politics which began in Athens and culminated in the Rome of Caesar and Cicero. In its last phases, rhetoric, sob-effects, shameless flattery, fantastic lies, games, presents, threats, blows, and money were the persuasive factors. The country has been introduced to all of these factors by Mr. Roosevelt, or members of his family, or his Tribunes in the Senate and House. When Caesar crossed the Rubicon, he rent his garments for the entertainment of his soldiers. Possibly, Mr. Roosevelt purposely has withheld this bit of drama for Congress when, as he anticipates, another X billion dollars will be needed for the 1940 election. No matter what we call our prevailing political system, the substance of a Democracy is nonexistent. Only the forms survive, as they also did in Rome in the last days when the substance of Democracy had disappeared.

¹"The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf & Co., Inc.) Vol. II, p. 464.

By Caesar's time, reputable people held off from any part in elections and the Emperor Tiberius complained because the most capable men of his time avoided politics.

In his study of "Tepoztlan, a Mexican Village," Robert Redfield says² that at public meetings in the village *los correctos* (the correct ones or more influential citizens) occupy a separate half of the platform from *los tontos* (the ignorant) because they "regard politics with something akin to disdain."

Able men, men both competent and honest, rarely will have anything to do with the means by which a party nomination and election may be had today and even when they are willing to make this sacrifice, they know how powerless they will be among all the scoundrels with whom, necessarily, they will be associated.

Of the last days of the Holy Roman Empire, it was said that it was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire. Of our American Democracy, it may be said now that it is neither American nor a Democracy. It is not American when our largest city elects and re-elects a mayor by name, LaGuardia, whose blood tradition is wholly foreign. It is not American when alien Communists can preëempt positions of power in our labor movement, as Harry Bridges and his confederates have done in the C.I.O. It is not American when negroes hold the balance of power in politics, as they do in Indianapolis and Chicago, or wield the political power centered in Harlem. It is not American when foreign born immigrants and their children, who can scarcely speak our language, dictate the personnel of our petty officialdom, as they do in many cities of many states of the Union. Even football, a game with American origins, has ceased to be American since its commercialization. The names of the stars of the past season, in large number, are unpronounceable to English speaking people. Everett Dean Martin

² "Tepoztlan, a Mexican Village" by Robert Redfield (University of Chicago Press).

observes as a significant fact in American history that "most of the present liberals are of the newer immigration, who bring to this nation a recent European heritage."

In a single issue of the *New York Times*⁴ the following names made the crime news of one day: Frank (The Bull) Giordano, Peter Cherichella, Theodore Orzo, Nelson Hellstrom, A. J. Kattenborn, Charles H. Howe, Isidore Markowitz, Martin (Bugsy) Goldstein, Seymour Magoon, Benjamin Fogel and Dominick Klucznack. Joseph Rao, Jack Greenblatt, William Greenstein and Ben Kemins were names identified with a story of death threats and sabotage charged against members of an electrical workers' union. Albert Stonkus, director of a C.I.O. union, made the news in connection with the seizure of Michigan power plants by C.I.O. employees. Aaron Shapiro made the news in connection with his disbarment from the law practice for "corrupt misconduct."

In five issues of the *New York Times*, selected at random,⁵ the following names made the crime news of those days: John Welsh, Emil Siroky, Marie Broderick, James Wright, John Mahoney, Martin (Bugsy) Goldstein, Seymour Magoon, Isidore Markowitz, Irving Glasser, Louis Glasser, Edward Grove, Samuel Zigg, Samuel Jenks, Samuel Weinstein, James Abisror, Morris Friedlander, Samuel Herson, Louis Yukelson, William Swirnow, Samuel Swirnow, Meyer Berson, Adolph Unger, Joseph Kreisberg, Richard Whitney, Morris G. Manker, Harry Scherl, Joseph Harvey O'Loughlin, Dominick Guariglia, Arthur Friedman, Philip Chaleff, Isidore Zimmerman, Harry W. Kouwenhoven, Simon Elmore, Vincent Forte, Arthur Perry, Fred J. Hull, Lawrence Marks, Michael J. Mooney, James Murphy, Charles (Lucky Luciano) Lucania, Francis Degnan, Chester Carson, John Kulka, James Stewart, A. J. Powers, John Birdsall, Harold Bowker, Andrew Howe, Santiago Gutierrez,

³ "Liberty" by Everett Dean Martin (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 2.

⁴ *The New York Times*, April 2, 1938.

⁵ *The New York Times*, April 9, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15, 1938.

Thomas Jasosky, Edward J. Penn, Werner Fred Luck, Ten Broeck M. Terhune, Richard Delaney, Andrew Luntz, John J. Sullivan and Jacob (Gurrah Jake) Shapiro.

Whitney's crimes shocked the country. Manker, a senior at Harvard, was convicted of manslaughter and drunken driving. Powers, graduate manager of the Princeton club, was indicted for theft. Kouwenhoven, a lawyer, was already in Sing Sing for theft. The national or racial origins of the others are obvious in more than half the cases. Painstaking study and research in connection with these names might disclose some unexpected explanations of our political troubles.

Ours is not a Democracy when the system of government under which we live is such that the first impulse of the able, the competent and the honest is to avoid political offices as they would a contagious disease. "When one hunts with the wolf-pack, one must howl like a wolf," but persons who put any value on their own self-respect simply refuse to hunt or howl.

Because it suited the purposes of the politicians to magnify the importance of the "people," because vanity encouraged them to accept this bouquet from the politicians, the people have adopted the theory that the French Revolution was *their* revolution and that out of it, the people got greater human freedom. The legend that the French Revolution was of the people, by the people and for the people, not only is untrue in fact but the legend has been detrimental to sound thinking in this country from its beginning.

The French Revolution provides many analogies which any citizen, who has more goods and chattels than his New Deal neighbor, may very well ponder.

"To make the people happy, their ideas must be reconstructed, laws must be changed, morals must be changed, men must be changed, things must be changed, everything, yes, everything must be destroyed, since everything must be remade."

Or, consider this gem:

"Everything will be changed, for masters will become servants, and you will be served in your turn."

It is undeniable that these pearls have the lustre of the "more abundant life." In these gems, there is something strangely suggestive that their authors might be located among the numerous secretariat of the White House or copies found in the files of some forgotten brain truster of another year. Naturally, Rex Tugwell is recalled. He started out to remake America, particularly the share cropper of Tobacco Road, the hill billy of Kentucky and the poor white trash of the Dust Bowl, abandoned the uplift for molasses and is back on the public payroll once more at \$15,000.00 annually in the service of that up-and-coming New Dealer, Fiorella H. LaGuardia, municipal commissar of our greatest city. Tommy Corcoran and Ben Cohen and Son Jimmie and Madame Perkins might have taken a four-way dive for the two gems. Or, Mr. Roosevelt might have had them in one of his vest pockets in 1932 when he accepted the Democratic platform 100 per cent. Or, he might have them now for detail to be used in the "broad picture" he painted on September 17, 1937, in his speech on the Constitution.

Every such clue is wrong. The first of these gems came from Rabaud de Saint-Etienne in 1789 on the eve of the French Revolution and somewhat prior to the time he went to the guillotine and his wife, in despair, committed suicide. The second came from another articulate French democrat when he was asking an audience of lackeys for their votes and just prior to the time when he was overtaken by events of his own creation and beheaded, the last of the terrorists, Maximilien Robespierre.

A summary of the achievements of the people's representatives in the Commune indicates how far Congress may be relied upon. The massacres of September, 1792, are typical. Of the total massacred, 5 per cent were aristocrats and officials, 17 per cent were priests and 78 per

cent were just common people. Until comparatively recent times, however, the common people of France were widely believed to have inaugurated and conducted the terror and, therefore, to have caused and personally carried out their own slaughter.

If the common people, those whom Mr. Roosevelt familiarly calls "the folks," were only better acquainted with history and particularly with the consequences of such great "democratic" surges as the French Revolution and Mr. Hitler's experiment in self-determination in Central Europe, they would be able to estimate better their own chances of survival in the New Deal surge. Based upon statistics available from the French Revolution, the prospects of "the folks" as compared to the prospects of the Economic Royalists appear to be in the ratio approximately of 1 to 15. If "the folks" knew this, they probably would be more sparing of their cheers of Mr. Hitler, Mr. Mussolini, Mr. Stalin and Mr. Roosevelt. The cheers for Mr. Stalin already have abated.

There is an analogy in the events of the French Revolution which should interest Mr. John L. Lewis and Mr. William Green. The Revolution of 1789, which resulted in impoverishing the wealthy class and in their flight from the country, demoralized industry and agriculture. The workers suffered most. Two years later, one of the outstanding results of this great "democratic" surge was the complete abolition of trade unions. All of their activities were put under strict prohibition by the National Assembly. Their members were left to walk the streets in idleness and despair.

If the French Revolution had its Jacobin Clubs where conspiracies against law, order and common decency were conceived and their execution planned, has not this country its klaverns of the Ku Klux Klan to which now a justice of the United States Supreme Court carries a passport? The State of Indiana has its famous "Two-Per Cent Club," the brain child of the forthright Mr.

McNutt to aid him in paying his fare to the White House and thereby relieve him of the stretch of tedium he has been doing in the Philippines.

Former Governor Earle of Pennsylvania, whom *The New Republic* called the "fat boy," presumably because he was attending to his own chestnuts exclusively, collected three and five per cent in a similar club.

It is necessary merely to make certain substitutions of words since our country is a republic in name, at least, whereas France was a monarchy at the time, to apply with deadly accuracy to our own present, a description of French fiscal policies just before the revolution given by Count Mercy, the Austrian ambassador:

"When waste and unthrift deplete the royal treasury, there arises a cry of despair and of terror. Thereupon the finance minister has recourse to *disastrous measures*,* such as, in the last resort, that of *debasing the gold currency*,* or the *imposition of new taxes*.* Thus for the moment funds are secured, embarrassment is relieved, and, with incredible levity, the authorities leap from gloom to a sense of the utmost security. However, in the last analysis, it is certain that the present government is worse than that of the late king (Louis XV) in respect of disorderliness and extortion. *Such a condition of affairs cannot possibly continue much longer without a catastrophe resulting.*⁶ *

How mournfully like the living present in Americal How dolefully the stock ticker languishes when the government funds are all spent! How surely it quickens its pace as each avalanche of new spending from increased taxes and mounting public debt gathers force! How very similar are the effects of "disastrous measures" everywhere, in the France of Louis XVI, in the America of Franklin Delano Roosevelt!

The deluge which Louis XV had predicted not only was just around the corner but it came without the aid

⁶ Quoted in "Marie Antoinette" by Stefan Zweig (Garden City Publishing Co., Inc.) p. 203.

* Our italics.

of any pump priming or spending to save. On his eighty-second birthday which was celebrated quietly, Morgenthau *pere* is reported to have said "we will be victorious in the great battle we are now fighting against adverse circumstances." What this wise old Jew *really* thinks would be interesting, if he would tell.

Mr. Roosevelt has enjoyed a wider opportunity than the adventurers of 1789. Most of the family, together with relatives, both near and remote, of both Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt seem to be more or less permanently attached to the public payroll which is unimportant, save as a matter of personal ethics and good taste. What is important is that the Revolutionaries of 1789 et seq. exhausted the resources of France. No one, save possibly the esteemed Harry Hopkins, would deny that we are approaching exhaustion.

In 1858 Gladstone asserted before the House of Commons that "decision by majorities is as much an expedient as lighting by gas." Eighty years hence, if tested by results, the former is as much outmoded and obsolete as the latter.

Just a few generations ago when revenge and stupidity joined hands in the United States Congress to widen the suffrage, there was a professed belief that universal education would equip the multitude to use the ballot wisely. Stripped of the assumption founded on hope and speculation, no one would dare to contend today that education has improved the wisdom of the multitude or that the country derives much benefit from popular elections.

Said Gasset in 1930: ⁷ "In the schools, which were such a source of pride to the last century, it has been impossible to do more than instruct the masses in the technique of modern life; it has been found impossible to educate them."

The outstanding facts are that the mass of the population which Gasset calls the "intellectually vulgar" ⁸ of

⁷ Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses" (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 55.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

both sexes are easily herded by scoundrels who make politics a business, or are subject to religious or racial prejudices, or favor the candidate and the party providing the best show. In the 1938 campaign, hill billy and swing bands appeared more persuasive than forensics. The "general welfare" is no longer remembered as a national objective.

No great intelligence is required to understand and approve the opposition of the southern states to the negro's participation in politics. The hypocrisy of the opposition appears in the paradoxical fact that while the negro is barred from the polls, he is counted as a voter in the apportionment laws which fix the number of representatives each state has in the lower house of Congress. The Republicans had many opportunities to do something about the matter. Their own morals are laid bare in their failure to do anything when they had the votes.

Doubtless, it never occurred to old Thad Stevens when he was lashing himself the better to perform in behalf of four million illiterate negroes that they ever would vote any save the Republican ticket. It could not have occurred to him that, comes a New Deal, the sons of Jeff Davis would be at the helm and in full control of ways and means to the more abundant life. Old Thad himself was a symbol of his times. He was a sturdy symbol of hatreds which, unfortunately, endure to our own day and to the detriment of what we once called "the general welfare."

The negro population has increased from four and one-half millions in 1860 to nearly twelve millions in 1930 and nearly one and one-half million negroes live in congested areas in a few cities of seven northern states—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania. Our foreign born population, plus the children of foreign born parents, plus those of mixed parentage number nearly eighteen million.

The enfranchisement of women has made no difference in public morals, politics, or government, save that

it has doubled the number of those unfitted for, but enjoying the privilege of citizenship and the vote, and thereby has doubled the perils which beset our experiment in self-government. While the proportions of qualified and unqualified voters have continued relatively constant since women were given the ballot, the important difference is the *added* mass force of the unqualified majority. In times of stress, this mass force of the unqualified majority in a Democracy is not dependable for discernment or wisdom for which reason it raises up its own contemporary demagogues, who further becloud the issues. The panic of 1873 produced the Greenbackers, the Populists and "Sockless Jerry" Simpson, and the Cleveland panic produced William Jennings Bryan. The 1929 debacle produced the New Deal and a new Messiah of the masses, late of Groton and Harvard.

After nearly one hundred and fifty years of experimenting with popular government, during which the franchise has been extended to the entire population, after fifty years of intensive effort at mass education, we unquestionably have the worst government, national, state and local, in our entire history. At no previous time has misgovernment been so widespread and indifference to government so nearly universal.

The relief contingent, the Neolithic mass, those sustained from the public treasury, and they are the prevailing majority, do not care whether the budget is ever balanced or whether a Klansman or a Communist sits on the Supreme Bench. That part of the population unequipped for anything which requires mental alertness, plus a considerable segment of the population capable of private endeavor but disliking it, are now on the public payroll and have been utterly ruined for any effort in self-support. Ambition has almost disappeared and only death can remove such dependents from the easier and more abundant life of the New Deal.

Not long ago, the statement was made in Congress that two million, more probably three million aliens, are on

the dole being supported by the American taxpayer. Nothing other than a *personal* government, guided by caprice and moved by maudlin indifference to domestic concern would tolerate the practice of providing any support to aliens. Of course, the concern of Mr. Roosevelt is strictly *political* and *personal*, in the relatives of aliens who have the vote.

No man possessed of broad sympathies and a reasonable consideration for the welfare of his fellows can fail to pity the status of persons on relief. But no man can defend the power they exercise at the polls to perpetuate their support at public expense. If they are to be supported at public expense, the decision ought to be made by those persons only who, from the taxes they pay, provide the support. So with the negro! There is no moral reason for denying the ballot to any man because he is a negro and there is no moral reason, and there never was, for giving him the ballot because he is a negro.⁹

If the government of these United States has broken down, if so-called self-government has failed or is about to fail, if our previous proud state of heart and mind is to be yielded up and we fall to the level of a second- or third-rate power, the reasons will be found not in what

⁹ Merely as a sidelight on political thinking within the domain of party organizations, the effect produced upon the Republican State Chairman of New Jersey by the effort of the Women's Rebellion to bar persons on relief and WPA workers from the polls because they are paupers and are not entitled to the ballot under the State Constitution, is illuminating. The effort was viewed with "utter abhorrence" and as an "abominable principle" which "will shock the heart and conscience of charitably disposed men and women everywhere." Mr. Roosevelt quickly responded to the issue of pauperism in politics by disclosing to the correspondents that he had advocated the abolition in Arkansas of its constitutional requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a condition precedent to voting. He also told the correspondents they could print "ladies" in quotation marks when he referred to the members of the Women's Rebellion. Why Mr. Roosevelt who calls himself a "liberal" comes to the aid of paupers in politics was explained by E. Haldeman-Julius, himself a "liberal" (See Chapter XVI) who says "liberalism" is a "natural attitude" among "uneducated and unthinking people." Not every person on relief and not every WPA worker is "uneducated and unthinking" but all "uneducated and unthinking" persons are on the dole or WPA rolls and reasonably dependable merchandise in New Deal elections, as Harry Hopkins has pointed out. When charity, silly sentimentality and partisan strategy are commingled, any appeal to human intelligence is futile.

follows but in what has gone before. In terms of our background, Roosevelt is not a reason. His two administrations expose the vulnerability of our experiment in self-government and the collapse of our party system but at most he is only a symbol of our distress, a symptom of our malady. In his practiced aims at popularity with the masses, Mr. Roosevelt has disclosed repeatedly how very slender is the thread upon which our fate hangs. Of course, Mr. Roosevelt is an alarming symptom of our decadence, of our helplessness in dealing with a grand demagogue. Unfortunately, we may be foolish enough to claim a recovery from the malady if and when the symptom disappears.

We have widened the suffrage on the theory that universal education, compulsory school attendance, gymnasiums, high school diplomas and college degrees are a cure-all for the shortcomings of Democracy. The cure might not have been necessary or it might have worked if applied to the children of our best native stock. We shall never know. We do know that, spread out to the entire population, it has failed. The evidence is that the more we have expended in mass education, the more nearly universal it has become, the more inefficient, wasteful and incompetent has our government become.

The investment bankers¹⁰ laid a sharp axe at the roots

¹⁰ A recent brochure by Ernest M. Sims, "Which Way America?" (published by the Conference of Methodist Laymen) attributes the cause of the Hoover-Roosevelt depression to the World War. Many others do the same. They appear to overlook the fact that following the brief post-war depression of 1920-21, this country enjoyed the greatest revival of industry in all its history. From moderate tax rates, several times reduced during the twenties, the revenues of the National Government were sufficient to discharge more than nine billion dollars of the public debt. In the later years of the twenties, of course, some of the tax was collected from income directly derived from speculation. Generally, however, profit taking was deferred and profits were included with original capital in the house of cards that began to tumble in October, 1929. The pyramiding of values by investment bankers had encouraged speculation in private enterprises and in foreign bonds just as deficit financing by the government today is prolonging speculation in the bonds and short term paper of our own government. When the cataclysm of October, 1929, occurred, it destroyed not only the paper wealth accumulated in speculation but ultimately vast earnings invested in non-speculative enterprises also were swept away in the spread of a defeatist contagion. A parallel

of industrial production under Harding and Coolidge and the New Deal bureaucracy under Roosevelt has continued the sabotage by interference and regimentation on a grand scale. We seem to have been unable to escape the extremes of politics, including the extreme penalties, and have executed a wide swing from the *laissez faire* interlude of Harding and Coolidge, which was dominated by the investment bankers, to the Socialistic sweep of Roosevelt which is already far advanced in a totalitarian regimentation, not only of engineers, entrepreneurs and industrial managers but of the remaining bourgeoisie including, particularly, the bankers.

The Hoover "depression" and the Roosevelt "recession," though the causes are different, fully disclose the damage done when bankers or politicians abandon their self-control and, from whatever motives, tamper with industrial production. The "recession" also discloses what happens to industrial production when engineers, entrepreneurs and industrial managers develop a back-ache.

It has become extremely doubtful whether our magnificent machine economy—the marvel of world history—can survive successive and prolonged disasters, particularly since the second and more devastating of the two is daily growing more acute. It is all the more doubtful since these external onslaughts have been merged into a third, the most withering and deadly of all, the political poison of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Absurd as the proposition is, Socialism and Communism are founded on the theory that society is separable into classes, the divisions of which are marked by sharp boundaries, "Capitalists" and "workers," the idle and the industrious, hence the "class struggle." Biological differences in human beings have been arbitrarily assigned to categories of class or caste though everyone knows that biological differences are not so accommodating as to be of this contagion occurs in the stock market when losses in an overvalued stock to some extent will be duplicated by losses in stocks that are undervalued.

thus managed for the benefit of the postulates of Karl Marx. The American experience is that Capitalists, who cease to work, in three generations revert to shirt sleeves and that workers who continue working become Capitalists. Of the latter, those who fail to become Capitalists would fill no more important niche in any society, however organized. Most absurd of all the Marxian nonsense is the total disregard of the obvious fact that perhaps three-fourths of the population are workers as well as Capitalists, and *vice versa*. All that has been published to create prejudice against "Great American Fortunes" and to smear the "Sixty Families" has some historical value and considerable lure as romance but little significance, otherwise. The huff and the puff heard in the New Deal Committee to investigate "monopolies," in accordance with Lenin's program, has objectives that are strictly personal. The huff and the puff are meant to conceal the personal motives of quick personal gain.

Socialism, that is, the economic socialism of Marx, Engels and Lenin and the American left wing contains no more than half a truth and Communism less than that. The half truth of Socialism consists in those functions of organized society which, under Capitalism, are performed by the state rather than by private enterprise. They represent a compromise by Capitalism and one which has been greatly overdone. Communism is less than half a truth because it presupposes the parity of all human values, that all men will live peacefully, happily and unselfishly in a non-existent bowl of cherries whereas a considerable number are unfitted congenitally to live in a stable. Both presuppose the absolute truth of a proposition that is only partially true, namely, the necessity of the "worker's" contribution to industry. They completely ignore the relevance and materiality of propositions that are inescapable in an era of machine economy. If we were a nation of shepherds or wholly agrarian, either Socialism or Communism might be valid as a system of political economy though precedent is wanting to

prove the validity of either at any stage in the world history. Precedent in every world culture actually proves the contrary.

Socialism and Communism in a machine age stress the importance of the least important factor in production, the "worker." The technocrats who merely intended to show the relation of the machine to unemployment actually proved that the machine is independent of the "worker" and that its manipulation is being carried on with increasing volume in his absence and without his aid. The incentive to supplant the "worker" with the machine arose partially from the distress suffered by the engineer, entrepreneur and industrial manager by reason of their contact with the "worker," and the impediments to production which the "worker" imposed in agitation, strikes and violence.

The most important factors in production are the engineer, who creates the machine, the entrepreneur who obtains the money for its development and the industrial manager who keeps it in operation and gives it commercial value. Interference with the functions of this group by excessive taxation (social security exactions); by restrictions on markets (failure of transportation, changes in tariffs); by excessive "regulation" (bureaucratic investigations, commissions) or encouragement of discontent among "workers" (labor racketeering, New Deal coddling, wages and hours legislation) tend inevitably to deaden their imagination and suppress their will to proceed. The dynamics of intellectual creation and invention and of production generally in an age of machine economy are slowed up in relation to opposition or interference of whatever kind.

While the contribution of the "worker" in an age of machine economy is an unimportant incident to production, the contributions of the engineer, entrepreneur and industrial manager are the indispensable, primary *sine qua non* of industrial life and being. When they fail to function enterprise ceases to carry on and the "worker"

walks the streets in despair or, in the radiant glory of the New Deal, adds his name to the WPA or the relief rolls.

The two Roosevelts were the inevitable products of a "Democracy" in which the "worker" of Marx, Engels and Lenin has the same political power as Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas A. Edison and Henry Ford, only there are many "workers" and few Bells, Edisons and Fords. If the present Mr. Roosevelt were conscious of the relative importance of C. I. O. "workers" and Mr. Ford in a country where political economy is based on the machine, perhaps this country would have escaped the New Deal and Mr. Ford's "co-operation" would be a present fact about which Mr. Roosevelt could boast to the Washington correspondents.

The consummation of the economic program of Socialism and Communism, which is the destruction of our machine economy, called "Capitalism," would bring us to a stalemate in logic—the ineffable logic of the machine—and an impasse in the objectives of orderly living. Progress would be ended and Western Culture finished. Even if we are to arrive eventually at such an impasse, there is no good reason to accelerate the processes of our decadence and thereby hasten the fulfillment of Macaulay's prophecy.

Socialism and Communism will mark the last phase of what we call our civilization because they are founded on a false supposition. They presuppose the existence of human instincts which are not found in Western Culture. The basic instincts of this culture consist in a devotion to the principle of variance in individual fitness and the ethics derived from this variable, that is, the enhancement of individual happiness from individually-owned property. Accumulated possessions may ameliorate the drudgery of the quest. Nevertheless, Socialism and Communism will destroy our civilization when their political strength in a Democracy has become sufficient to replace the dominant ideals and ethics of a culture which has produced the machine, with their own objectives. It is

this threatened victory which, if it cannot be averted, ought to be postponed as long as possible.

When the heart-beats of the engineer and inventor are retarded, when the will-to-do of the entrepreneur and industrial manager is harassed and threatened, when the profit motive which spurs them on is circumscribed or eliminated, the machine deteriorates and the human mind which produced it and keeps it going grows weary and indifferent. There is much deterioration and even greater weariness in every American industrial center. Mr. Roosevelt has observed this phenomenon and complained because Economic Royalists have failed to "co-operate" with his bureaucracy.

Since Mr. Roosevelt is incapable of deep thought, he naturally has overlooked the reason for industry's failure to "co-operate" and has suspected the obtuseness and perversity of human nature which he has tried to control with fireside chats, numerous messages to Congress, primary purges and new laws.

While Mr. Roosevelt has been able to scent "contumacy" afar off, he failed to hear the squeaks of the pump and is not yet aware that the pump leaks.

CHAPTER III

More Background

*Long-time Neglect of Nation's Political Health,
Particularly With Regard to Suffrage and Minorities,
Prepared Country for Orgy of "Spend-
ing to Save" and "Pump Priming."*

"A great man in office may securely rob whole provinces, undo thousands, pill and poll, oppress at his pleasure, flea, grind, tyrannize, enrich himself by the spoils of the Commons, be uncontrollable in his actions, and after all, be recompensed with turgent titles, honored for his good services."—*Robert Burton.*

APPARENTLY, THERE is something eternal in the truth of cycles, parallels and the inertia of human nature. No intelligent person entertains the notion today that human nature will change much in the next two thousand years and for the simple reason that, in essence and variety, human nature is approximately the same as it was when all Gaul was divided in three parts. So many good people so fervently hope the world is growing better that in their zeal, they have fallen into the error of assuming it to be a fact and this error is responsible for many of our current mistakes. We still expect to harvest figs of thistles, get a silk purse from a sow's ear and reap the bread of life when we sow only tares.

In everyone's youth, he is certain many things are true that really are not true. They are the things that only seem to be true. The fact is they are false. The errors of youth probably are due in largest measure to false assumptions about human nature, to beliefs that human nature, human motives are simple, direct and relatively

honest and pure. Age and experience bring on a deeper knowledge of human nature and dissolve the apparent truths and assurances of adolescence.

It is not that human nature is very complex. It is only that youth has not encountered its manifestations, observed the tongue in the cheek of self-trained sophistates, witnessed the hypocrisy of self-interest and felt the sting of disappointment. Only from experience may one know the whole truth because wisdom that may be had from books and personal counsel is wisdom minus eyes to see, ears to hear and a mind to understand. Where there are no eyes there is no sight, where there are no ears there is no sound, though the lightnings flash and the heavens fall. Where there is no mind to understand, human phenomena are meaningless.

The average age of those authors of current outpourings which begin with the assumption that any political, social or economic doctrine not derived from the Russian revolution is unworkable and obsolete, is not available, but this average age must be very low. Either that or the assumption springs from sources that have not been exposed to the world, to the vicissitudes of human experiences. A third explanation may lie in the fact that novelty has superior attraction to mental neophytes.

There is no denying that John L. Lewis, Social Security, Rex Tugwell, the TVA, Harold Ickes, Spending to Save, Hugo Black, Fireside Chats with the Folks and "My Diary" have had their vogue: so also the Big Stick and the Strenuous Life; so also the Mississippi Bubble and the War to End Wars; so also Prohibition; so also the League of Nations and the slaughter of little pigs. But most of these vogues have quite folded up in popularity.

It is no longer illegal to drink a cocktail or *lèse majesté* to question the motives of John L. Lewis; or even unpopular to denounce the social security laws as hoaxes; or to express doubt about whether Rex Tugwell actually made over the share cropper, the hill billy and our poor white trash; or to expose the TVA as a monumental deception;

or to thumb one's nose at Harold Ickes; or to advocate thrift openly; or to discuss the material in Hugo Black's nightshirts; or to turn off the radio on Roosevelt and emit a Bronx cheer at Eleanor's Diary.

In the no very distant future, it again may be perfectly safe to assert and proclaim the truth of

1. Whatever goes up has got to come down;
2. The whole is greater than any of its parts;
3. Those who dance must pay the fiddler;
4. The poor always ye have with you;
5. Supply and demand control prices;
6. What is valuable is not new, and what is new is not valuable;
7. No laws, however stringent, can make the idle industrious, the thriftless provident, or the drunken sober;
8. A politician inclines to graft as naturally as a cat to climb a tree and the more successful he is the greater the inclination;
9. No man ever hoisted himself higher from pulling at his own boot straps and no spendthrift ever increased his bank balance from a fresh orgy of extravagance.
10. Two plus two are four.

Of the forty-eight states several are so small they have very few representatives in Congress. Of the larger states having as many as ten representatives in Congress, ordinarily no one has more than a single member of any importance as an individual or as a legislator. The unexceptionable member of Congress is no more than a professional politician.

More than half the members of the last Congress were educated for the law. The failure of the American, state and local bar associations to function with respect to the "reorganization" of the Washington government is thus explained. Their feeble opposition in the court-packing fight is also explained. Members of Congress exerted sufficient influence on the bar associations to curb their

natural antipathy to interference with the highest court in the country.

In excess of seventy members of the last Congress either had no vocation except politics or failed to mention it in the Congressional Directory. The only achievement claimed by the New Deal boss in Pennsylvania, who is also a Senator, is that he is unmarried.

Many of the members of Congress manage to increase the family income and reduce expenses in Washington by employing relatives in clerical capacities, by taking "campaign contributions" and accepting gratuities from constituents and by remaining adamant and uncommunicative, pending the chance of a free meal. The failure of Congress to react to Son Jimmie and nepotism in the Roosevelt family is thus explained. Lobbyists stationed in Washington and those occupied with legislation in the forty-eight state capitals provide many free meals and much free entertainment. Generally speaking, service in Congress is regarded by the members as a kind of game to be won only if the taxpayers are completely fooled. A successful career in Congress is founded on human capacity for cleverness in practicing deceit on a wide front. A term in the Senate is the prize de luxe for deceit of first magnitude.

In the twenties, the administrations of Harding and Coolidge had the benefit of favorable conditions, with the creation of which, neither President had anything to do. That Coolidge could have postponed the debacle of 1929, no one seriously doubts. That he could have prevented it is at least debatable. To have postponed the crash in stock market prices would have necessitated the administration of a sedative to the speculative mania. Before the country got out of hand, there were many things which could have been accomplished to check the mania, by a mere nod of the Coolidge head. But Mr. Coolidge was having a very pleasant season and temperamentally he was not constituted to make motions with his head or hands which involved any loss of personal com-

fort. He was laconic of speech and grudging of effort.

Not that many men in his place would have acted differently! Few men would have dared apply the brakes to otherwise easy credit. Coolidge may have lacked both the interest in and the courage to perform any such bold act. His natural impulses, insofar as he possessed any impulses whatever, were to let human nature take its course without interference and without restraint. There is some evidence, however, that he was annoyed by the reckless extravagance of the country, as for examples, his remark about visiting the shoemaker for half-soles and his own meticulous thrift. Perhaps, he thought people ought to control their own foolishness.

In 1932, Hoover pleaded world conditions as an excuse for what had happened. There was no admission that the unchecked speculation which went on during the administration of his predecessor was a contributing factor. Such an admission would have been a reflection upon a Republican President and that was not considered "cricket."

It is not to be expected that candidates for office will ever tell the whole truth. It is not considered "good politics" to do so, the reason being that the voters are unable to recognize the truth when they hear it told. The crafty politician, the one who has had experience with the multitude, very well knows the limitations of the multitude and from experience fashions his appeal to match these limitations. Politicians are evasive, insincere and unreliable because so large a proportion of the voters are incompetent, ignorant and gullible. Mr. Roosevelt has come nearer than any politician of modern times in guessing just how incompetent, ignorant and gullible the voters are. Knowing very well that the incompetent, ignorant and gullible far outnumber the intelligent voters and having mastered a technique in appealing to the greater number, he has finally narrowed his appeal almost exclusively to the multitude, as a class. He appears to be groping for improved methods to arouse their

hatreds, to array them in mass voting strength against an intelligent minority.

In America, the latter day politician ordinarily has no business of his own and no hope of any since he lacks the essential realism a business career demands. He is incapable of a trade because he lacks the necessary industry. His sound knowledge is in inverse ratio to his garrulity and eloquence because of which, and in proportion as he poses and pretends, he is able to charm the multitude whose heads are as empty as his own. His morals are founded on the necessities of each separate hour for which reason he is equally able to hold with the hare and run with the hound. If he manages to occupy a seat in Congress, or to get into the Cabinet, or *mirabile dictu*, into the White House, he will thereupon and thereafter enjoy the advantage of having the last word in every controversy, which is more important than the wisdom of a seer.

It is no secret that the successful politician is the one who correctly anticipates the wishes of the voters, who never excels them in righteousness or surpasses them in unselfishness. The idealist is rarely elected to public office. If this happens by accident his early repudiation is assured.

Those humorous references to party platforms, as means whereby parties get into office, rather than objectives to be attained after they have won, have become a kind of major tragedy. Our party system of politics is shot through with much similar humor that finally has backfired on our economic structure. Want of sincerity, straddling, evasion, meaningless jargon, pandering to idiotic minorities, flamboyant gestures to the vanity of particular groups, absence of common honesty in party platforms instance the degradation of political parties and the resultant low state of public morals.

Apparently the country was in a mood for an orgy of spending after the lean days of Mr. Hoover, the ex-mining promoter. No better choice of a spendthrift for President

could have been made in 1932. Governor Herbert H. Lehman was occupied for six years in extinguishing the one hundred million dollars deficit left him as a souvenir by Roosevelt when the latter moved from Albany to Washington.

Prior to 1932, Mr. Roosevelt's private spending had been limited largely to remittances received from his father's estate. His record at Albany as a spendthrift seemed highly satisfactory and he, therefore, was entrusted with greater opportunities. As is often said of the home town boy, Mr. Roosevelt has certainly made good. That he has fulfilled every expectation of the back streets where the votes are found has been proved. According to Doctor Gallup in a recent pin cushion survey, national bankruptcy, Hugo Black's appointment, the breathing spell for business, and the "recession" have lost him personally very little support. A banker in Gallipolis, Ohio, and the *Chicago Tribune* have announced publicly that they will not support Roosevelt for a third term. Otherwise, according to Dr. Gallup, the Roosevelt popularity is not much diminished.

Mr. Roosevelt is a natural and inevitable consequence of the failure of Mr. Hoover to survive the do-nothing policies of Mr. Coolidge. Promises of two chickens in every pot and two cars in every garage plus the repeated assurances after 1929 that prosperity was just around the corner left the masses a bit groggy. They were still willing to believe a quack but they wanted a new performer. They got one in Mr. Roosevelt.

If the Roosevelts, Franklin D., Eleanor, Jimmie, Elliott, "Sistie" and "Bustie," John and Junior are presently anathemas to those Economic Royalists who are embittered by the New Deal, they have only to recall their indifference to the merry-go-round of the twenties when the Anti-Saloon League and the Ku Klux Klan were at the throttle and when both common sense and common decency were disregarded in polite circles. Or, they may recall their indifference to the whims of the late Mr.

Penrose when his choice for the Presidency was announced to the bigwigs in a Chicago hotel room during the summer of 1920, thereby assuring the scandals of the Harding administration. The Economic Royalists might have saved themselves from some present agonies by earlier attention to the political health of the nation.

With few exceptions, our presidents have been men of third- and fourth-rate ability, a fact well understood by most party precinct committeemen. The party system has made the election of very able men all but impossible. But our Presidents have been as much devoted to the welfare of the country as they have been generally lacking in great wisdom. We have not heretofore had to suffer from the suspicion of their good intentions and their undivided loyalty. Even Wilson who was our first Internationalist and who allowed his vanity and his egotism full play in the later years was perhaps an ardent patriot at heart. The country was saved from his most serious mistakes by the United States Senate.

Mr. Hoover arrived in the White House via the billboard and such an advertising campaign as the slogan experts use to make the public tooth-paste conscious, all of which was then new to American politics. It is true that the ex-mining promoter failed to survive the accumulated mischief which began with the lucky times of Harding and Coolidge but it is only fair to say now, while he did little good, he also did no real harm. His troubles were inherited.

While Mr. Wilson may have aspired to the position of head man of the League of Nations with which the Senate would have nothing to do, there is no evidence that he aspired to become a domestic dictator. Hoover was too busy making predictions of the coming boom, with opposition in his own party¹ to have had time to think of anything later than 1932. Coolidge attached too much

¹ Instigated principally by Charles Michelson, a Jew, operating out of Democratic National Headquarters and who developed a technique of Disraelian scope and effect that destroyed temporarily what was left of the Republican party.

importance to his afternoon nap to "choose to run" while Harding not only had no thought of becoming a dictator, he never wanted to be president in the first place.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, however, is no such man. Aside from straining at dictatorial power and authority, there is some evidence that he has dynastic ambitions, apparent in the vicarious activity of Son Jimmie and Eleanor, in the presence of Roosevelt striplings at White House press conferences and in the marriages, engagements and divorces of the other children since March 4, 1933. If the daughter's new husband was unable to make an impression on the *Chicago Tribune*, all together they were able to annex William Randolph Hearst. Other marriages have resulted in substantial attachments to well known bank rolls and most of the family seem to be well fortified against the current "recession" and subsequent financial disasters. The martial fulminations of the President should be well received in Wilmington, Delaware, where the American munitions industry is owned and so ably managed by the DuPont family, to which the Roosevelts contributed a son.

Under the scheme of making "grants in aid," Congress for more than a half century has been invading the domain of strictly local affairs and, as a consequence of this "aid," exercising an ever increasing control over local government.

"Grants in Aid" of strictly local functions but embracing objectives of national concern have gradually increased in scope and cost. The principle has been applied within state boundaries in the distribution of educational funds. Monies collected for education from the more productive areas is distributed for use on the basis of school population by established state agencies. The states and the nation have levied heavy taxes on urban industry to build roads for the hill billy. The New Deal has expanded this principle to apply to a wide variety of Federal undertakings, most of which are absurd but the New Deal has added an altogether new objective in the

application of the principle, an objective not heretofore considered by the stupid statesmen who make our laws, namely, the *redistribution of wealth*.

In other words, the eleemosynary motives which prompted the *haves* to share some of the good things of life with the *have-nots* in the first place, have been converted into a permanent and fixed obligation to be robbed of all their property, even stripped of all means of continued production.

To perpetuate the many diabolical schemes originated by the New Deal on behalf of the organized and systematized robbery of surviving taxpayers, the radio is being used for propaganda produced and presented by substantially every agency created by the New Deal, and, at the taxpayers' expense. Never before has the victim been required to provide the rope with which he was to be hanged.

So long as this waste was circumscribed by reason, the taxpayers were able to pay the bill and got used to the practice. Occasionally, they grinned good-naturedly when reminded of the practice, as they might do when the cook was caught pilfering from the ice box. If they howl now, their vocal outburst is brought on, not by reason of any difference in kind of legislation, though the difference exists, but only by reason of the vast difference in quantity and the diabolical magnitude of the sums appropriated. The members of Congress in the nineties were utterly unschooled in legislative log rolling and graft when compared with Mr. Roosevelt's trained seals on Capitol Hill. Taxpayers who were accustomed to see the seals toss a log from snout to snout suddenly have found them able to handle an entire forest with the greatest of ease.

The complete want of common sense in government and want of the application of simple principles of business are illustrated by the history of our post office department. There is no reason whatever for the annual deficit in operating the mail service and there never has been any

sufficient excuse for the deficit. The Government enjoys a monopoly of the field and should charge enough to make the service self-sustaining. Postal rates may go up or down but the politicians consistently manipulate the department patronage to produce an annual deficit, the only characteristic of the service which remains constant. Rural free delivery of mails is maintained in the South over many impassable roads at large expense and from which all the mail collected and delivered in a year would be less than the volume handled in a single day at one thriving northern town.

The past five years, as an epoch, are incredible. The country can no longer pretend. It is overwhelmed with a deluge of bad example in high place, of such a multitude of transparent deceptions that the cheek no longer hides the tongue. It is unnecessary. Impudence and insolence are adequate protective devices when a nation slumbers.

In retrospect, Roosevelt's election, especially his reelection, are incredible as facts unrelated to the political system under which we live. When interpreted in relation to this system, including the mass herding of great portions of the population, the universality of the suffrage and the proved distortion of mass thinking and mass morals, Roosevelt's two major triumphs can be understood. The mass herds of negroes, foreign-born and their children who live together in congested areas in our larger cities plus an unhealthy number of ignorant, gullible and irresponsible natives wield an influence in elections widely out of proportion to their qualifications as citizens. Roosevelt is a product of these megalopolitan herds and we shall have more Roosevelts unless we do something about the herds.

CHAPTER IV

Lord Macaulay Forecasts New Deal

*Mr. Roosevelt Goes Buggy Riding with Famous
Historian and To Please the "Folks" Seizes the
Reins but Accurate Judgment Saves
Prophet from Disaster.*

"Is there no hope? the sick man said;
The silent doctor shook his head."—*John Gay.*

LORD MACAULAY'S famous letter to an American citizen, which the daring Mr. Roosevelt tried to distort to his personal advantage, was written May 23, 1857, four years before the beginning of the American Civil War. Lord Macaulay had little faith in the permanence of democracies, that is, majority rule, which he defined as rule by "the poorest and most ignorant part of society."

"Distress everywhere," he said, "makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million, while another cannot get a full meal. . . . It is quite plain that your government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority. . . . On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, a strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagogue ranting about tyranny of capitalists. . . . I seriously apprehend that you will . . . do things which will prevent prosperity from returning . . . when society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar

or Napoleon will seize the reigns of government with a strong hand or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your country by your own institutions."

Only the complete realization of the prophecy is yet to be fulfilled, and that is foreshadowed in the striking similarity of conditions precedent, as described by Lord Macaulay and those now prevalent. The "demagogue ranting about tyranny of capitalists" not only has appeared but is in control of the country's destinies. It is quite unnecessary to present the detail, quite useless to quote any of the ranting. While the ranting has persisted, the ravages of the depression have scarcely touched the demagogue's family. The ruling family have struggled along during all the weary years with an average of \$3,947,340.00¹ annually from the public treasury. The amount expended in excess of the President's salary of \$75,000.00 and son Jimmie's salary of \$10,000.00 as dominant member of the Secretariat, if paid a royal family, would support it in befitting elegance. The merger of the New Deal and the munitions business, in the marriage of one of the Roosevelt sons to a DuPont heiress, no doubt was intended to protect the family for the long pull, a kind of hedge against 1940 and against prospects of either peace or war.

Our disintegration as a nation probably dates from the close of the Civil War. Landmarks of the disintegration in its early stages were the enfranchisement of four million negroes, the carpet bag government in the southern states, which trained a legion of scalawags in politics for revenue only and whose ways have been handed down from generation to generation and the free use of the

¹ "Our Uneconomic Royalist, The High Cost of Dr. Roosevelt" by Blair Bolles, *The American Mercury*, March, 1938.

"bloody shirt" in presidential campaigns as late as those of Benjamin Harrison.

The slogans of the campaigns since Harrison, absurd as they sound now, epitomize the waning intelligence of majorities. In 1896, it was the "full dinner pail" versus "16 to 1" and in 1900 "the constitution follows the flag." The first Roosevelt won in 1904 because he was a superior showman and had an inept opponent and Taft in 1908 because the first Roosevelt made him the heir apparent. Wilson had the benefit of the Taft-Roosevelt feud and was elected for the second term in 1916 because "he kept us out of war." The Democrats lost to Harding and a "return to normalcy" because Wilson did not keep us out of war after all. In 1924 the country was offered the chance to "keep cool with Coolidge" and in 1928 it was the "great engineer" who had "fed the starving Belgians."

In the meantime, the spread of primary elections, the popular election of United States Senators, woman's suffrage, Prohibition and the Ku Klux Klan drove most persons with any self-respect completely out of politics. The politics of the country passed to the control of organized and irresponsible minorities, each with an axe to grind.

The character of our electorate determines the nature of our politics. Political bosses in America are the inevitable creatures of what Tolstoy called the "elemental life of the swarm" and what we have called variously the Neolithic mass, the hapless herd, the unintelligent majority. So long as the level of intelligence within this swarm, this mass, this herd, this majority is static, and so long as we depend upon this intelligence for guidance, we shall have no different political leadership. The political boss cuts the most bizarre figure in the melting pots of our great industrial centers where hordes of aliens have been settling for half a century.

Huey Long was an anomaly in Southern politics and so is the state of Florida lately resettled and now largely

populated from the Northern states. It is not an accidental bit of good fortune that the Democrats of the South are less boss ridden than both parties elsewhere. The reason lies in the more stable character of its population. Now and again in its choice of elective officials, good taste has gone to the discard in the South but generally the South has not been infected with political and economic heresies to the same degree as other sections. John L. Lewis, Rex Tugwell, *The New Republic*, the Roosevelts and Ben Cohen have made little progress in behalf of the "class struggle" of Karl Marx in old Dixie. Nor is it an oversight of John Garner that the South has been sluggish in its fervor for negro housing projects. Housing projects are unnecessary to win votes that don't exist.

The last wounds of "reconstruction" are nearly healed and the political dilemma in which the South finds itself now, as a consequence of persisting in the virtue and worth of a party label, afford some hope that the "solid South" will terminate with the New Deal. Mr. Roosevelt has introduced Dixie to many strange gods and labels are about to lose their meaning in Richmond, Atlanta, Memphis and Dallas.

Since the reformer's mind is normally superficial and he is accustomed to confuse cause and effect and optimism with analysis he generally expects, and in any event hopes, to change prevailing conditions with a new law, whereas one law is equally as futile as another to the extent that the working material in politics remains the same. The working material in this country remains the same, one year with another, save perhaps that from the infiltration of each new horde of alien "citizens," and the fallacies taught them by our pedagogues, the working material constantly deteriorates. There will be no wisdom in politics and little in government as long as persons with no property and who pay no substantial taxes, persons being supported directly or indirectly at public expense, recently arrived aliens without any con-

ception of the duties of a citizen, herds of any race or foreign country who lack the elementary qualifications to be a citizen have equal privileges at the polls with the responsible, the intelligent, the productive portion of the population.

The second Roosevelt won as a consequence of the failure of three Republican administrations to make any move or take any step to curb the scandalous swindles of the twenties promoted by investment bankers. The Republicans coasted to defeat and the near-annihilation of their party in 1932 and 1936, in apparent helplessness.

The elections in 1932 and 1936 gave the country a new generation of politicians in national, state and local office who have practiced the most diabolical chicanery in notoriously open defiance of standards, already below the level of good morals, good manners, and good taste. That the 1938 elections temporarily will improve the moral tone of politics may be admitted.

So long as the customers at the public crib have one of their own kind in possession of the keys to the crib, they do not intend to switch custodians or pay taxes or do any work they can avoid. In a country where everybody has a "secret" vote; where the New Deal is so popular that one citizen may vote several times in the same election, the prevailing custom in Kansas City, now and again there is a wavering between two impostors, but when only one is offered at the polls, instinct is an adequate guide.

By the middle of 1933, it was apparent to any save the most hopeless simpleton that Mr. Roosevelt had no plan whatever for curing our national maladies, that witchcraft and voodooism and black magic were his sole remedies. But ten thousand cults founded on the most palpable quackery flourish throughout the land and so also does Doctor Roosevelt.

But we already suffer from the "general spoilation," from "national bankruptcy," from "a ruinous load of taxation laid on the rich for the purpose of supporting the poor in idleness," as described by Lord Macaulay.

Nor is the present widespread alarm likely to lead to any effective remedies. A large majority still expect us, with the aid of Providence, upon which we are wont to lean heavily, and Republicans elected in 1938, to muddle through and out of our present difficulties. No such assurance is justified. There is too much evidence in history that Providence and good sense walk out together.

We have spent, over and above what we have collected, in five years, nearly twenty billion dollars. The spending has been instigated and directed by one chosen of the people who solemnly promised in specific terms the doing of specific acts, diametrically opposed to his actual performance. That he was re-elected in 1936 shows that truth and honesty are not primarily important to majorities. The evidence is rather that broken promises are highly regarded. In spite of the spending, it appears that unemployment has scarcely been affected.

To the disadvantage of art, which would be concerned merely with depicting men and events as they appear to the artist, and to the possible credit of reform, which is concerned with changing the status of men and events, something ought to be done about the Hon. Al Capone if the Huns and Vandals of the New Deal are to go unpunished. He has been doing a long stretch at Alcatraz for the violation of a single law, for an offense which hardly injures society at all. The Huns and Vandals of the New Deal, on the other hand, disturb and disrupt orderly living in every state of the Union. Through many vicious laws and commissions, through a never-ending series of exactions and impositions, they prey on society generally. Their offenses are felt by the humblest taxpayer. These Huns and Vandals, these barbarians of the twentieth century, have been permitted to plunder and lay waste the whole country while a lone racketeer languishes in prison for failure to pay off the barbarians.

Solemn declarations by the National Association of Manufacturers of an intent hereafter to co-operate with the New Deal, made at the convention in December,

1938, have no more permanent force and effect than the guaranties of personal liberty contained in the last Russian constitution. Co-operation between industry and the New Deal is no more possible than brotherly love between an oil magnate and a Mexican Communist. Hence, it is that space writers in the field of political economy mix their wishing and their hollow assumptions with fact and logic to the prejudice of sound conclusions. Only because Walter Lippmann is afflicted with a chronic faith in New Deal purposes does he conclude that "the recent elections showed clearly that the people support them (New Dealers) on underlying issues." The affliction is further evidenced by Lippmann's naïve belief in "the general recognition" that the "inquiry into 'monopoly' is in principle desirable." Finally, the hopelessness of Lippmann's affliction is established in his irrelevant discovery that the New Dealers' "prejudice against business" has abated somewhat. Lippmann was writing on December 14, 1938, scarcely one month after a general election in which a host of New Deal candidates were liquidated.

Since Miss Dorothy Thompson turned her face from the domestic scene to the international, she seems to be using the same forked stick as Lippmann to divine the state of domestic psychology. "The recent elections," she said on December 17, 1938, "indicated that the major objectives of the New Deal have become accepted as a part of the American social philosophy." The "profound discontent," she thought, is limited to "methods and procedures." To circumscribe and limit the purposes that moved forty million voters to begin the liquidation of New Dealers in the 1938 elections, as both Mr. Lippmann and Miss Thompson do, invades the realm of the supernatural and may qualify them as astrologers but will add nothing to their reputations as columnists.

Miss Thompson and Mr. Lippmann would do well to remember that election returns are apt to be misinterpreted and that such a fascinating political chameleon as

Mr. Roosevelt misjudged the scope of his mandate from the 1936 returns. Finally, if the domestic psychology since the 1938 elections happens to be grounded in error the present state of American social philosophy, in such event, might make one last struggle to correct itself. Perhaps some truth remains in Denis W. Brogan's observation² that "the man in the street has more sagacity than his critics allow for; he can smell a rat (if not always a red herring) pretty quickly." Or, when the labyrinth of our new bureaucracy is infested with vermin there is no need by the man in the street to depend upon the stench of just one rat.

² "The Prospects for Democracy" by Denis W. Brogan, an essay on "Dictatorship in the Modern World" (The University of Minnesota Press) p. 178.

CHAPTER V

Labor Racket in High Gear

*Harvard Accent Proves Welcome and Helpful
to Alien Thugs of John L. Lewis Who, in a Later
Phase, Enters the Tents of Prophets and
Is Disturbed by What He Sees.*

"Logical consequences are the scarecrows of fools and the beacons of wise men."—*Thomas H. Huxley.*

WHEN THE Pharisees undertook to maneuver Jesus of Nazareth into a declaration of treasonable design, he courageously asserted "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." Two thousand years later a President of the United States, the Governors of at least two states and a numerous *fournée* of their cohorts twirled their thumbs in silent approval when ruffians led by John L. Lewis seized and held property which did not belong to them and which has a value greater than that of the whole Roman Empire. After a distressing interval the mass intelligence did conclude that perhaps Christ was right, that these ruffians should yield up Caesar's property. The delay enabled Lewis to fasten his racket on the property so that sufficient tribute to support him and his associated racketeers in regal opulence may be collected for an indefinite period.

Wages, hours and working conditions are of remote importance. What is important in the Labor racket is the pay-off and nobody complains much about intimidation, bombing, bribery, illegal strikes, riots or violence. It is futile to complain. The labor racketeers have found

it possible to create and maintain a state within a state, i.e., a state of anarchy.

Nobody has yet stressed adequately the palpable folly of trying to raise wages when so many wage earners are out of work yet this has been the fixed policy of the New Deal from the beginning. Perhaps the failure to recognize the folly has been due to a natural unwillingness to admit facts that are unpleasant. The result of the New Deal policy is that those who had any work have received (or did receive) a higher rate of wages and those who had no work ate out of the public granary, and both groups have been supported by productive industry. The double burden finally has broken the back of industry. Mr. Roosevelt, when he is compelled to refer to this unpleasant consequence of his magic, still calls it a "recession."

The determination of both Hoover and Roosevelt to maintain a predepression wage level in a depression when unemployment is widespread and the determination of Roosevelt to add thereto a program of social reforms are lacking in elemental good sense. The unemployment problem alone was perhaps too serious for either to solve. The added burdens of a false wage standard and an extra load of taxation laid on the weakened structure of industry, the renewed strength of which was the sole promise of recovery, cannot be explained in terms of sane and mature reason.

The origin of this policy might be found in a nursery since, in these policies, there is a suggestion of children playing with blocks. The Mexican Indian, on his way to market with a great burden on his back will add a heavy stone simply because he is accustomed to carry a given weight, but Mr. Roosevelt, particularly, has had no training for great burdens.

Nine out of ten annual reports to stockholders for the last fiscal year told the same sad story of higher wages and heavier taxes. Higher wages were paid during a year when more than 10,000,000 wage earners had little or no work of any kind. These higher wages were forced on

industry by the New Deal to the prejudice and detriment of industry which was thereby prevented from earning a reasonable return, or, in most cases, any return whatever for stockholders. Not only was industry compelled to bear a greatly increased wage burden but also a greatly increased tax burden to support New Deal extravagances.

A typical company which, in the last fiscal year, failed by \$1,080,442.67 to earn its bond interest, made this report to its stockholders: "The increase in operating expenses were due principally to a higher wage *rate* * and heavier taxes. Operating wages were \$2,308,257.00 greater than last year and Social Security taxes were \$594,294.00 higher."

One of the receivers of this company, the Chicago Railways, has done very well in feathering his own nest in late years and naturally he is a New Dealer. Mr. Roosevelt conferred with him at length on October 5, 1937, when he came to Chicago to dedicate the new bridge and to rattle the sabres so that the country would get its mind off his odd appointment of the very odd Mr. Hugo Black to be a justice of the Supreme Court.

Organized Labor is completely out of hand today. In the cities, where its numerical strength lies, its leadership is affiliated with local political racketeers, to the discomfiture and disgrace of the community. This is the rule and not the exception. In Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit, New York City, San Francisco, in every important city of the country, active Communists, "Liberals," Socialists, aliens and ex-convicts occupy key positions. Assassination is the only means whereby they may be removed from office. While this practice is common, neither Organized Labor nor the community gains anything from the death of one thug when his place is promptly taken by another. The alliance between the hoodlums of Organized Labor and Politics is so close, it is impossible to interfere with either, except by destroying both.

Business and industry have become accustomed, if not

* Our italics.

wholly reconciled, to blackmail as the *sine qua non* of an amicable relationship. Now and again extortion overleaps itself and there is a conviction in some court but such cases are rare.

What fertile ground for the philosophy of the New Deal, the More Abundant Life! Labor racketeers adopted the Harvard accent by instinct. It was the most unexpected and welcome windfall in the whole history of sabotage, blackmail and extortion. It made these common practices appear respectable and worthy. This was particularly so when personified and reinforced on the air waves, with "MY FRIENDS."

It is not so important, the struggle between craft unionism and industrial unionism. What is important is a bit of common decency in both. But this is altogether too much to expect so long as any breath is left in Mr. Roosevelt and new promises of Utopia are whispered in the ears of "My Friends."

That railroad workers who lose their jobs because of government-dictated railroad consolidations are to receive annuities or lump-sum compensation for doing nothing (only slightly less than they do now) is the New Deal promise. The promise, however, fails to reveal who is to provide the money. The railroads are bankrupt so that it is reasonable to suppose this will be a new excuse for additional taxes. Or, is it the intent that railroad workers shall take the will for the deed, "listen with credulity to the whispers of fancy, and pursue with eagerness the phantoms of hope"?

Railroad workers, by reason of the death grip of their unions on the major transportation industry, are notoriously overpaid for what they do. If those who lose their jobs are unable to live on what they have saved, it might not be amiss to suggest that they do what any other person would do under the same circumstances, find another job.

The railroads are already overmanned, so much so that trainmen appear ludicrous in their efforts to appear more

important than the necessities of their jobs warrant. The solemnity in which two, often three, able-bodied trainmen collect tickets and confer with each other from time to time is impressive only as good posing and straight-faced pretense. One might suppose from their great seriousness that they were about to purchase the railroad or to be attacked by Indians.

Typical of the mental processes of Organized Labor's leadership in these days of the New Deal, when perverted by personal greed and human selfishness, was the lament of Labor's Tamerlane, John L. Lewis, that all is not as it should be in the Republic. The Lord of Samarkand finally entered the tents of the prophets and was overwrought by what he saw darkly, through a glass. The country would be less belabored had his vision been better in the spring of 1937 when his alien desert riders were shaking down our native industrialists. Lewis belongs to the cash-and-carry corps of political "liberals" whose faith and trust depend upon more laws. He seems to be entirely innocent of the acute shortage of printer's ink brought on by the deluge of laws, orders, proclamations and propaganda of the New Deal. He was distressed because Congress "for months past had failed to devise and enact a single statute." That, however, was before the enactment of the wages and hours bill and the current spending orgy.

The difficulty with the Lewis prophecies is the time element; that he sees only now what many prophets saw long ago, so long ago that if he had had equal vision, the drift "with terrifying and deadly sureness to the never, never realm of financial bankruptcy, economic collapse and human tragedy" might have been averted. The language is that of Lewis. If he were now possessed of the vision of the earlier prophets, he would know how futile is any statute, except one to repeal those laws he has heretofore successfully demanded in return for approximately \$600,000.00 he invested in Mr. Roosevelt's last campaign.

In the spring of 1937, had the Lord of Samarkand put the same emphasis upon "the right of capital to have a reasonable return," as he did after a year's pillage by his own spear men, "labor's right to live" might have some vital meaning. He estimated current unemployment at 13,000,000 and "steadily increasing," the present number approximating the number out of work when, just after his election in 1932, the gentleman from Hyde Park scoffed at Hoover's "baby."

If the ghost of Samuel Gompers were able to address his living successors in the labor movement, what a philippic he would deliver! In his long career as President of the American Federation of Labor many regrettable acts were committed in the name of Organized Labor but Gompers personally was a symbol of decency and possessed of much wisdom. It is unbelievable that the political conniving and irresponsible leadership of Madame Perkins, John L. Lewis and David Lasser would receive any blessing from Gompers. He steadfastly opposed legislative interference with wages and he never ceased to advocate caution in the use of the strike. Although Gompers knew his way among politicians, he always appeared wary in dealing with them and seemed loath to become involved in party intrigues, or even in political intrigues. His ways were forthright and straightforward. Gompers proceeded on the cautious and eminently safe basis that what legislatures could grant, they also could take away and he preferred that organizations of workers should bargain privately with employers to establish conditions of employment.

Since Gompers knew that any fixed minimum wage with relentless certainty tends to become the maximum wage he unceasingly opposed the friendly offices of demagogues to shoulder this two-edged sword in behalf of Organized Labor, for any reason whatsoever. He would be dumbfounded to find himself among the present labor racketeers, either *in* or *outside* Congress. The American Federation of Labor, which he guided so long and with

such rare judgment, in 1915 defeated a resolution of Socialist origin indorsing legislation for the eight-hour day and reaffirmed a resolution of the 1914 convention of directly opposite purport:

"The American Federation of Labor, as in the past, again declares that the question of the regulation of wages and hours should be undertaken through trade union activity, and not to be made subjects of laws through legislative enactment. It cannot be overemphasized that the wage-earners must depend upon their economic organizations for securing a shorter work day. . . . To secure a shorter work day by any other method makes it necessary for the wage-earners to delegate to other authorities other things which vitally affect them, and which constitute a limitation upon their activities and their rights, *and thus finally lessen their freedom.*" *

Fifteen years later, Everett Dean Martin wrote,¹ "When a populace becomes indifferent to its freedom, it begins to lose it," but this was after Samuel Gompers had left the stage and three years before Mr. Roosevelt and John L. Lewis were assigned major parts in the New Deal-C.I.O. drama.

Lewis is a more nauseous hypocrite than Adolph Hitler. For twenty years he has surpassed Hitler in his Nazi-Fascist domination of the United Mine Workers. There is no more democracy in the United Mine Workers or the C.I.O. than Hitler has tolerated in Germany and even less decency. Joseph Stalin and the Bolsheviks present the closest resemblance to Lewis in their tyranny and brutality.

Samuel Gompers was a realist. As such, he had a very accurate notion of the limitations of the material with which he had to deal in the labor movement. He accepted human nature as he found it and seemed reconciled to slow progress toward an objective. Apparently,

* Our italics.

¹ "Liberty" by Everett Dean Martin (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 4.

he had no confidence in the permanence of achievements reached by a short cut.

Oswald Spengler after assembling nearly one thousand pages of learning which touches the entire morphology of human existence, in the next to the last page of his monumental contribution to human knowledge and as a conditioning agent of the cosmos to ward off chaos, timidly prescribes Ethical Socialism, which, as defined by Spengler, is as far removed from the applied Socialism of Mr. Roosevelt and associated wool gatherers as Nietzsche's Superman from a ward heeler of Tom Pendergast or a sit-down-striker of John L. Lewis.

Spengler is more interesting as a historian of world cultures than he is convincing as a metaphysician. His prophecy of the world's tramp, tramp to Caesarism, contained in the last paragraph of the second volume, is a logical conclusion from the facts he has marshalled but his faith in so-called *Ethical Socialism* as a by-pass to avert Caesarism seems voodooistic.

It is possible to agree with Spengler in the objectives of so-called Ethical Socialism and even to indorse its imperatives but as a practical matter Ethical Socialism will have to be catalogued as a "remainder" in the culture which, as the case may be, we now enjoy or from which we now suffer.

Mr. Roosevelt's contribution to the confusion of rugged individualism, i.e., Capitalism, may be freely admitted but he has continuously surpassed himself in the prejudice he has incited against both Fascism and Socialism. His wanton and rakish extravagance contemporaneous with biennial elections, his pressure on many economic groups which is bitterly resented and the tricky nature of all his political operations hardly qualify him for the role of an acceptable dictator and, at the outset, Caesar will be less popular because of him. His experiments in applied Socialism, TVA, negro housing, resettlement, Passamaquoddy and the Florida ship canal have

not added to the prestige of Karl Marx, or the Marxian program. Final and complete impotence of orderly production to which Mr. Roosevelt has made a major contribution, as a corollary of confiscatory taxation, may please enrolled party Communists but it will gain no converts. It will produce a Caesar, but his surname will not be Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt more nearly resembles Cicero who, Gasset says² was "engaged his life long in making things confused."

Ever since the publication of "Das Kapital," the theme note of the Socialist has been the exploitation of the worker by the capitalist whereas, in the new order both are being exploited by the politician, who also may be a labor racketeer. The carcasses of worker and entrepreneur are depended upon daily by the hungry lions of the bureaucracy, jointly collected by Roosevelt and Lewis, and whose appetite grows by what it feeds on.

If one pauses to reflect upon the "liberal" and pseudo-Marxian formulae of other days, panaceas that are kindred to the congeries of the New Deal, it is impossible to escape a rising nausea from which the only relief is an external interference such as, for example, the music of a symphonic orchestra or a sudden collision. The initiative and referendum, primary elections, the popular election of United States Senators, proportional representation, *universal* suffrage, *universal* education, the recall of judges and judicial decisions, collective bargaining, "social justice" including pensions and insurance were some of the cure-alls since the turn of the century, and most of them are established in our present political system.

Even vocational education, as a result of refinements imposed by orthodox school men, has been futile. It is doubtful if the system has produced enough first-rate mechanics to man the service department of the leading Ford agency in St. Louis, for instance. From all this hodgepodge of "reform" we have got little or nothing,

² Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses" (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 171.

save a weakened morale, a forty billion dollar debt, a new schedule of specifications for new "reforms" and a universal headache.

In spite of the tumult and the shouting of the Socialists, Communists and Labor Racketeers, there is no valid objection to Capitalism because of the conduct of the generation that accumulates Capital. The objection lies in the conduct of progeny who have inherited or married fortunes. Mr. Rockefeller may have been a bit ruthless with competitors but his wise benefactions are adequate social compensation for his will-to-win. Society, however, is not likely to derive much compensation from the ruthlessness of his "in-laws." Woolworth performed an economic and social service of great value in spite of Barbara Hutton's irresponsible and unseemly conduct. Harry Thaw and Tommy Manville have added nothing to the public respect for inherited fortunes yet Andrew Carnegie's disposition of a fortune in steel, not to mention Guggenheim and Russell Sage, has yielded social benefits that offset all the damage done by thrill-seeking second and third generations.

One reason for the steady tramp, tramp to Caesarism in America is the never ceasing assault on Capitalism by Socialists, Communists and Labor Racketeers who have not had to withstand a sustained and critical examination of what they offer the country as a substitute for Capitalism. Likewise, they have been able to dodge the devastating fact that Socialism and Communism at most are only brief interludes between Capitalism and Caesarism, as Russia, Germany and Italy so clearly show.

The malignant wounds inflicted on society, and particularly on Organized Labor, by the successors of Samuel Gompers in coalition with the New Deal will rankle long beyond the lives of those now in being. The whole nauseous mess of unripe and ill-considered labor legislation sponsored by Mr. Roosevelt and his labor cohorts finally will be spewed up and it may take three generations of stomachs to cleanse the body politic.

CHAPTER VI

Universal Education to the Rescue

*Self-created Martyrs of the Schoolroom Provide
Country with Many Gymnasiums, Blaze an Easy
Trail for the New Deal and Languish
When Bankruptcy Arrives.*

"Nature is more powerful than education."—*Disraeli.*

ONLY BECAUSE so-called universal education has failed to justify its cost to the whole country and because it is relied upon to improve citizenship is it necessary to consider education in connection with our prevailing political system. It is *assumed* that citizenship has improved from generation to generation for the reason that universal education is *assumed* to be a specific remedy for the inferior citizenship that is derived from *universal* suffrage. These are the two assumptions upon which these United States have depended in recent times to justify increasing appropriations to expand the educational system.

The popularity of the white collar supported by many romantic examples of successes achieved in the pioneer era plus the compelling stimulus of family pride have made it possible for the pedagogues to help themselves to public funds, all of which they have done with growing abandon.

Children of low capacity and no talent have been compelled to attend school from twelve to sixteen years with no more noticeable benefits to themselves or to society than those which flow naturally from idleness, restless-

ness and discontent acquired in the schoolroom. "Universal Education" has provided this multitude with new "ideas," to be sure, but the "ideas" are, as Gasset says,¹ "in effect nothing more than appetites in words," license² "to impose the rights of vulgarity" and to³ "give force of law to notions born in the café."

The extent to which the pedagogues have dominated public thought in behalf of compulsory school attendance and the depth to which mass intelligence has drifted with respect to enforced "education" were brought out in the testimony of Mayor Frank Hague of Jersey City in his controversy with subversive organizations, contending for the right of free speech and assemblage.

Two Jersey City boys, twelve and thirteen years old, were about to be sent to a state penal institution for truancy where they preferred to go rather than attend school. Mayor Hague ascertained that they were perfectly willing to go to work and to contribute to the support of their mothers and when told by the assistant superintendent of schools that this would be a violation of the child labor law, Hague replied, "I am the law in this case."

As a result of this retort, Mayor Hague was branded by certain newspapers, more inclined to sensationalism than sanity at the moment, with "I-am-the-law" Hague.

Our educational system is not the only nonsense founded on fallacious assumptions and on family pride but it is best organized to get the last cent to be had and for the reasons heretofore stated. Besides the impetus of family pride there is the alluring thought that education is "free."

Few persons have considered the enormous cost of so-called universal education and fewer still know or care what it is. To maintain the public school system of children from 5 to 17 years of age, who are compelled to

¹ Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses," (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 80.

² *Ibid.*, p. 77.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

attend school, the current cost is approximately one and three-fourths billion dollars annually. To maintain the system of higher education, a plant and property valued at nearly four billion dollars and a current annual outlay of another three-fourths billion dollars, altogether two and one-half billion dollars, are necessary. These figures are not impressive when considered in connection with New Deal extravagances, but they are impressive when considered in connection with a normal national income. While the population has doubled in forty years, the number of students enrolled in colleges and universities has increased twelve times. If the taxpayers got anything, in terms of improved citizenship, in return for supporting this increased college and university population, no complaint would be justified but the most outstanding result of tax extortion is a rhythmic process of completing an end run on the gridiron and even that was originated in a school which is not supported from public funds.

The City of Chicago, wavering between the absurd and the ridiculous, is now seriously contemplating a twelve months school term, supplemented by evening classes. The city is already bankrupt as a consequence of political piracy long practiced openly by both parties and was compelled to reduce teachers' salaries in order to maintain the 1937-38 term. The prosperous city of Dayton exhausted all available funds for education after the first three months of the 1938-39 term.

A School system which costs twenty times as much per capita as it did before the three "R's" went out of vogue is worth our serious consideration. It is now possible for a child to learn twenty things that aren't true where formerly the child was limited to one or two.

Long years in the schoolroom tend to disqualify many children for any useful pursuit whatever. Those who might have become useful citizens but who are required to spend formative years in comparative idleness are

being utterly ruined by the system established in their behalf. The country has long been victimized by its schoolmasters and its only apparent hope of relief is national bankruptcy.

The strange part of the whole matter is that teachers are generally regarded as martyrs. The role is self-created since the facts are that most teachers are incapable of making so good a living outside the schoolroom. In spite of the fact that the martyrdom of the pedagogues is a self-created role, their dissimulation has been so nearly perfect, the public has come to accept them for what they pretend. They have pretended so long that the part has finally become one of second nature, like the piety of the missionary and the bent for impartial law enforcement of the informer in the prohibition era.

What the politicians of our state universities think is perhaps another matter. Perhaps they also are too stupid to know that their educative processes are not worth the cost. It does seem that it might have occurred to some of the Economic Royalists who decorate the summits of our educational system and who, therefore, do their thinking at public expense that there is little value to be had by the country from the social snobbery which, if they do not encourage, at least they condone.

The dean of American pedagogues is John Dewey, who has been professor of philosophy at Columbia University since 1904. He has written nineteen books and lectured widely. Few men have been identified with more shabby causes than Dewey. The American Society for Cultural Relations With Russia, the Defense Committee for the I.W.W., the American League Against War and Fascism (now the American League for Peace and Democracy), the Mooney-Billings Committee, the Sacco-Vanzetti National League, the American Civil Liberties Union and the Fellowship of Faiths are a few of them. If he is not a member of the Communist Party, he nevertheless should be qualified to wield the hammer and use the

sickle and is entitled to possession of all the party secrets.

The learned professor's last book, "Logic" ⁴ may be a "great" book, as one of its reviewers, ⁵ himself a subordinate in Columbia's department of philosophy, says, but if the book contains the same meaningless jargon as the review, no one will lose anything by omitting to read the book. The greatness of the book, the greatness of any book Doctor Dewey has written, would not be so difficult to acknowledge were it not for the practical application he has given to his learning with which, incidentally, the country is better acquainted than with his books.

When their customers began to yawn, the organized preachers got behind prohibition and when the organized pedagogues foresaw a stalemate in school attendance, they got behind basketball and new gymnasiums. It is all done in the name of "universal education." What a well turned phrase is this! One may wonder what has become of the phrase which formerly served the purpose of the pedagogues so well, "the common schools, the hope of the country"?

It ought to be obvious that we have got nothing from our public school system commensurate with its cost, and that, as presently constituted, we never will. As entertainment for the indifferent and the unfit, it is only a partial success because, as entertainment, the cost is out of all proportion to the results. The pedagogues have set up too much incidental machinery in the nature of curricula. Basketball, football, baseball and amateur theatricals should not be commingled with Algebra and Ancient History and if a diversified curriculum is needed as an inducement to get together an athletic team, the pedagogues ought to get their job over quickly, in six months perhaps instead of four years.

Public education is our most expensive racket. How long the country will be able to continue its expenditures for education is uncertain. That perhaps half the school

⁴ "Logic" by John Dewey (Henry Holt and Company).

⁵ Prof. Irwin Edman, *New York Tribune Book Review*, December 11, 1938.

and college population would be better off if engaged in some productive enterprise hasn't the least bearing on the problem of crushing taxation. Self-appointed friends of popular education, principally the organized pedagogues, have invented many devices to make their racket appear vital, among which are compulsory school attendance, minimum wages, tenure acts for teachers, free transportation, curricula to appeal to every whim, gymnasiums, athletic fields, free lunches, free textbooks, free nurses, free dentistry and free medical care, together with palaces that rival Versailles in architecture.

Has anyone ever stopped to consider the ultimate of all this nonsense? Has anyone, anyone save the pedagogues, undertaken an appraisal of the product, an appraisal in terms of improved citizenship? Has anyone calculated the country's financial ability to keep up this show? Very little has been done. The assumption is widespread that money cannot be wasted if spent in the name of universal education. Like most popular assumptions it is false. The organized pedagogues who have disseminated the assumption will not enjoy an examination of their racket. They will persist that the country ought to assume the benefits of the system and not apply to it the most natural test, that of improved citizenship.

During the New Deal era, the educational system of the country has continued to produce its annual crop of malcontents, with little knowledge and no wisdom. Having been taught the Government was bound to provide the necessities of life for all its citizens who failed to do so for themselves, many of our citizens of tomorrow have come to believe quite sincerely it is very odd that anyone should struggle for self-support. This viewpoint they have gained in the classroom of high school and college from a dreary and dour lot of Utopian dreamers, utterly devoid of any practical experience in private endeavor and who, themselves, might starve if their breakfast depended upon the exercise of the slightest imagination or initiative. Wanting in those qualities of body, mind and

spirit whereby economic independence may be attained, their envy and jealousy have feasted on each other.

The damage done the country by the pedagogue, unfortunately, is not confined to the classroom. Many pedagogues increase their personal earnings from the lecture platform, the columns of the newspapers and magazines and the radio. For reasons beside the present point, the public have come to associate the possession of several college degrees with profound wisdom upon which they can depend, though what the pedagogues proclaim from time to time should have provided a hint of their ignorance and incompetence *in*, as well as, *outside* the classroom.

The schoolmasters have enjoyed a field day during the administration of Mr. Roosevelt. If there is any theory of economics or government from Plato to Karl Marx or from Karl Marx to the absurdities of *The New Republic* which has not had a trial, more or less, under the aegis of the New Deal, it is the theory that the direct way is the nearest route to any given goal. The tenacity with which Mr. Roosevelt has clung to the theories of the pedagogue is explainable only on the ground that he himself has a pedagogue's mind and is incapable of retreating from the pursuit of fallacies so long as any are untried. Our colleges and universities for more than a generation have been filling up with disciples of Karl Marx * until now, because they are a vociferous lot, they dominate the departments of political economy in most colleges and universities. They have been able to protect themselves in their positions behind a barricade of pretenses, pretexts and subterfuges which they have called variously "individual independence," "free assembly," "free speech," "civil liberty" and "academic freedom." The stupid public have been bewildered by their mock piety, their overstrained earnestness, their didactic claptrap. The barricade generally has been effective.

* See Appendix II.

Incidentally, those persons who ordinarily make the loudest protests against limitations of free speech and free assembly are the same persons who would ignore a bill of rights to impose their own tyrannies if they had the power. They are the Communists, Socialists, Anarchists, C. I. O. racketeers, sit-down strikers and alien agitators. Stalin in Russia, Mussolini in Italy, and Harry Bridges in America are fair examples. In America, Anglo-Saxon names were rarely found among agitators for the "class struggle" in the days before Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Chicago and other notable cloisters of Communism raised the red flag. It ought to be remembered that every Socialist and Communist agitator advocates the overthrow of the same government from which they claim protection and the adoption of another system of government which has suppressed free speech and free assembly wherever adopted. New Deal judges, however, appear to welcome their effrontery.

It is really surprising that the Economic Royalists, as a class, have not done more about this situation. It is more surprising that they have not guessed what the situation is, particularly from the great number of their own sons and daughters who after four years have emerged from the classrooms of American colleges and universities, confirmed disciples of Karl Marx and the social revolution and filled with a burning passion to promote the "class struggle."

Using Prof. Paul H. Douglas of the economics department of the University of Chicago as a guinea pig from which to reach general conclusions after a specific examination, some notion of the intellectual depths of pedagogues may be had from his observations on "Controlling Business Depressions."⁷

The "failure of business," Douglas said, is "due to the absence of competition and the presence of powerful monopolies," which he further said have created "false prosperity prices whereby the sum total of the price tags

⁷ Address before Indianapolis Jewish Center Community Association, 1938.

is far in excess of the sum total of money in the consumer's pocketbook." Douglas, who seems to have studied Lenin's program and to have adopted it *in toto* advocated arbitrary price reductions. A fundamental reason for the present depression, he said, is the decrease in residential construction which he attributed to the high cost of materials. He concluded that "the government will have to pump purchasing power into pocket-books if industry is to be kept going."

It appears that Mr. Roosevelt was returned to a squeaky and leaky pump by the college professors and that Prof. Douglas, perhaps, was the source of the President's inspiration to direct a major assault against "monopolies."⁸ There is a remarkable similarity between Prof. Douglas's doctrines and the doctrines underlying and surrounding the fireside chat of April, 1938.

The learned professor completely ignores the relation between current prices and the cost of production which has been greatly enhanced by extortionate taxes, enforced labor rates that are absurdly high and added expense due to the incessant meddling of New Deal agents. If industry were compelled to dispose of an accumulated inventory at a loss, what incentive would remain to the manufacturer to produce an additional stock of merchandise, having lost money in the last venture? There is the same hint in the suggestions of Prof. Douglas that is found in the reasoning of Mexican Communists who expect the capitalist to exhaust himself in order to make another experiment in state socialism possible. Josh Billings was more candid. He was in favor of war so long as the fighting would be done by his wife's relatives. Prof. Douglas, speaking as a pedagogue, favors the control of business depressions by requiring business to operate at a loss.

That high prices stopped residential construction and that the stoppage of residential construction was a lead-

⁸ An article, "We Shall Make America Over," by Alsop and Kintner in the *Saturday Evening Post*, November 12, 1938, states that another pedagogue, Thurman W. Arnold, sponsored this Marxian enterprise.

ing cause of the present depression presents a curious confusion of cause and effect. The decrease in residential construction is a result rather than a cause of the depression and it ought to be obvious that prices were not so high as to have had much bearing on the volume of construction. That prices are not controlling in the activity of the building industry ought to be apparent from our recent history. Except for construction initiated and paid for largely by the government, there has been little building since 1930 though prices have been very low during most of the interval. Like Lenin, Prof. Douglas sets up a bogey man he calls "monopoly" which fixes prices too high for building construction which, in turn, causes a depression. This bogey man was an invention of Lenin and seems to have been considered necessary to the logic of the learned Prof. Douglas. A sequence of fallacies has to begin somewhere. From the professor's apparent, though perhaps sincere, confusion, it would appear that he is quite as likely to attribute the movement of a locomotive to the shriek of its whistle.

When the pocketbooks of the consumer are nearly if not quite empty, which is the condition now applicable to perhaps fifteen million unemployed workers, there will be little purchasing at any price. The unemployment problem, moreover, has been complicated by government interference with private enterprise to such an extent that enterprise is paralyzed. Only the soundest industries have survived. No new enterprises have been undertaken and none will be undertaken so long as interference and ruinous taxation continue to check and impede human incentive.

Any boy would be better off with no information about economics than to have his head crammed with false information, such as that disseminated by the learned professor of economics from the University of Chicago.

The pedagogues have done their part to blaze the New Deal trail. "No picture of the Midway is complete with-

out a snapshot of a social science professor departing for Washington or elsewhere with his little black bag," Prof. Douglas told a reporter of *Fortune* in the story of the University of Chicago published in December, 1937. The same article stated that Prof. Charles E. Merriam, head of the department of political economy, is a member of the National Resources Board (NRB); that Prof. Jacob Viner spends his spare time as assistant to Mr. Morgenthau; that Prof. William F. Ogburn has advised both Hoover and Roosevelt on social and technological trends and that Prof. Douglas furnished advice on social security. Morgenthau and Viner insure the alien tradition of New Deal finances.⁹

Regimentation would have been impossible save for the pedagogues' annual crop of human tares. The ultimate social effects of subsidizing the education of high school and college youths, the consequences of deliberately training boys and girls in mendicancy are incalculable. Pride and self-respect are being sacrificed on the altar of the more abundant life and if the more abundant life results in numerous generations of beggars, the country may then remember "for as you sow, you are like to reap."

That celebrated publicist, Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, says¹⁰ the ancient Greeks held that "education was indispensable" to self-government and himself sanctions the proposition that "the more education the better the self-government." Hutchins asserts that "Denmark has the best educated population in the world" and that "democracy functions better in Denmark than it does in most places." Otherwise, no evidence is offered to support his assertions.

⁹ Jewish professors in the University of Chicago include Jacob Viner, economics; Louis Wirth, sociology; Henry Schultz, economics; Samuel H. Nerlove, business economics, who was senior financial economist for the U. S. Treasury, 1930-31; Louis Gottschalk, history; Edward H. Levi, law; Nathaniel Kleitman, physiology; Morris S. Kharasch, chemistry; William S. Hoffmann, physics; Simon Freed, chemistry and Leon Carnovsky, library.

¹⁰ *New York Times Magazine*, June 12, 1938.

He makes no claim that our own government has benefited from education of any kind.

Regardless of what their philosophers held, ancient Greece was not saved from decadence by education and in the last phases of its culture, the masses were subjected to the whims of despots and tyrants and shamefully corrupted by politicians. The "educated" masses of ancient Greece were far more interested in the bribes of Eubulus than in their responsibilities and duties as citizens.

One wonders about the truth of the assertion that "Denmark has the best educated population in the world," since its educational facilities do not exceed our own, and how the assertion could be proved, even if a fact. School attendance in Denmark is compulsory between the ages of six and sixteen. There are differences between Denmark and the United States which affect the relevancy of the implied parallel.

Denmark has a population of uniform blood tradition and no melting pot. It is less than one-third the size of Illinois and has less than half its population. Its total wealth is about one-fifth that of Illinois. In the twenties, the bank deposits of the City of Chicago alone exceeded the entire wealth of the Kingdoms of Denmark and Iceland, including their principal colony, Greenland.

The learned Dr. Hutchins seems to have a grievance against "the fifty-two leaders of the American Bar who pronounced the Wagner act unconstitutional." He wants to "deprive many little ones of their constitutional right to mine coal" by means of the pending child labor amendment and to "teach our people how to live an *examined life*," whatever that may be, but which identifies Hutchins as a member of that school of intellectuals who believe it is impossible to seem profound unless they are ambiguous or vague.

Many of these academic economists and intellectuals are "labeled" ¹¹ the lunatic fringe . . . are younger men

¹¹ "Current Economic Delusions," E. C. Harwood, et al.

. . . whose conceit is not tempered by experience and general knowledge" and "whose sympathy for downtrodden humanity, coupled with an exaggerated conception of the depth of their own knowledge, leads them to accept worthless panaceas for our economic ills." Some are opposed to "profits," some are opposed to "thrift" and some opposed to creditors who want to be paid. Dr. Hutchins seems to be opposed to "reality" for he asserts that "reality is the slogan which accompanies and justifies the backward steps of history."

Thus it is that in a world of reality and reason, fact and logic yield precedence to a pattern of fiction and make-believe in a university supported largely from the accumulated earnings of the late John D. Rockefeller. It is, indeed, apparent why young men and women subjected to four years of such nonsense fail to discharge their duties as citizens. It is quite clear why our country now lacks the resistance to repel such a resurgence to nihilism as the New Deal.¹²

The late Mr. Edison now and again made himself a bit ridiculous when he ventured outside the field of science in which he had no equal. Others renowned in a particular vocation have done the same. If young Mr. Granville Hicks, now of the Harvard faculty, had confined himself to English composition, the political economy of America would have lost nothing and Hicks himself might be less careless as a writer.

Hicks labored three years with young women in freshman English at Smith and in 1929 went to Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute as assistant professor of English. He was invited to quit in 1935 not because his English was objectionable to engineers but because he could not resist the temptation to give long-range assistance to Mr.

¹² If it is argued that there are many colleges and universities where fundamental truth in political economy is still being taught, the answer is that their graduates have been ignored by the New Deal and that very naturally they value their own self-respect too highly to wrestle with the shysters who direct the New Deal.

Roosevelt and John L. Lewis, cheerfully on their way to the more abundant, or *new* life.

Hicks, who makes a point of his American ancestry, "wants all the poor people to be helped"¹⁸ and in Communism has found a specific panacea for "abolishing poverty." America, he says, "is a rich nation and it can take care of the needs of all its people." While "some people seem to think we will find it difficult to plan for abundance, I don't," he says. His conceit is well expanded when he observes: "*We* have learned to organize production and distribution on an incredibly vast scale and the idea of our *working together* is simply the next step." So simple as all that! And wherefore the glib use of the personal pronoun "we"? What has young Mr. Hicks personally contributed "to organize production and distribution on an incredibly vast scale"? If he has contributed nothing, perhaps it would be more fitting to hear from those who have made a contribution and are possessed of first-hand knowledge of the difficulties ahead. While Harvard may agree with young Mr. Hicks that "we can and we ought to *give* everybody in America a decent income," it is refreshing to consider that one institution of higher learning, the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, does not.

¹⁸ All quotations from Granville Hicks are taken from his last book "I Like America" (Modern Age Books, Inc.). Although the Hicks masterpiece is titled "I Like America," most of the text is devoted to a condemnation of Capitalism for what it has failed to provide. His liking for the country is limited to its "future" in which he visualizes a time when every family will have breakfast in bed and cocktails at four. If America can survive a full trial of the Communist program, then it will have to be admitted that Capitalism has, in fact, furnished a sturdy foundation for the Huns and Vandals inspired by Karl Marx; otherwise it would quickly crumble when exposed to the impious hands of such fools and knaves. The Communists freely admit that, like the European cuckoo which lays its eggs in the nests of other birds, a Communistic society can be founded only on the prior accomplishments of a Capitalistic state. To turn our Capitalist structure over to Communists to manage is somehow suggestive of the disasters under Capitalism which often pursue a prosperous business left to the operation of ne'er-do-well sons. Hicks seems to reveal a secret admiration for Capitalism, else why should he, a Communist, be so eager to lay hands on its structure? W. P. Knudsen will have to bestir himself in General Motors to hold his job when Hicks applies for it to the Commissar.

Unless one is prepared to defend both the piety and purity of labor racketeers and is either an enrolled Communist or one of their "fellow travelers," he will be catalogued by Hicks as "anti-labor." The *Chicago Tribune* is called "notorious" because it did a vigorous job of exposing the strategy of Communists and New Deal "liberals" in the strike of "Little Steel" workers. When translated by Hicks, "freedom on the campus" means the subversion of those principles cherished by benefactors whose gifts made the campus possible in the first place. There is the sham and pretense in the Hicks opus that the virtue of one subversive group was guaranteed by the presence of clergymen notwithstanding the pulpit is overrun with "little men" in whom sound knowledge of political economy is as wanting as their own faith in the theology they labor to expound. Like John T. Flynn, Hicks complains because Henry Ford employs W. J. Cameron rather than Earl Browder or himself to speak to the Sunday evening symphony audience on economic issues.

The active participation or acquiescence in the gigantic fraud continuously practiced on the taxpayers in the frequent changes in school textbooks is sufficient to discredit the mental processes of the pedagogues. Enough of material and method, once upheld as sacrosanct, has been discarded by the pedagogues in the course of one generation to establish their everlasting shame and dishonor. The practices of the oligarchy, which is made to appear holy from decorations and degrees, are conclusive proof of a want of courage, honor and good sense.

So it is that the making of books, of many books, that are read by those of inferior capacity, by college students and their instructors as well, who are unqualified to distinguish the true from the false, constitutes a menace of major importance. The learned Samuel Johnson observed that truth "is a cow which will yield such people no milk and so they have gone to milk the bull." The

all-too-human want of capacity to separate the true from the false plus a striving for innovation accounts for such masterpieces as "Great American Fortunes," "The Robber Barons," "America's Sixty Families," "The Tyranny of Words,"¹⁴ "The Folklore of Capitalism,"¹⁵ "The Coming Struggle for Power," "I like America," "The Future of Liberty"¹⁶ and a vast number of others.

The effect is to create illusions, not unlike those children get from the movies. Such books are loaded pistols in the hands of children and imperil society accordingly.

"Great American Fortunes," "The Robber Barons" and "America's Sixty Families" have contributed materially to class hatred in America. The last was publicized by Harold Ickes in one of his many outbursts. It was written by Ferdinand Lundberg of Swedish and Norwegian ancestry who also wrote "Imperial Hearst." He has denied any Left Wing connections. The first two books were written by Jews, the first by Gustavus Myers and the second by Matthew Josephson, who holds a Guggenheim fellowship.

Our school system cannot be charged with responsibility for all the imbecilities of the present regime but neither does it dare claim credit for them or for its processes in avoiding them. The solemn fact is that our colleges and universities have long been training schools for the dissemination of most of the economic fallacies which have belabored the distraught farmer, industrialist and business man since March 4, 1933. No other proof is necessary than the simple reminder that all the inspiration and substantially all the ideas of the New Deal had their sources in the college and university lecture room from which a succession of Brain Trusters have made their way to Washington during the years of Franklin I. Few of their silly formulae have not been tried. Their combined nonsense, after five years, should be nearing exhaustion.

¹⁴ See Chapter XIV.

¹⁵ See Appendix I.

¹⁶ See Appendix II.

CHAPTER VII

Chaos in Business and Industry

*Ringmasters of New Deal Circus Reverse the Rope
in Surprising Departures from Established Rou-
tine and Industrialists Are Compelled
to Improve Their Technique
as Acrobats.*

"The remedy is worse than the disease."—*Francis Bacon.*

IN THE early days of Franklin I, when the blatant exhibitionist, General Hugh Johnson was cracking down in a Simon Legree act on Eliza and her child, on Economic Royalists and Little Business, the trade code was the objective, the trade code with its rigid price agreements, quotas and fixed standards, departure from which was sought out in an inquisition and punishable by an *auto-da-fé*. Those were the days when the nation first became conscious that it had an alphabet, that NRA, previously lacking in any sense, after all, had a meaning.

General Johnson presently returned to the sanctum of the estimable Mr. Baruch and has since carried on as a columnist in certain newspapers which have their emotions for the more abundant life under better control than formerly. His seat at the foot of the throne has been occupied by other parvenus. They also have cracked down but they have made a distinction between Eliza and her child, between Economic Royalists and Little Business. They have tried to separate mother and daughter. They have even offered to nurse the child, if she will desert Eliza. So far the child has remained with Eliza,

believing either that the nurse offered is dried up or would be likely to abandon her. Eliza, in the meantime, has been sorely persecuted.

Price agreements and fixed standards have become obnoxious, immoral and illegal since the pursuit of "monopolies" began. Economic Royalists are now being prosecuted for doing exactly what, in the early days of Franklin I, they would have been prosecuted for *not* doing. They were prosecuted for doing what one Washington satrap approved their doing as a matter of sane business practice, except that one satrap approved an act in advance and an altogether different satrap followed up with the persecution because it was done. This epitomizes briefly the prosecution of the major oil companies before a New Deal judge at Madison, Wisconsin. The administration of justice is now founded on the principle "confusion worse confounded."

The direct result of the double dealing, shoddy ethics, sharp practices and deceit is chaos in business and industry. The pitiable aspect of the chaos is the persisting conceit of those who have caused it. They purpose to dispel the gloom with another law, another volume of laws, with new commissions and more regimentation.

The National Bituminous Coal Commission, in violation of the law creating it, established coal prices and regulations without hearings, effective December 16, 1937. Between December 16, 1937 and February 7, 1938, a period of fifty-three days, two hundred and eighteen orders were issued by the Commission amending, modifying or supplementing original regulations, an average of more than four each day. Order No. 218 of February 7, 1938 is thus described in the caption:

ORDER NO. 218

AN ORDER MODIFYING ORDER NO. 89, AS MODIFIED BY ORDERS NOS. 126, 148, 187 AND 192, AND SUPPLEMENTING THE SCHEDULE OF MINIMUM PRICES FOR COAL OF CODE MEMBERS PRODUCED WITHIN DISTRICT NO. 1 BY ADDING THERETO

A SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE OF PRICES TO BE
KNOWN AS "SUPPLEMENT NO. 5 TO PRICE SCHED-
ULE NO. 1—DISTRICT NO. 1."

The clerical difficulties in such a situation are apparent particularly on account of the heavy penalties provided in the act for any departure from the prices, orders and regulations of the Commission. Coal operators, brokers, wholesalers and retailers were bewildered by the deluge of such orders coming out of Washington. The purpose of the act was to provide the coal operators with more money so that John L. Lewis could impose higher wages and thereby increase the revenue of the Union he operates. It had no other purpose save the incidental one of enabling its author, the illustrious political Boss Guffey, of Pennsylvania, to tighten his grip on the miners' vote. A fifty per cent increase in coal prices was laid on the consumer but apparently it was thought his opposition would be less important *negatively* than the miners' vote *affirmatively*.

To attract the farmers' votes, the membership of farm co-operatives were allowed to charge a commission, equivalent to a price reduction, and a flagrant discrimination against the established retail coal merchant. The price of "slack" coal or screenings, as established by the Commission was so high as to be substantially equivalent to the cost of gas and oil. Many mine operators expected to be ruined by this competition. Inability to dispose of the "slack" at the fixed price would have closed many mines since the "slack" must be marketed from day to day to make continued mine operation possible. Otherwise, congestion on railroad side tracks closes the outlets of the mines. Political pressure controlled the creation of marketing districts and the base price established in each district with the result that discriminations were the rule and not the exception.

The cities of New Albany and Jeffersonville in Indiana have practically contiguous boundaries. They are industrially similar. New Albany is in District No. 17 and

Jeffersonville in District No. 19. The base price of "slack" coal in New Albany was fixed at \$1.45 per ton and in Jeffersonville at \$1.05 per ton. The base price of 6-inch lump in Indianapolis was fixed at \$2.10 per ton and in Ben Davis, a suburb, but located between Indianapolis and the mines, the price was fixed at \$2.30 per ton.

So widespread was the protest against this New Deal fraud and so numerous the injunctions granted that all prices and all regulations affecting prices were cancelled by the Commission as of February 25, 1938. The coal industry already understands the meaning of regimentation and chaos.

New Deal methods in the regimentation of business recall the classic story of Clyde Fitch and a troupe of stranded actors in Louisville, Kentucky. The show had flopped and the troupe lacked sufficient funds to reach Broadway. Fitch, a good poker player, collected all funds available, found a game to his liking and after a long time had won just about enough money for the return trip. He thought he was playing his last hand. He had three aces against an opponent who laid down two clubs and three spades. When he was about to take the pot, he was stopped and his attention called to a sign on the wall at his back, "An Old Kentucky Beats Any Hand in the Deck." It was then explained that an "Old Kentucky" consisted of two clubs and three spades. It took hours to recoup his loss to "Old Kentucky," but finally he drew one himself. When he was about to take the pot, his attention was called to an amendment which, to his surprise, had been made to the sign. There had been added in fine print "Once Each Night."

Business is no more than a poker game in which the rules are being changed every day. The vast industrial enterprises of the country are being subjected to the juvenile caprice of scriveners, suddenly elevated to top rank and importance, who heretofore would have been considered bad risks for a thousand dollar loan in their home towns. One of the White House statesmen owes

his importance and prestige to his ability to play the piano. Very little is yet to be done to complete a Fascist state. There is little difference between the status of industry here and in Italy, or Germany, but the advantage of ability in the state administration of industry is in Rome and Berlin, not in Washington. It is hard to believe any man, enjoying the supreme power, as does Franklin I, could have assembled so many stupid courtiers; or rather that having assembled them, he would have entrusted them with such vast responsibilities. In Italy and Germany, the status of industry is that of military socialism, i.e., dictatorship or Caesarism, but in neither country is there anything approaching the chaos that obtains in the soft coal industry.

Labor has been regimented while in pursuit of wages and hours bait dangled before it by the New Deal. De Loss Walker once silenced a labor racketeer who was directing a strike and who had complained about the high salaries paid executive officers for management, engineering, legal counsel, advertising and sales. The total amount was found to approximate \$3,000,000.00 annually which, had it been divided equally among the company's other employes, would have increased the daily wage of each person exactly four cents. Walker silenced a hostile audience by offering a twenty dollar bill to anyone who would name a single man or woman who ever became a success in life by working only thirty hours a week.¹

The farmers are in process of being completely regimented in consequence of subsidies, controlled acreage and prices and numerous financial gratuities distributed by Mr. Wallace. Any nation which would spend money on education for agriculture, on soil conservation and irrigation, on the eradication of plant pests and, at the same time, maintain a system of crop control and compel

¹ "Men and Management," an address by De Loss Walker, associate editor, *Liberty*.

the destruction of surplus products, not only is decadent but its leadership is insane.

The unemployed have been regimented as a consequence of the dole, resettlements, employment on government projects and enterprises of divers character established by the government. A notable beginning has been made to regiment youth.

All industry enjoying a national market has been partially regimented through the operations of the National Labor Relations Board and the so-called Social Security Act. Long ago, the commercial banks were completely regimented in a program of regulation and through loans and enforced requirements, which leave the banker with no more independence than a robot.

The railroads were already regimented but the stranglehold of the government has been tightened. If Mr. Roosevelt failed in his direct assault on the Supreme Court, he nevertheless has succeeded in regimenting that last bulwark of freedom, because of the resignations of two members, the death of another and the gradual weakening of morale among other aging members of the Court. The Federal district courts and courts of appeals have gradually been regimented through Presidential appointments. Vacancies in the past five years generally have been filled with police court lawyers, or lawyers with no practice who had nourished personal grudges against the successful portion of society. Others had been engaged, principally, in subversive political activity.

Substantially all that is now needed to make the Fascist state complete in America is censorship. The Federal Communications Commission, having felt out its power in the radio field, may attend to the larger and final undertaking. The necessary agency already exists. Dorothy Thompson is inclined to favor censorship for or the liquidation of the Rev. Charles E. Coughlin who has already been barred from some Jewish-owned or Jewish-

controlled radio stations, notably WMCA of the Knickerbocker Broadcasting Company of which Donald Flamm, a member of Mr. Roosevelt's NRA administrative board in 1933, is president.

During the twenties, the investment bankers of America were guilty of so many crimes and misdemeanors that a deserved punishment would have accomplished what the Securities and Exchange Commission, with more politeness but equal effect, has succeeded in doing, i.e., close their marts completely to new industries in need of capital. There is this difference. The infliction of deserved punishment would have closed up the shops of all merchants in stock certificates and debentures, whereas, the Securities and Exchange Commission has closed only those shops where they were accustomed to listen to undertakings of less than a million dollars.

In the Coolidge days, all underwriters were also brokers or bankers and vice versa. The dual effort made it possible to operate at a profit. Since underwriting, brokerage and banking were separated by law, the small underwriter has found it impossible to continue in business. The small business man thereby lost his only prospect for financing a new enterprise, or for that matter, refinancing an old but established small enterprise. The very large merchant in stock certificates and debentures has survived, even if his shelves are now overstocked with unsalable merchandise. But the economic result on the whole country of shutting off the source of money to the small business man undoubtedly has been disastrous to permanent recovery.

Earnings which were lost in private speculation in the get-rich-quick promotions of the investment bankers in the twenties are now being confiscated and squandered by the New Deal tax gatherers. The public has gained nothing from a substitution of the government for the place once held by the partnership of private promoter and investment banker. In either case, the earnings of the individual are lost. The Securities and Exchange

Commission is an absurd agency created to perform impossible functions, that is, functions which are impossible outside the playroom.

It was amusing to contemplate and consider the apparent seriousness in which William O. Douglas, former chairman of the Commission, and lately elevated to the United States Supreme Court, went about the job of transforming the personnel of Wall Street, casting out the devils from Broad and William streets and reaching out now and again to LaSalle Street to exorcise the minor imps. In his earlier role, Douglas seemed to enjoy himself as much as "Sockless" Jerry Simpson and old Bob LaFollette in their berserk roles when Populism and public utility regulation first fetched the zanies to the polls.

The careers of Richard Whitney, Serge Stavisky, Ivar Krueger and Philip Musica (alias F. Donald Coster), who have strutted across the domestic and foreign stage within the memory of the living generation, prove the futility of law to control human passion. Even the learned New Dealer, Adolph A. Berle, Jr., suffers from misplaced confidence in his former secretary who stole \$80,000.00 of public funds before his defalcations were discovered. The hopeful Mr. Douglas, however, inclines to "better audits and accounting"² as a remedy for human vices. Like the Socialists, the "liberals," the progressives, the uplifters and world improvers, he persists in the faith that some new and untried formula, reduced to law or an administrative code, will cleanse the human heart. The founding fathers who emphasized the importance of minimum government were much wiser than their gullible great-grandsons.

Beginning with Populism and ending with the New Deal, some curious phenomena have emerged to besmear the devils who have belonged in what we know now as the upper income brackets. The plight of the railroads after fifty years of "regulation," the sad state of the

² United Press dispatch, December 17, 1938.

public utilities after thirty years of "regulation," the confusion bred by political interference with all business are meaningless to the ex-pedagogue, who occupied the No. 1 seat of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Sufficient ingenuity and resourcefulness have survived to date to provide the country with transportation that has no rival and with electric, gas, water and telephone service at rates that have no parallel but this ingenuity and this resourcefulness are about to be destroyed, "regulated" to extinction. Like any fetish, "regulation," particularly "regulation" by politicians, has inherent limitations. The limitations are inherent because "regulation" depends upon the whims and caprice of vainglorious men who, not infrequently, are also stupid, clumsy and corrupt. What has been gained from the super-government builded in the past fifty years? What is to be gained from the bureaucracy added to it by the New Deal?

The Governor of Michigan, too cowardly or too muddled to drive the sit-down strikers out of industrial plants so they could operate, conjured up the impertinence to say the government "will be compelled to exercise its helpful and reasonable influence" to prevent the wide-swinging economic cycle if industry fails "voluntarily" to solve the problem. Who believes the "government" is capable of solving any serious problem after repeated frustrations since March 4, 1933? Mr. Roosevelt has rewarded the cowardice and stupidity of former Governor Murphy by elevating him to a seat in the cabinet in charge of all national law enforcements.

If Murphy and Douglas, for example, could remember "that government is best which governs least," as the founder of the Democratic party said long ago, and which the whole pitiable lot of bureaucratic sycophants ignore, Cohen, Roosevelt and Corcoran would soon find themselves looking for new jobs, and Son Jimmie and Eleanor would have more freedom for Hollywood and their insurance business. It is a matter of supreme indifference

to the country whether it is robbed by "blue sky" promoters operating in a private capacity or by the Washington government operating under Congressional sanction if, in fact, robbery is an inescapable *bête noire*. After all, the New Deal bureaucrats have merely adopted for official use the private code introduced by Jim Fiske, Jay Gould and their puny imitators of the late twenties.

Nor should there be any surprise because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has failed to perform its functions and to be of any real use to the country. This agency was conceived by poor Mr. Hoover, in the slough of despond. All it did during his administration was to save the Dawes family by advancing their bank \$90,000,000.00 on frozen assets. Since then, under the administration of the distinguished "builder" from Texas, the Hon. Jesse Jones, it has helped out other banks, on the theory apparently that bank solvency is sufficient to restore credit and confidence. Jones was quoted as saying, "Honestly, I can't see what's behind this business recession. Certainly, the conditions that existed back in 1932 don't exist now." Jones overlooks what should be obvious to a freshman student in economics, namely, an increased government debt of \$20,000,000,000.00 plus an extra burden of wages, taxes, unemployment and New Deal reforms which industry now has to support.

Additional accounting expense made necessary by New Deal experimentation in reform has embarrassed a legion of small industries which were unable to avoid the employment of one or more new clerks or bookkeepers, in order to keep up with the demands of Washington for new and voluminous reports. This new burden, plus the overwhelming new burden of taxation, and reports made necessary on account of it, have chilled the enthusiasm, not alone of Economic Royalists but Little Business as well. The burden has been particularly onerous in the so-called marginal small industries, those in which profits were already near the vanishing point.

Many such marginal industries have folded up, thereby shifting their employees from a private to the public payroll.

American business management is accustomed to do little profound thinking outside the domain of strictly vocational endeavor. There are many reasons for this. Like the normal *homo sapiens*, American business management, outside the factory, the store, and the office, has focused its attention on strictly personal matters, on births, deaths, marriages and divorces, even the improvement of the family's social position. Luncheon speakers of the Chambers of Commerce, Rotary and Kiwanis have satisfied the demand for intellectual inspiration. Serious thinking in the related fields of education, economics, political economy and politics has been left largely to pedagogues and to the rabble rousers of organized minority groups employed to mix entertainment, distorted facts and bad logic in such proportions that George W. Babbitt is quickly converted and, when seen privately, will open his purse or give whatever response is desired. Finally, the mental processes which have been necessary to produce the machine probably are antithetical to the mental processes necessary to develop a man of deep wisdom. There is perhaps a deep significance in the inclination of the industrial manager to seek the golf course, or the night club or the ball room, rather than the library, when he leaves the factory, the store or the office.⁸

⁸ On June 10, 1938, Dr. Virgil Jordan, President of the National Industrial Conference Board, presented what may be regarded as the prevailing point of view of the American business man before the Union League Club of Chicago. He traced the current ills of the American people to the World War and advocated an awakening of private enterprise as a partial remedy. That the World War accelerated somewhat the ravages of a disease, already far advanced at the outbreak of the war, is undoubtedly true. The war was equivalent roughly to an unexpected exposure of a patient, whose life already was ebbing away. Dr. Jordan very well diagnoses the illness of the patient but the suggested cure does not match the seriousness and hopelessness of the malady. No one would expect a change of diet to cure a disease known to be incurable. The proper causes of the disease long chronic among American people are (a) extension of the suffrage (more democracy) to the masses who have been unfitted to exercise the privileges of citizenship and (b) blind reliance upon "universal education" to prepare the unfit masses for the re-

Human capacity for directing and managing industrial enterprise, when translated into action, is equivalent to the employment of the unemployed and this human capacity generally varies directly with the applicable income tax rate. The maximum tax rate is now seventy-nine per cent of personal income. The inevitable consequence of such extortion is the elimination of our ablest directors and managers from the industrial field since only a fool would assume the business risks incident to the remaining twenty-one per cent, all that is left for maximum talent and effort.

Thus are the effects suffered by the whole country from the offhand, off-the-record and flippant statesmanship that springs from press conferences in Washington. It has been called "government by hunches." Whatever it is, the whole country is on its way to the skillet, to sizzle and fry in its own grease.

Most of the New Deal "economists" turn their backs on our horse-and-buggy days but they do not avoid the confusion that arises from putting the cart before the horse. They have wearied the country with their incessant clamor that *consumption* must be expanded and have totally ignored its dependence upon *production*. The mass *appetite* is still very healthy and gluttony needs no encouragement. Our domestic economy gains nothing from artificial restraints on production and artificial stimulation of the human appetite. Increased *consumption*, in due course, must follow and not precede the parade of increased production. All of which may not accord with the profound learning of Mr. Roosevelt's Jewish economists but it will be fairly clear to most of our inarticulate Americans.

Not so long ago we had a "war to end wars," one to "make the world safe for democracy" and a "peace with-

sponsibilities of citizenship. Such an exhortation as that of Dr. Jordan may evoke deserved applause at the moment but if "American business management as a whole has so far failed to fulfill the full measure of its responsibility to the American people," as he asserts, something more stimulating than a reminder will be required to arouse its active consciousness.

out victory" yet twenty years later we have Mussolini "compelled to defend" himself against a rampant Negus of the Coptic Christians in Abyssinia, Japan conducting a "defensive" warfare in China because the Chinese fail to "co-operate," Hitler's seizing Austria and desirable portions of Czechoslovakia and a worldwide contest in armament building to prepare for another world war. At no other time since the birth of Christ, except for the actual duration of the World War, has the civilized world equalled its current outlay for instruments of human destruction.

Since the World War began, international treaties have lost all binding force and effect. The treaty wherein the neutrality of Belgium was guaranteed was treated as a "scrap of paper" by the invading German armies and since then, in spite of the solemnity of international conferences and the rigid agreements that have followed, treaties have ceased to have any meaning. The sovereign powers continue to make treaties with no intention of fulfilling their terms beyond the time when they have acquired the military strength to repudiate such portions as may be considered prejudicial to their national well being.

A review of conferences, covenants and treaties entered into since the beginning of the World War, together with their widely known breaches and violations, are not very convincing of any improvement in human nature since the world was made safe for democracy and the "war to end wars" was concluded. It is unfortunate, indeed, that the American State Department chooses to ignore the lesson to be learned from this pattern of deceit and double dealing and to pursue rather the phantoms of a vain and foolish hope.

CHAPTER VIII

The Jew and the New Deal

*History Reveals the Revolutionary Inclination of
Chosen People and Misfortunes Which Pursue
Their Intervention in Alien Cultures.*

IT IS not a mere coincidence that the avowed objectives of the New Deal and the Communist Party of *increased spending* and its result, *increased public debt*, are identical. As the former Communist, Prof. J. B. Matthews, pointed out¹ to the Dies Committee, the Communists differ very little from the Roosevelt Administration. Communists anticipate the collapse of the government from the completion of the New Deal program and purpose to aid and abet the program by every possible means.

Alien and Jewish Communists in the new bureaucracy and the C.I.O. got together by Mr. Roosevelt and John L. Lewis are thus able to lay a sharp axe at the roots of our economic stability in the strikes they foment, the political power they exert, the proselyting they foster. Before the New Deal emerged, sporadic outbreaks of isolated subversive groups were unimportant, but now that both sympathy and co-operation are to be had without the asking in high official quarters in Washington, New York, Detroit, Pittsburgh and Akron, a new meaning attaches to Communist activities. The large number of Jews who pursue their devious ways under the standards of John L. Lewis, particularly in the Workers Alliance,² warrants

¹ *New York Times*, August 23, 1938.

² The Workers' Alliance grew out of Communist-controlled groups of unemployed known as Unemployed Councils. The two organizers were David

special consideration by Congress; likewise, the pedagogues, Jews and non-Jews, aliens and natives in our American colleges and universities should be carefully examined for the doctrines they teach and labeled accordingly.

It might well be fitting to ratify and confirm the teaching of Communism if that is what the country wants, after the country understands clearly that Communism is being taught. The country also would derive a substantial benefit from the proper labeling of principles of political economy derived from Karl Marx that are being skillfully masked by New Dealers and Communists for public contemplation and absorption as "liberal," as

Lasser and Herbert Benjamin who led the "hunger" march on Washington in 1933. Lasser is a graduate of M.I.T. in civil engineering and formerly was on the technical staff of M. S. Sloan of the New York Edison Company. The activity of these gentry in the C.I.O. was explained by Earl Browder, grand panjandrum of the Communist Party in America when presiding over the Communist International at Moscow in 1935, when he said: "The Communist Party strives to develop the C.I.O. movement into the development of a People's Front and to build itself into a mass Communist party."

Lee Pressman, a graduate of the Harvard Law School, was assistant general counsel of the AAA from 1933 to 1935 when he became general counsel of the WPA and RA. In 1936, he became general counsel of the C.I.O. and S.W.O.C. and in 1937, general counsel for the Textile Workers Organizing Committee. The deep wisdom of Oswald Spengler in his observation that "the struggle of, not principles but men, not ideals but race qualities, for executive power is the alpha and omega" is further illustrated by such names as Lucien Koch, formerly president of the Communist Commonwealth College, and now educational director of United Electrical and Radio Workers, a C.I.O. affiliate; Max Michelson, regional director of the clothing workers; Ben Gold, president of the Fur Workers International Union; Irving Potash, general manager of the joint board of the Fur Workers; Clarina Michelson, organizer of the Department Store Employees; David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union and Marcel Scheer, national secretary of the Friends of Soviet Russia and an active leader in the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians.

The career of Isidor Laderman is that of a typical Jewish labor agitator. Laderman is a native of Poland. In 1924, he organized the Knit Goods Workers Union and led the membership in a general strike. In 1925, he organized the Delicatessen Clerks and in 1926 the Suit Case, Bag Makers and Portfolio Workers. In 1934, it was the Pocketbook Union and two years later was made president of the International Ladies Hand Bag, Pocketbook and Novelty Workers Union. Laderman, therefore, has found our American "Democracy" a very congenial environment in which to seize and hold on to the fleshpots. Max Mosewitzky, a native of Russia, a member of the American Jewish Congress and secretary of the first national Socialist Commission for the American Jewish Congress, organized the Jewish branch of the Workers Alliance.

"democratic," as "forward looking," as "progressive."

Theodore Dreiser, who admits that he got "an idea or two" from Karl Marx, hit the bull's eye when he observed that Karl Marx "surely made a good thing for Roosevelt, Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini."⁸

The part of the Jews in the New Deal is a subject of deep fascination to anyone acquainted with their history.

Top-ranking Jews in the New Deal are Ben Cohen, formerly of the PWA but nominally counsel for the NPPC and co-author of the SEC act and the holding company act; Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury; David E. Lilienthal, a director of the TVA who forced out Dr. Arthur E. Morgan; Jerome Frank, now a member of SEC but formerly with the FSRC and AAA and, of course, the new justice of the United States Supreme Court, Felix Frankfurter.

Other Jewish "economists" who have helped chart the New Deal route to Moscow are Mordecai Ezekiel and Louis H. Bean who report to Henry Wallace in the Department of Agriculture; Abraham M. Fox, formerly

Theresa Wolfson illustrates the career of a female of the species. She is a native of Brooklyn, and got an M.A. degree from Columbia in 1922 and a Ph.D. from Brookings Institute in 1925. Previously, she had been a field investigator for the National Child Labor Commission of 1918, executive secretary of the New York State Consumers League and health director of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. In 1926, she became an instructor in economics at the Communist Brookwood College and in 1935 went to Brooklyn College, a part of the College of the City of New York, as professor of economics. Miss Wolfson is a director of the League for Industrial Democracy, a Communist front organization, and a member of the board of editors of the *Woman Today*.

Morris L. Ernst, a native of Alabama, got an A.B. degree from Williams College in 1909 and an L.L.B. degree from the New York Law School in 1912. Ernst who was a "conscientious objector" during the World War is a trustee of the American Civil Liberties Union and brought the suit against Mayor Hague of Jersey City to restrain him from interfering with radical agitators. He is a director of *The Nation*, a member of the New York State Banking Board, originally appointed by Roosevelt when Governor of New York, a lecturer on government relations to business in the Harvard University School of Business Administration since 1934. Most of his public activities have been on the Communist front.

Among the other more prominent Jewish labor officials in New York City are Joseph Breslaw, Fannie M. Cohn, M. C. Feinstone, Harry Greenberg, Sidney Hillman, Louis Hollander, Abraham Miller, J. S. Potofsky, Alex Rose, Rose Schneiderman and R. D. Wortis.

⁸ *New York Times*, August 22, 1938.

director of research for the Tariff Commission and since 1937 a member; Herbert Feis in the State department and E. A. Goldenweiser, research director for the Federal Reserve Board since 1936. The National Labor Relations Board and its predecessor the National Labor Board both have derived the necessary inspiration in economics from Marxian Jews. Benedict Wolf and William M. Leiserson held the secretaryship of the latter. Leiserson, on leave from Antioch College, is now Chairman of the National Mediation Board. David J. Saposs is the "economist" for the National Labor Relations Board. L. H. Seltzer has been head economist and assistant director of research for the U. S. Treasury since 1935.

Madame Perkins has been kindest of all to the Marxians. The Department of Labor maintains Isador Lubin, Edward Berman, Jacob Perlman and many others. Lubin is engaged with the anti-monopolists in taking industry apart to ascertain what makes it tick. Perlman has been chief of the division of wages, hours and working conditions in the Bureau of Labor Statistics since 1934.

Morris L. Jacobson has been chief statistician of the U. S. Government Research project since 1936 and Max Sasuly was the senior statistician of the Division of Research and Planning of the NRA during its existence. A. H. Myers has been regional director for New England of the National Labor Relations Board since 1936. Asher Achinstein has been "economist" for the New York State Housing Board since 1930. Harold Loeb, educated at Princeton, was an economic consultant for the NRP in 1936 and 1937 and worked with Walter Polakov, lately arrived from the land of Stalin. Albert Goldman is the present New York City postmaster.

Charles E. Wyzanski, a product of Harvard College and the Harvard Law School, was a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva in 1935 since which time he has been a special assistant to the Attorney General. Previously, he was solicitor for the Department of

Labor. Jack Levin who attended Reed College, Northwestern, the University of Oregon, the University of Washington and Columbia and who got a Ph.D. degree from the American University in 1933 has been assistant general counsel of REA since 1935.

William Seagle who collaborated with Morris L. Ernst in some literary endeavors took his A.B. degree at the College of the City of New York and his law degree at Columbia. Since 1934, he has been attorney for the Petroleum Labor Policy Board.

Herman A. Gray, a law professor at New York University since 1922, was a member of the policy committee of the National Housing Conference. Previously, he was chairman of the New York Unemployment Insurance State Advisory Council and helped draft the unemployment insurance bill. He is a director of the American Association for Social Security.

It is unnecessary to believe Jewish intellectuals throughout the world are *particeps criminis* in a conspiracy to promote national dissensions to dispute the voltage of their national loyalties or to doubt their attachment for the established institutions of the country in which they happen to be living. Their dominant attitude is that they are Jews first and Americans secondly, Jews first and subjects of George VI afterwards. In the light of their history, this attitude is not unnatural. Theirs is a world outlook born of necessity. Their detachment from nationalism is founded on a code of human conduct which encourages them to be all things to all men, in Germany even Nazis before Hitler began his persecutions. At the beginning of the Italian revolution, the Jews were loyal to Mussolini who tried sincerely to protect them. Lately, Mussolini has not been able to save them from the relentless consequences of the philosophy he created. Persecutions in Italy are growing in scope and severity.

Since the protest of the Jews to Pontius Pilate "Jewish

character has not changed," asserts ⁴ Rabbi Louis I. Newman. "Toward those of their own faith," said Tacitus, our authority for the history of the first century A.D., "they are loyal, and prompt in charity, but against all others they feel hatred as toward an enemy."

No one should expect from an American Jew the same devotion to American traditions, or to the stability of American society or even to the perpetuity of our constitutional government as from other racial and national elements of the population. Joseph Kastein, in discussing the Jew as an alien, himself observes that ⁵ "the Jews could not possibly become entirely assimilated with the people about them or identify themselves wholly with the country of their adoption." In discussing the Jewish question in Germany in the first half of the last century, Otto Ruhle observes ⁶ that "The Jews had themselves shown little inclination to come into close contact with the intellectual life of the German nation."

The Jew "follows the history of the present . . . with the fundamental feelings of Magian mankind, even when he himself is firmly convinced of the Western character of his thought," says Spengler.⁷ Thus is explained the aspiration of the Jew to *seem* as "other men" and the futility of his striving to be so. "Even when he regarded himself as a member of the people amongst whom he sojourned and took part in their good and evil fortune—as happened in so many countries in 1914—he lived these experiences, not really as something his own, but as a partisan, a supporter; he judged them as an interested spectator and hence it is just the deepest meanings of the struggle that must ever remain hidden from him."⁸

⁴ "Biting on Granite" by Rabbi Louis I. Newman, *Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1938.

⁵ "History and Destiny of the Jews" by Joseph Kastein, p. 131.

⁶ "Karl Marx, His Life and Works" by Otto Ruhle, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul (The Viking Press) p. 62.

⁷ "The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) Vol. II, p. 320.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 319.

His patriotism is "induced" ⁹ and is not generated within the fibre of his own soul.

Instinctively, the Jews are very much at home in the New Deal and fit snugly into its pattern for the simple reason that the warp and woof of the pattern are *change, confusion, disturbance, even revolution*, to which the Jew is accustomed. Egyptian bondage, the Babylonian captivity, the return to Judah, encounters with Greece and Rome, migration to the West, exile to the East and persecution everywhere have equipped the Jew for quick adjustment to changing political and economic conditions. The Communistic ideals of the New Deal profoundly impress the Jews who, as Joseph Kastein further observes,¹⁰ "are all filled with the idea of sharing something in common with others." The support given to New Deal candidates by Jews of great wealth as late as 1938 cannot be explained as an accidental difference in political thinking, since the issues were so extraordinary that all other intelligent persons who owned any property were hostile to the point of *potential hysteria*.

In *Opinion*, "a Journal of Jewish Life and Letters" (February, 1939), Rabbi Alexander Feinsilver asserted that Mr. Roosevelt received the unanimous vote of the Jews of "Middletown," i.e., Muncie, Indiana, in 1936. This is the home town of the Hon. Benjamin V. Cohen who, in behalf of world Jewry, and with Mr. Roosevelt's co-operation, has made so much progress in America towards the "*new life*" of Nikolai Lenin. Even though there probably were less than one hundred Jews of voting age in "Middletown" in 1936 (fifty-five families), their unanimity is hardly to be explained by the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt's *alter ego*.

Nietzsche quotes Tacitus as saying that the Jews were "born for slavery." Tacitus may have found the germ of his idea in Aristotle since Rousseau paraphrases Aristotle as saying that "men are not naturally equal" and

⁹ "The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) Vol. II, p. 320.

¹⁰ "History and Destiny of the Jews" by Joseph Kastein, p. 435.

"some are born for slavery and others for dominion." Rousseau said Aristotle was right but himself added that "every man born in slavery is born for slavery." Kastein clarifies the observations of Tacitus and Rousseau when he asserts that ¹¹ "in Babylon the Jews arrived as captives taken from a conquered country. They first entered Asia Minor and the Ionian Islands as slaves, while Pompey took them to Rome as prisoners of war. Even in their historic refuge, Egypt, they arrived in the time of the first Ptolemies either as prisoners of war or as fugitives from their own country."

Nietzsche argues that the so-called slave-insurrection in morals, which was born of resentment and out of which slaves created our prevailing moral code—turn the other cheek, abjure riches, practice meekness and humility ("the morality of the vulgar man")—began with the Jews; that their resentment was born of their weakness and fear; that having "baited" the world with "dangerous" ideals, the Jews repudiated the code's first teacher, himself a Jew.

In the "Genealogy of Morals" (1887), Nietzsche accused the Jews of responsibility for "the facts that the people have triumphed—or the slaves, or the populace, or the herd, or whatever name you care to give them" in consequence of pursuing the ideals of a moral code proclaimed by a Jew. The Socialists, the Communists, the "Liberals" of America designate the universal acceptance of this code as the triumph of Democracy.

When Frederick Nietzsche wrote the "Genealogy of Morals," the influence of another Jew, Karl Marx, was not felt so deeply or widely as one-half century later, to wit: this year of 1939. Considered alone, one may very well discount or dispute Nietzsche's theories but a remarkable coincidence appears in the damage to orderly living charged against the Jews by Nietzsche and the indisputable and unquestionable damage to orderly living since the World War accomplished by the seductive phi-

¹¹ "History and Destiny of the Jews" by Joseph Kastein, p. 130.

losophy, the political and economic objectives, the sorcery of a second Jew, the author of the "Communist Manifesto" and "Das Kapital."

It was Marx who induced Heinrich Heine, another Jew,¹² "to devote himself to singing the sufferings of the oppressed instead of the sufferings of passionate lovers. . . ." Still another Jew, Moses Hess, scion of a prosperous manufacturing family of the Rhineland, was responsible for converting Frederick Engels, the scion of a prosperous manufacturing family of Manchester, England, to Communism.¹³ Hess thought the Jews would always remain strangers among European people and that Jewish emancipation was inconsistent with Jewish nationalism, which could not be uprooted.¹⁴ It was Engels who paid Marx's debts, furnished him an income for many years and edited and financed the publication of his writings.

"Marx felt that as a Jew he had been given a bad start in life," says Ruhle,¹⁵ and from his youth to old age suffered from a bad liver. He was never able to earn a living in the capitalistic world into which he was born, having been saved from starvation again and again by pawnbrokers and by the largesse of relatives and friends. Thus is explained the inferiority complex from which Marx suffered all his life. Thus was evolved the political philosophy (the only political and economic philosophy which might satisfy frustrated ambitions) seized upon after the lapse of a century, in consequence of the uncertain results of American democracy, when economic frustration and political power were united in the person of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

If one adds to Nietzsche's observations and the Marxian influence on American politics, the "liberal" contribution

¹² "Karl Marx, His Life and Works" by Otto Ruhle, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul (The Viking Press) p. 75.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

¹⁴ *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. 16, p. 373.

¹⁵ "Karl Marx, His Life and Works" by Otto Ruhle, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul (The Viking Press) p. 377.

to contemporary political and economic thought of still another Jew, appointed by Mr. Roosevelt to the United States Supreme Court, Prof. Felix Frankfurter, of Harvard, the origin of many of our political ills loses some of its mystery. Frankfurter has been active in the American Civil Liberties Union. Even Theodore Roosevelt thought his attitude in the Mooney case "fundamentally that of Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders in Russia."

The voluntary contributions of Frankfurter and those he has directly influenced, Jews and non-Jews, to the New Deal of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, plus new opportunities on the Supreme Court bench to confuse the natives, may warrant the suspicion that the New Deal is ordained to end in a Raw Deal for those persons whose feet are firmly planted in American soil. While the specifications are wanting in detail, the contribution to "Liberalism" by Judge Louis D. Brandeis is known to be important.

Another Jew, Leon Trotsky,¹⁶ born Bronstein, though now an exile in Mexico, missed Lenin's mantle by a narrow margin. Raymond Robins, who knew Trotsky well in Russia, called him¹⁷ "a four kind son of a bitch but the greatest Jew since Christ." Assisting Robins as director of the American Red Cross in Russia was Alex Gumberg, a Russian-American Jew, who Lockhart says¹⁸ "for years had been in close touch with the Bolshevik movement."

¹⁶ Leon Trotsky was expelled from France and Spain in 1916. Thereupon, he came to America and from January to March, 1917, he edited the Russian revolutionary daily *Novy Mir* in New York City. The Czar abdicated on March 15, 1917, whereupon Trotsky returned to St. Petersburg. Thereafter, he worked with the Mezhrayantsi organization for a fusion with the Bolsheviks at their Sixth Congress in July, 1917. Trotsky led the insurrection of October 25, 1917, and in November, 1917, became commissar for foreign affairs. After the peace of Brest-Litovsk on January 8, 1918, Trotsky became commissar for war, a post which he held until 1925. The Czar and his family were assassinated on July 16, 1918. On January 16, 1928, with Kameneff, Zinovieff, Rakovsky and Radek he was exiled. Kameneff, Zinovieff and Radek had been associated with Trotsky from the beginning of the Bolshevik revolution.

¹⁷ "British Agent" by R. H. Bruce Lockhart (G. P. Putnam's Sons) p. 222.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

Gumberg is back in America working for Floyd B. Odum and is frequently in the vicinity of the sanctum of the New Deal at Washington, D.C. There has long been a question regarding the source of funds used by Trotsky in fomenting the Russian revolution and what, if any, part Gumberg had in delivering to Trotsky funds contributed by a distinguished American Jew for that purpose. Trotsky says nothing about the funds in his history of the revolution¹⁹ and from his book it might be supposed that no money was used.

The late Jacob H. Schiff, who died in 1920, aided in financing the Japanese loan of 1904-05 for which he was twice decorated by the Emperor of Japan but refused to participate in Anglo-French loans of 1915 because assurance was not forthcoming that Russia, where the Jews had been ill treated, would not benefit from the loan. After the Czar was overthrown, Schiff supported the first revolutionary government with a subscription to a Kerensky loan of one million rubles. His biographer asserts²⁰ that "he was bitterly opposed to the Soviet government and to all its doctrines," but his "opposition," it seems, did not interfere with his financial aid of both Kerensky and the Bolsheviks.

While it is unlikely that the Rev. Charles E. Coughlin deliberately baited those Jews, who hold that wisdom and deception are synonymous, and the hostile press in his two radio addresses, November 20 and November 27, 1938, in which he assailed Jewish co-operation in the Bolshevik revolution of 1917-18, still his three addresses ending with his radio address of December 4, 1938, were worthy of having been planned carefully in advance, so completely did he annihilate his critics in the last address. His documentary proof of previous charges was devastating. The British White Paper, the Sisson documents and the files of the American State Department, from

¹⁹ "The History of the Russian Revolution," Three Volumes, by Leon Trotsky (Simon and Schuster).

²⁰ Cyrus Adler, *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 23, p. 32.

which he quoted, show beyond doubt the active participation by Jewish world bankers, including American Jewish bankers, in the Bolshevik revolution.

Kerensky, Trotsky, several Jewish rabbis, a sizable section of the American press and the double dealing of the American State Department were stripped of their deception and falsehoods. On one occasion, as he showed, the communication facilities of our own State Department were loaned to the Jews to transmit a message to Jewish bankers in Petrograd.

Perhaps the most significant fact recited by Father Coughlin was the refusal of the American Jewish Congress at its 1938 meeting to approve a resolution condemning Communism offered by a delegate from St. Louis, and the withdrawal of the resolution after a noisy protest.

According to the *New York Times*²¹ the Congress consisted of four hundred delegates elected by 351,674 persons from one hundred eighty-seven communities in thirty states. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise sat on the platform.

"The mention of Communism" said the *Times* story of the Congress, "threw the convention into an uproar when delegates and visitors attempted to shout down Abraham Levin, a St. Louis, Missouri, delegate who demanded that a proposed declaration of the convention's principle(s) be amended to include a denunciation of Communism. *After heated discussion, Mr. Levin withdrew his demand.*" *

The significance of the noisy protest against such a resolution in a Congress so thoroughly representative of American Jewry, plus the withdrawal of the resolution without a vote, is so obvious that comment can add nothing whatever, though Father Coughlin did urge an immediate reassembling of the Congress. Delayed action upon the resolution in keeping with the obligations of

²¹ October 29, 1938, p. 19.

* Our italics.

Jews as American citizens would only emphasize the tragedy of Jewish detachment from American ways of life.

The Rev. Fr. Coughlin also discussed the "cruel and violent" Bela Kun,²² alias Aron Cohn, born of middle class Jewish parents in Transylvania, who entered journalism and who, before the World War, was in disgrace because of involvement in the mismanagement of funds belonging to a co-operative society. Captured by the Russians, Bela Kun was in Russia at the time of the Bolshevik revolution, and escaped across the frontier with a forged passport after Lenin had filled his pockets with funds to promote Communism in Hungary. On becoming Communist dictator in 1919, he set about to nationalize all property but his system soon collapsed and he fled the country. Before his departure, however, he carried on a Red terror in Hungary for several months.

Unless the Hon. Frank R. McNinch, chairman of FCC, was in the same pliable humor as a woman who has already determined to surrender her chastity, it is scarcely possible that he was impressed by Miss Dorothy Thompson's "Open Letter" of December 20, 1938, in which she concerns herself with Father Coughlin's broadcasts. The country is not much concerned *where* or *how* Father Coughlin got the data for his broadcasts or even whether the broadcasts "injure any racial, religious or other group." The concern of the country is limited to the major question, "Did Father Coughlin state the facts?" and the correlated question, "What are we in America to do about the peril of Jewish intervention in American politics, if, in fact, such a peril exists?" Miss Thompson is altogether too legalistic in discussing whether a certificate of public convenience and necessity should issue to Father Coughlin to be convincing.

Neither the "reply" to Father Coughlin of Frank T.

²² *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. 13, p. 516-517; "Hungary and Her Successors 1919-1937" by C. A. Macartney (Oxford University Press) p. 39 et seq.

Hogan, the eminent Washington lawyer who was attorney for Doheny in the Fall-Doheny bribery prosecution, nor the declaration of Cardinal Mundelein that Coughlin does not speak for the Catholic Church will erase the evidence presented by the Detroit priest against the Jews. Such strategy, as Mencken puts it, *infra*, is puerile. Hogan's endeavor was beside the issues as also was the totally irrelevant declaration of the Chicago Cardinal.

The Jew predominated in the membership of the Central Executive Committee of the Fifth All-Russian Congress which met July 4, 1918, in Moscow.²³ "No one who is familiar with the history of the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917," says William Henry Chamberlin,²⁴ "can mistake the prominent part which Jews played in the Bolshevik party leadership at that time." Chamberlin says the political bureau created October 25, 1917, to act for the executive committee of the Bolsheviks had four Jews out of seven members. He also names Sokolnikov, Uritzky, Volodarsky and Joffe, among others, who were active leaders at the time in Bolshevism. Joffe was head of the first peace delegation to Brest-Litovsk. Besides Trotsky, his nephew Saalkind, was assistant commissar of foreign affairs in the first Bolshevik government. Lutsky, a Jewish lawyer, whom Lockhart calls a "rat," had charge of the passport bureau. Karl Radek, another Jew and pamphleteer of Bolshevism, was assistant commissar of foreign affairs after the government was moved to Moscow in 1918. Radek's real name is Sobelsohn. Sverdloff, President of the Congress and of the Soviet Executive Committee; Afanasieff, Secretary of the Central Executive Committee; and Kamkoff and Karelin, Social-Revolutionary leaders, all were Jews.

Father Coughlin, in his radio address of November 20, 1938, asserted that when Lenin seized control of the Russian government in 1917, he created twenty-five quasi-

²³ "British Agent" by R. H. Bruce Lockhart, p. 292.

²⁴ "Do Jews Rule Soviet Russia" by William Henry Chamberlin, *Christian Science Monitor Weekly Magazine*, June 30, 1937.

cabinet positions every one of which was held by a Jew, except the one held by Lenin himself.²⁵

While the Russian Jews, who numbered one-half the world population of Jews in 1914, obtained political emancipation from the World War, the lot of the average Jew has not been particularly happy under the Soviets. Jewish Communists have²⁶ "taken a sinister delight in the proscription of all Jewish religious teaching. Synagogues were confiscated and converted into workmen's clubs. . . . Zionists are pursued with a czar-like ferocity as counter-revolutionaries and 'agents of British imperialism,' hundreds of them having been banished to Siberia. The use of Hebrew is suppressed as a 'bourgeois language.' . . . Jewish institutional religion became paralyzed in Soviet Russia and the religious outlook for the growing generation is dark."

The emphasis put on Jewish objections to Nazi ideology and the absence of any objections to Communist ideology in the current *American Jewish Year Book* are not wanting in significance. The development of anti-Semitism in America, as a consequence of the activities of Jewish radicals, is dismissed as "political."²⁷

The activity of Jews in the New Deal, the C.I.O. and the Communist party in America indicates rather forcefully the triumph of instinct over experience but such triumphs are not limited to Jews. Judaism and Communism were both assailed as being linked together by the United Fascist Front, organized in Mexico in October, 1937.²⁷

In the middle of the last century the "Jews made common cause with liberals and even with revolutionists,"

²⁵ Their assumed and real names were Trotsky (Bronstein), Steckloff (Nakhanes), Martoff (Zederbaum), Zinovieff (Apfelbaum), Kameneff (Rosenfeld), Dan (Gourevitch), Ganetzky (Furstenberg), Parvus (Helpfand), Uritzky (Pädomilsky), Larin (Lurge), Bohrin (Nathansohn), Martinoff (Zibar), Bogdanoff (Zilberstein), Garin (Garfeld), Suchanoff (Gimel), Kamnell (Goldmann), Sagersky (Krochmann), Riazonoff (Goldenbach), Solutezeff (Bleichmann), Piatnitzky (Ziwin), Axelrod (Orthodox), Glasnuoff (Schultze), Zuriesain (Weinstein) and Lapinsky (Loewensohn).

²⁶ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. 13, p. 63.

²⁷ *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 40, p. 600 et seq.

observes²⁸ Otto Ruhle. The Jews were actively identified with the movement which led to the emancipation of Cuba²⁹ and our own American Revolution had the financial support of a recently-arrived Polish Jew, Haym Salomon, who acted as broker for Robert Morris.

The French Revolution and the Revolution of 1848 both resulted in better conditions for the Jew though the Jew suffered terribly during the Reign of Terror. The present "Democratic" front in France is directed by a Jew, the former premier, Leon Blum, who dared propose an alliance between France, England, the United States and *Russia* to operate against Germany, Italy and Japan. While the ultimate outcome of French politics is perhaps unpredictable, the defeat of the extreme Left by Premier Daladier, who himself is no Rightist, in December, 1938, foreshadows the direction of affairs, if not the final goal. The direction is toward dictatorship.

The revolutionary pattern, however, is not attractive to many thoughtful American Jews who have been omitted from the New Deal bureaucracy or who would have nothing to do with it. These Jews have to consider the prospect of an eventual persecution that will affect *all* Jews. Burton J. Hendrick absolves the Sephardic and German Jews in America from revolutionary inclinations but is severe in his denunciation of Polish or Eastern Jews, comprising those from Lithuania, Russia and parts of the former Austrian Empire.³⁰

Throughout the country, in the smaller cities especially, are many Jews who perform well their full duties as American citizens. They enjoy every privilege to be had in the communities where they and their forbears have lived for seventy-five or a hundred years for the very simple reason that they have earned the respect and

²⁸ "Karl Marx, His Life and Works" by Otto Ruhle, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul (The Viking Press) p. 63.

²⁹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. 13, p. 60.

³⁰ "The Jews in America" by Burton J. Hendrick (Doubleday, Page & Co., 1923)

esteem of their neighbors. They are not Communists or revolutionists or even New Dealers.

The Socialistic and Communistic flavor of the present American labor contingent, especially the C.I.O., is due in large measure to the leadership of Jews. The sit-down strikes in Detroit were instigated by a group of Communists among whom was William Weinstone⁸¹ according to evidence given the Dies Committee.

It is not enough to say that the Jew belongs to the Semitic race and that the predominating race west of the Vistula is Aryan, as Spengler points out,⁸² to account for the destructive influence of the Jew on Occidental peoples. The eternal conflict between the Jew and the non-Jew has its origin perhaps in differences between *phases* or stages of Jewish culture and *phases* or stages of Western culture since anti-Semitism began.

That a people numerically unimportant has been able to exert so profound an influence upon vastly greater numbers may be due to the fact that Classical Culture, that is, the Culture of Greece and Rome, was already decadent when the cause of the meek and lowly first was emphasized two thousand years ago and that Western Culture is now decadent, when Judaism, "Democracy" and Communism operate on a common front. It must be conceded that the Jews have retained a race vigor, that seems to have been lost to the peoples among whom the Jews have lived.

By reason of the fact that the Jew belongs to a different culture and that the present phase, or stage, of his culture differs by many generations from the present phase, or stage, of Western Culture, his inner life is different and his thinking is different. After thirty centuries of world contacts and countless persecutions on account of these contacts, the Jew is unassimilated. He is accustomed to

⁸¹ *New York Times*, October 19, 1938.

⁸² "The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) p. 318.

adapt himself to any philosophy but is more inclined to use the tools forged by Karl Marx than any other, the reason being that Marxian philosophy is a Jewish philosophy which fits Jewish experience.

This is precisely why the Jew is a real danger in our political system. While no well informed person accepts the economic philosophy of Karl Marx yet our American political system which is based upon mass voting strength, generally devoid of caution and generally wanting in great wisdom, is such that Marxian teachings threaten to destroy the philosophy under which we live. Jews in large number are active in politics for the first time since the great dispersal and, in America, are providing the masses with leadership, particularly in the New Deal, the C.I.O. and the Communist Party.

There is a striking likeness in the people among whom Christianity gained its first converts and those who have accepted the philosophy of Karl Marx. As Christianity first appealed to the poor and the humble, the weak and the forlorn, so the Communism of the New Deal has appealed most to the "folks," the WPA, dependents of the dole, negroes, and tatterdemalions of whatever origin. While the leadership of both Christianity and Communism has been provided by Jews, it is significant that the latter repudiates the religious tenets of the former. Is it possible that the Jews have correctly anticipated the decline of Christianity?

The passion of Karl Marx for the "worker" and the "liberal" contribution of Prof. Felix Frankfurter to contemporary political and economic thought are explained in the formula of Joseph Kastein⁸⁸ wherein he asserts that "in Jewish law there was no such thing as a legal justification of *inequality* * . . ." whereas Capitalism recognizes *inequalities* in the right to own and enjoy property, whether acquired by personal effort or by inheritance.

⁸⁸ "History and Destiny of the Jews" by Joseph Kastein, p. 53.

* Our italics.

Before leaving Egypt, according to Exodus 13:36, the Jews could boast of having "spoiled the Egyptians" and Kastein asserts³⁴ that "the Alexandrian Jews brought about the disintegration of Hellenic civilization." Historians may have confused cause and effect in an effort to account for the decline of Spain as a world power. While its decline followed immediately the expulsion of the Jews from the West and undoubtedly there were other factors to account for Spain's decline, still the collapse of the country followed so closely upon an era of tolerance within the empire of the Moors, often called the "Jewish Renaissance," that this phenomenon is not wanting in significance.

Spengler asserts that "Jewry has been equally destructive where it has intervened"³⁵ in Western civilization and explains the Jewish tendency to foment revolution in the observation that revolution means "the breaking down of all that is of other build than himself."³⁶ When the Jew engages in politics, as Disraeli in England, it is to manipulate³⁷ the tools of an alien culture, analogous to the back somersault of James P. Warburg in 1936 when, after having published two diatribes directed at Mr. Roosevelt, he voted for him in the election. The manipulations by David E. Lilienthal to oust Dr. Arthur E. Morgan from TVA; by Samuel Goldwyn to maintain the status quo in Hollywood by introducing Jimmie Roosevelt to the payroll; by Moe Annenberg to overthrow the Guffey-Earle-Lewis New Deal triumvirate in Pennsylvania politics; by Hymie Katz to delude gullible physicians and preachers as a race-track tipster extraordinary; by "Lippy" Lipshitz to maneuver the bail-bond racket in Brooklyn and by Walter Winchell to evoke "lotions" of fervor for "democracy" when presenting the

³⁴ "History and Destiny of the Jews" by Joseph Kastein, p. 53.

³⁵ "Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) Vol. II, p. 320.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 320.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 320.

refugee problem to Mayflower descendants may vary widely in results, or even in motivating ethics, but all such maneuvering is of the same general pattern. They are such manipulations as Jews, Greeks, Armenians and Parsees impose upon the people of a younger culture when freely allowed to mingle with it.⁸⁸

The findings of intellectuals employed by *Fortune* with respect to "The Jews in America"⁸⁹ are somewhat confusing. "Anti-Jewish prejudices" are attributed to a "dislike and fear of strangers which the Greeks knew as xenophobia and which appears as a familiar phenomenon among primitive peoples and peoples reverting to primitivism. . . ." all of which is thoroughly inoffensive but not quite convincing. Nor is the statement with respect to the comparatively small number of Jews enrolled in the Communist party any more convincing. The "natural propensity of the Jews for revolution," however, is explained in language that is simple and direct.

"The second-generation Jewish intellectual with his background of Talmudic dialectics," says the *Fortune* article, "is *mentally disposed* * to Marxism to a degree which he himself rarely appreciates. And Marxism with its internationalism and anti-nationalism is eminently

⁸⁸ The *American Mercury* has kept its relatively few readers well advised of New Deal vulgarities in the blistering observations by Mencken, Channing Pollock, Albert Jay Nock and its editors. Walter Winchell's announcement on January 31, 1939, that "the American Merck's new set-up will embrace F. D. R. and other liberal American tendencies with the April issue," therefore, was an astounding bit of news. The March issue containing "Dictators into Gods, the Deification of Hitler and Stalin" by Eugene Lyons stated that he was to become editor with the April issue. Lyons, a Russian Jew, was educated at the College of the City of New York and Columbia. He was in Russia from 1927 to 1934 as correspondent of the United Press. His "Assignment in Utopia" (Harcourt Brace & Co. 1937) was a best seller. Lyons went to Russia as a Communist and while his enthusiasm for Stalin and five-year plans subsided during his sojourn, he is still bent on saving the world from "capitalistic onslaughts," which recalls a remark by one of Kenneth Roberts' characters in "Northwest Passage," to wit: "Once a wh...e, always a wh...e." The manipulations in Jewish quarters which were necessary to bring about the pollution of The American Mercury might excite a pathologist but he would soon resign himself to an early demise of this heretofore healthy journal.

⁸⁹ *Fortune*, February, 1936.

* Our italics.

fitted to the emotional needs of a people without a fatherland. . . . Jewish intellectuals are attracted to radicalism because the Jewish intellectual very understandably feels that the 'system' is against him."

"Both parents" of the late Adolph S. Ochs, publisher of the *New York Times* and *Chattanooga Times* "were revolutionists by temperament and conviction" is a statement made in his biography published after his death in the *American Jewish Year Book*.⁴⁰

"Besides the ideal of an exodus to the historic homeland, there was the dream of a revolution which would overthrow the autocracy and usher in a new *social order*," * asserts⁴¹ Avrahm Yarmolinsky in a discussion of Zionism and Russian realities as they flourished before the World War. He further says "the Jews were the first to set up a revolutionary social-democratic organization on a national scale." This was the General Jewish Workers' Union of Russia, Poland and Lithuania founded secretly at Wilna in 1897. By 1906, it had 274 locals and 34,000 members.

In the years immediately following the turn of the century—during America's tableau of the horse and buggy—Socialism, Communism, Anarchism and the revolutionary conspiracies which gave them impetus were not widely comprehended and, save for occasional overt acts such as the Haymarket riot, the Homestead strike and the assassination of McKinley, generally were ignored. The conspirators carried on their propaganda, proclaimed their philosophy and boasted of their beginnings with complete candor. So it was that Hippolyte Havel, in a biographical sketch of Emma Goldman, Russian Jewess and anarchist, published in the second edition of her "Anarchism and Other Essays,"⁴² boasted that

⁴⁰ Vol. 37, pp. 29-30.

* Our italics.

⁴¹ "The Jews under the Soviets" by Avrahm Yarmolinsky (Vanguard Press 1928) p. 32.

⁴² "Anarchism and Other Essays" by Emma Goldman with a biographical sketch by Hippolyte Havel, second revised edition (Mother Earth Publishing Association) p. 9.

"very little is still (*sic*) known of the important part the sons and daughters of Israel have played in the revolutionary movement and, especially, in that of modern times."

The Jews have provided the New Deal with a maximum of leadership and a minimum of votes, save in New York City where the Jewish vote is also important. The present political attachments of its mayor, who managed to get into Congress as a Republican, is a natural shift, his ancestry considered.

Instinctively, the Jews admire Mr. Roosevelt. Even Emil Ludwig, author of many notable biographies, succumbed to the spell of the New Deal and Mr. Roosevelt, as his recent panegyric⁴³ attests. Ludwig disclosed to the American Club of Paris just before the 1938 election⁴⁴ that he is "a 100 per cent admirer of Mr. Roosevelt."

In spite of the distress he caused, is not Solomon revered by the Jews for his wisdom? The reign of the present Roosevelt and the reign of Solomon, moreover, were founded on much common ground. To obtain funds for his "grandiose schemes,"⁴⁵ Solomon rotated tax levies on twelve different special taxing districts which he created. His court, his harem and his building program "reduced many of the poorer people to a condition hard to distinguish from slavery"⁴⁶ and "the lavish expenditure"⁴⁷ was "the prime cause of the discontent which led under his successor to the division of the Kingdom."

If it is said that the New Deal does not support a harem, on the other hand, neither did Solomon undertake a Passamaquoddy, a Florida ship canal, pump priming nor condone sit-down-strikes.

The country may very well anticipate its fate on the

⁴³ "Roosevelt, a Study in Fortune and Power" by Emil Ludwig, translated by Maurice Samuel (The Viking Press).

⁴⁴ *New York Times*, October 23, 1918.

⁴⁵ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. 20, p. 952.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

succession of one of the Roosevelt striplings from the policy announced by Solomon's son, Rehoboam, when the "folks" petitioned for more generous treatment.

"My little finger is thicker than my father's loins," said he. "My father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions."⁴⁸

"The national election campaign of 1936 was of tremendous importance from the standpoint of the fear and insecurity which it aroused in Jews and liberal-minded non-Jews," asserted Dr. Maurice Karpf,⁴⁹ president of the Second International Conference on Jewish Social Work. President Roosevelt's "remarkable victory left no doubt that anti-Semitism is not a safe campaign issue in the United States."⁵⁰ Why Jews should be interested in the insecurity of "liberal-minded non-Jews" except as they see eye to eye is not explained. Moreover, the statement is not so convincing now that another election has been held.

Jewish politicians have furnished magnificent leadership in the New Deal era to those Americans who are forever wanting to change the rules or the system and who would expect the millenium to appear at the next stop-and-go sign if only the right system could be found. Hence, the appeal of Communism to the masses. Before Communism, the appeal was a horde of panaceas extending as far back as the latch strings of the founding fathers. It seems never to occur to the *Americano* who lives in "high hope for a low heaven" that every change in the rules or the system, only produces additional parasites, without any diminution of the older varieties.

Is it not possible that the nature of the Jewish mind and heart is such that the Jew's misfortunes are the logical consequences of his contacts with non-Jews in any land? Otherwise, how shall the universality of his misery, the enormity of his persecutions everywhere, be explained?

⁴⁸ I Kings 12:11, 14; II Chron. 10:11, 14.

⁴⁹ *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 39, p. 65.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

Kastein himself presents a penetrating analysis of the Jew⁵¹ who, he says, "has become at once accommodating and apodeictic, humble and haughty, a freeman of the spirit and a bondman of society, a capitalist and a revolutionary, the most pious of men and also the greatest nihilist of the spirit." Are not these antithetical roles fully explained in a separation of the extrinsic acts of the Jew in his struggle to conform to his environment from his true self, his inmost thoughts? In such a warfare between form and substance, between body and spirit, may be found the explanation of fundamental inconsistencies in the Jew, phenomena that otherwise are a mystery. An example of these inconsistencies is found in the Jewish ownership of the detested "sweatshop," particularly in the garment industry, *vis-à-vis* the Jewish leadership of the garment workers' unions.

Waldo Frank and Channing Pollock well represent two extremes in the highest types of Jewish spirit, the first romantic and fanciful, the second apodeictic and realistic. If Channing Pollock goes over to Stalin and Roosevelt, along with the *American Mercury*, it should be remembered that the Hon. James P. Warburg very quickly accommodated himself to Stalin and Roosevelt, after publishing "Hell Bent for Election" and "Still Hell Bent."

The American Jewish Committee, therefore, shows a want of understanding of Jewish character or a predilection to argument for its own sake when it says⁵² the Jews are "accused of controlling international finance" and "accused of being radicals working for the overthrow of Capitalism," as though such antithetical roles can have no existence in fact. Actually, there is a basis of truth to support each role, inconsistent as the two are since many Jews, whatever their spiritual inclinations, avoid the "liberalism" of Karl Marx.

By no means the least objectionable trait of the con-

⁵¹ "The History and Destiny of the Jew" by Joseph Kastein, p. 448.

⁵² *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 39, p. 795.

tentious Jew is his penchant for presupposing the imbecility of an adversary and for ignoring the possible intelligence of a neutral audience. E. Haldeman-Julius, who claims to be an agnostic but who possibly is one of those "atheistic Jews" Father Coughlin had in mind in his radio barrage, is entitled to whatever prize Stalin may offer for insolence, intolerance and intemperate propaganda. Haldeman-Julius, born plain Julius, long ago made Girard, Kansas, famous with the "Appeal to Reason," the "Little Blue Books," *The American Freeman* and a stereotyped violation of every principle of human conduct inherent in a gentleman. His "Opinion of Father Coughlin's broadcast of November 20, 1938,"⁵⁸ is unworthy of many Jews and disgraceful to all. Only a wound suffered in a vulnerable spot, however, could produce such madness.

If the Jew inclines to "Liberalism," to Socialism and Communism, to revolution, he is only pursuing objectives which accord with his history. The surrender of Governor Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, to the forces of "Liberalism," exemplified in the career of Mayor LaGuardia; to Socialism, Communism and revolution, exemplified in the ideals of David Dubinsky and his revolutionary allies, in becoming a candidate for a fourth term at considerable personal sacrifice, represents a fulfillment of the Jewish spirit, altogether too powerful for the individual Jew to withstand. In like circumstances, a Calvin Coolidge would "not choose to run."

If the Jew shudders at the thought of Fascism and his soul is warmed by contemplation of and most of his contacts with Communism, he is thinking largely of Germany and Russia: Germany where the Jew has suffered indescribable agonies and Russia where the Jew prepared the revolutionary stage and where, in spite of some suffering, in partnership with Lenin and Stalin, has continued to occupy it. Father Coughlin is authority for the state-

⁵⁸ *The American Freeman*, No. 1998, E. Haldeman-Julius, editor, March, 1939.

ment⁵⁴ that although the Jews constitute only two per cent of the population of Soviet Russia, they occupy from sixty-five to seventy-five per cent of the offices in the Soviet bureaucracy. Lazarus Kaganovitch,⁵⁵ commissar of transport, is regarded as Stalin's leading lieutenant. Litvinoff, commissar of foreign affairs, is next in rank and authority. A. Rosengoltz is commissar for foreign trade. Heinrich Yagoda, formerly head of the GPU, is commissar for posts and telegraph. Emilian Yaroslavsky whose real name is Gobelman, is the grand inquisitor of the Communist Party.⁵⁶

As late as 1935, fifty-six of the fifty-nine members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Russia were Jews and the remaining three members were married to Jewesses, the Rev. Charles E. Coughlin said in his radio address of November 20, 1938.⁵⁷ Not one of those

⁵⁴ Radio address, December 4, 1938.

⁵⁵ The Kaganovitch family seems to be getting on very well in Russia. A dispatch to the *Chicago Tribune* of January 14, 1939, states that Lazarus (Lazar) Kaganovitch is a member of the Political Bureau, commissar of communications and roads, commissar of heavy industries, deputy to the supreme council and secretary of the central committee of the Communist Party. His sister or daughter is either the wife or mistress of Dictator Stalin. Two of his sisters have high posts in the bureaucracy. Machail Kaganovitch is commissar of the defense industry, a member of the central committee and deputy of the supreme council. Julius Kaganovitch is secretary of the Communist Party in the Gorki district. Andrie Kaganovitch is director of state trade in the Kiev district. Baruch M. Kaganovitch heads the industry which furnishes uniforms to the army. Sergie M. Kaganovitch is chief of the textile trust. Marie Kaganovitch is president of the trade union of the knitted goods industry.

⁵⁶ "Do the Jews Rule Soviet Russia" by William Henry Chamberlin, *Christian Science Monitor Weekly Magazine*, June 30, 1937. The most recent head of the GPU, according to *Social Justice* of January 23, 1939 is another Jew, Laventi Respi Pavlovich Berijev.

⁵⁷ Non-Jews married to Jewesses included L. V. Stalin, S. S. Lobow and V. V. Ossinsky. The Jews were, V. V. Balitsky, K. J. Baumann, I. M. Vareikis, J. B. Gamarnik, I. I. Egoft, I. S. Zelensky, I. D. Kabakoff, L. M. Kaganowitz, V. G. Knorin, M. M. Litvinoff, I. E. Liobimow, D. Z. Manouilsky, I. P. Nossow, J. L. Piatakow, I. O. Piatnitsky, M. O. Aazoumow, M. L. Ruchimovitch, K. V. Rindin, M. M. Houtaevitch, M. S. Tchuodow, A. M. Schvernink, R. I. Eiche, G. G. Iagoda, I. E. Iakir, I. S. Iakovlew, F. P. Griadinsky, G. N. Kaminsky, I. S. Unschlicht, A. S. Boulin, M. I. Kalmanowitz, D. S. Beika, Zifrinovitch, Trachter, Bitner, G. Kaner, Leo Krichman, A. K. Lepa, S. A. Lozousky, B. P. Pozern, T. D. Deribass, K. K. Strievsky, N. N. Popow, S. Schwartz, E. I. Veger, I. Z. Mechlis, A. I. Ougarow, G. I. Blagonravow,

who ushered in the revolution in 1917 was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in 1935.

When the Jew thinks of Russia, he is also thinking of a symbol that is very near to his heart, the political symbol of *social equality*, Democracy; i.e., the Democracy for which Karl Marx yearned. It is, of course, a short-range view but short-range views are not the exclusive folly of Jews.

Such an address as that delivered by Premier Viacheslav Molotoff, chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars,⁵⁸ on November 29, 1936 to the All-Union Congress of Soviets may impress Jews but is not likely to persuade many conservative non-Jews. The address is quoted in the *American Jewish Year Book*:⁵⁹

"The Nazi leaders have well earned the appellation modern cannibals. Their persecution of the Jews is in marked contrast to our respect for this race which gave us Karl Marx. Our attitude toward national minorities is one of friendliness and kindness. The Nazi attitude is one of barbarism and cruelty. The Fascists are the destroyers of culture and the advocates of monstrous social theories."

Since this speech was delivered, between May, 1937, and June, 1938, the "friendliness and kindness" of Moscow has been visited on the Soviet army. The known result of this "friendliness and kindness"⁶⁰ is the execution of two marshals, three out of six army group commanders, ten out of thirteen army commanders, fifty-seven out of eighty-five corps commanders, one hundred ten out of one hundred ninety-three divisional commanders, two hundred two out of four hundred brigade commanders, the commander-in-chief of the navy, all the fleet admirals, the chief of the air force, the head of the tank

A. P. Rosengloz, A. P. Serebrovsky, A. M. Steingart, I. P. Pavlounovsky, G. I. Sokolnikow, C. I. Broido, V. I. Polousky, G. D. Veinberg and M. M. Kagano-witz.

⁵⁸ *Social Justice*, January 23, 1939.

⁵⁹ *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 39, p. 457.

⁶⁰ *Chicago Tribune*, November 14, 1938.

corps, the commandants of the staff colleges and thousands of colonels and majors.

While believing everything charged against the Nazis, the conservative American non-Jew will not bother himself with distinctions between Hitler and Stalin.

Albert Einstein recognizes in the Jew⁶¹ the traditional bent to social and economic equality which he calls "the democratic ideal of Social justice" and for which, he further says, Moses, Spinoza and Karl Marx "lived and sacrificed themselves." Einstein attributes Nazi opposition or anti-Semitism in Germany to "insistence on popular enlightenment of the masses," (another name for "universal education" and the "dictatorship of the proletariat") by "the Jew as a non-assimilable element." This is tantamount to an admission of fundamental differences in character between the Jew and his Nazi neighbors. Although Einstein commits the Jew to the "popular enlightenment of the masses" he admits that "in times of unrest and turmoil the masses are inclined to hatred and cruelty" against Jews.

Ghastly as the persecutions of Jews in Central Europe undoubtedly are, there is a sincere doubt among non-Jews, who cherish no race prejudices and who themselves bitterly resent the persecutions, with respect to whether the Jews are wholly blameless. Moreover, there is a related doubt with respect to the final consequences to Jews in America of too much stress upon the role of Jewish martyrdom in Germany. There is still a deep-seated resentment in America against meddling in either the good or bad fortunes of European peoples.

As long ago as 1918, H. L. Mencken in his Introduction to Nietzsche's "Antichrist"⁶² delivered this blast:

"The case against the Jews is long and damning; it would justify ten times as much prejudice as they now encounter in the world."

⁶¹ "Why Do They Hate the Jews?" by Albert Einstein, *Collier's Weekly*, Nov. 26, 1938.

⁶² "The Antichrist" by Frederick W. Nietzsche (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) p. 29.

Previously, in his "Treatise on the Gods,"⁶³ Mencken was even more withering:

"The Jews could be put down very plausibly as the most unpleasant race ever heard of. As commonly encountered they lack many of the qualities that mark the civilized man; courage, dignity, incorruptibility, ease, confidence. They have vanity without pride, voluptuousness without taste and learning without wisdom. Their fortitude, such as it is, is wasted upon puerile (*supra*) objects and their charity is mainly a form of display."

Whatever Henry Ford did or did not say to Rabbi Leo M. Franklin who sought to interest him in engaging the services of Jews about to be expelled from Germany, nobody has denied he said he believed that Jews wouldn't be content to work in factories. The homeless Jews of the world have had many opportunities to establish a home of their own since Titus destroyed Jerusalem in 70 A.D. The two American continents have been colonized in the meantime but the Jews had no part in the pioneering that was necessary. They came in increasing numbers, however, as cities became established.⁶⁴ Before the Zionist movement was well started, Great Britain offered them a home in East Africa which they declined.⁶⁵ In 1933, after thirty-six years of the Zionist movement,

⁶³ "Treatise on the Gods" by H. L. Mencken (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) pp. 345-6.

⁶⁴ In his "Racial Realities in Europe" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924) Lothrop Stoddard says that it was during "Poland's golden age" when Poland and Lithuania were united under a single crown as they first were in 1386 that the Jewish immigration took place. "At first welcomed and encouraged by the Polish Kings, the Jews," says Stoddard, "flocked in from every side, settling in the towns in such numbers that the Poles at length checked the immigration." Stoddard goes on to say that "the Polish Jews thrived and multiplied, and Poland became thenceforth the numerical center of the Jewish race."

After two centuries, the country began to decline, Stoddard explains, and with its "oppressed and rebellious alien elements like Russians and Germans, and with its cities full of unassimilated Jews, became a mere helpless hulk" and finally was wiped out altogether in the two famous partitions of 1772 and 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria. Poland's lesson is not without meaning to America.

⁶⁵ "The History and Destiny of the Jews" by Joseph Kastein, p. 442.

the total Jewish population of Palestine was only 175,000.⁶⁶

There are less than 4,000 Jews in the Irish Free State and only 16,000 in Mexico. Finland has less than 3,000. These countries are wanting in natural resources and life is difficult in all of them. There are less than 10,000 Jews in all of South America, excepting the two countries of greatest resources, Argentina which has a Jewish population of 215,000 and Brazil which has 40,000.

Not only will the Jews not work in factories or even on the farm, save under compulsion, but their migrations have been limited generally to those countries whose resources had already been developed by the pioneer effort of others. Nearly twenty-eight per cent of all the Jews in the world have found a haven in the United States. The Carthaginians who are called a "rear-guard of the Babylonian civilization" by Spengler⁶⁷ and who finally were swallowed up by the Greeks and Romans were much superior to the Greeks and Romans "as men of business and hated accordingly." The Parsees enjoy their great wealth in Bombay today and have little friction with the natives only because the Indian civilization is even older than the Persian.

That the Jew will continue to pursue his historical ideals in America, the one land where he has enjoyed un-

⁶⁶ An unsigned article in *The Commentator* for January, 1939, recommends the island of Madagascar as a new homeland where "Jewish statesmanship would have a chance of working out a liberally conceived commonwealth," but here again there is a disregard of racial traits in their last phases, a disregard of the Jew's inherent disability, if limited to trade and commerce with other Jews. Like the Parsees, the Greeks and the Armenians, the Jews thrive best when freely allowed to mingle with and to shuffle the plastic elements of a younger race or culture, to their own advantage and profit. Because the mastery of finance, or money, is a universal gift that emerges in the final stages of all cultures, the Jew turns naturally to the stock market with its "pools," its "corners," and its "wash sales." Syndicated gambling, owned and managed by a related network of bookmakers, with its innumerable ramifications, is another enterprise dominated by Jewish talent, which would be in need of customers, if the home office were in Madagascar, rather than in New York and Chicago.

⁶⁷ "The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) Vol. II, p. 323.

limited freedom, may be accepted as inevitable; that this pursuit will continue until there is an open breach with the "majority" which, in its distress, will turn against the Jew likewise is inevitable. Thus, will the sad plight of the Jew be repeated. Thus, once more will Jewish history be fulfilled.

There is abundant evidence to support the hypothesis that the authorship of "red baiter" and of "Jew baiter" is the same. There is also abundant evidence to support the hypothesis that contemporary anti-Semitism in America is founded largely on the identity of Communism and Judaism. If anti-Semitism is about to rear its ugly head for the first time in America among thoughtful and intelligent non-Jews, the most plausible explanation is that this identity can no longer be disguised.

The operations of the Semitic mind in Western civilization are mysterious only in so far as Semitic origins are disregarded. Lawrence emphasizes⁶⁸ the "essential likeness" of the Arabic, Assyrian, Babylonian, Phoenician, Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac tongues and ascribes to them "common influences in the past" and even a "common origin." The "Semites had no half tones in their register of vision," and were "a dogmatic people," says Lawrence.⁶⁹ "Sometimes inconsistencies seemed to possess them at once in joint sway; but they never compromised; they pursued the logic of several incompatible opinions to absurd ends, without perceiving the incongruity." Mencken observed the same trait when he said⁷⁰ the Jews have "learning without wisdom."

When Americans are tempted to embrace the ideals and objectives of the Jew—ideals and objectives which fit the Jew but which are repugnant to the Western soul—they ought to consider in deep solemnity the warning that

⁶⁸ "Seven Pillars of Wisdom" by T. E. Lawrence (Garden City Publishing Co.) p. 33.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁷⁰ "Treatise on the Gods" by H. L. Mencken (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) pp. 345-6.

Lawrence has left. He went into the desert to serve the Arab "for love of the glamour of strangeness" he admits.⁷¹ "Pray God," he reflects, "that men . . . will not . . . go out to prostitute themselves and their talents in *serving another race.*" *

Pray God, that America shall remain American; that the Trojan horse of Communism, conceived by Karl Marx and his successors and already half through our gates, shall not be allowed further entry; that we may return forthwith to the service of our own people and escape the servitude so well planned for us by alien factors, the Jew and the New Deal.

⁷¹ "Seven Pillars of Wisdom" by T. E. Lawrence (Garden City Publishing Co.) p. 31.

* Our italics.

CHAPTER IX

Keeping Up with the Joneses, and Roosevelts

How the Neglect of Ancestors Has Given Mr. Roosevelt Unrestricted Freedom to Play with the Alphabet, Together with Pertinent Extracts from the Declaration of Independence.

"People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors."—*Edmund Burke.*

SOME VERY conservative persons believe the country suffers from keeping up with the Joneses. The contest for position with the Joneses may explain our own failure to inform ourselves how the ancestors of the Jones family behaved. Naturally, the Jones family is not now pre-occupied with their own ancestors, so that the result is, the Jones ancestors and ancestors generally are neglected. What the Jones ancestors believed, as a sound and secure way of life, is beside the issue of present struggles for position and place, or so the Jones family, today's Joneses, would maintain.

The Jones family might not go so far today to maintain that the country is on a new economic level or that the only direction the Dow-Jones average can take is "up." The Joneses so believed in the Summer of 1929 but as early as the spring of 1930, they had ceased to believe it. The Jones family didn't lose their shirts but they did lose two of their three automobiles and they did cancel reservations for a trip around the world which they had planned to pay for from profits in the market.

The Joneses, however, still maintain that the homely maxims of life which guided their ancestors and which enabled them, in old age, to live in comparative independence have no present force and effect. All the Joneses make sport of old Ben Franklin whose almanac was read by their ancestors with great respect. They all laugh whenever they go to the attic where a very old sampler hangs to the rafters. On it is an axiom of old Ben Franklin and it is the axiom which particularly amuses them:

"A man may, if he knows not how to save as he gets, keep his nose to the grindstone."

The Joneses live in the present, not the past. They contend very merrily that the way to save is to spend and they emphasize spending more than saving. They do not believe thrift is practicable. In fact, they think thrift is outmoded and that there are shortcuts to opulence. By no means do they believe with old John Heywood that "the happy man's without a shirt," but they hope the "recession" will soon be over and they believe that by July 1, 1939, Mr. Roosevelt will have all the factories running again and they would not be surprised if Mr. Roosevelt already has the personal promises of Mr. Stalin, Mr. Hitler, Mr. Mussolini and Mr. Anthony Eden to attend the New York World's Fair this year and be his week-end guests at Hyde Park.

All the Joneses actually believe Mr. Roosevelt "saved us from Communism" and very naturally they are all New Dealers.

Although the Joneses believe in fables, they have not discovered the contrast between the Roosevelts and the fabled dog that dropped a real bone to recover an imaginary bone mirrored in the stream. When Son Jimmie connected with the movie payroll in Hollywood, Eleanor succeeded him in the insurance business. The Joneses have overlooked the hint that the Roosevelts have adopted the Trojan horse policy of the Communists and that after

March 4, 1941, the remaining members of the family expect to follow Jimmie to Hollywood.

The Joneses are among the "folks" who deny that any relation exists between the Dow-Jones average or the trend of stock market prices and future business prospects. The Joneses, like Mr. Roosevelt's Securities and Exchange Commission, believe most of our evils can be traced to "monopolies," to Wall Street and the New York Stock Exchange. They think the complete abolition, by law or executive order, of short selling will change the complexion of the Wall Street trader, if not his whole nature. They believe stock market prices are determined by the odd caprices of gamblers and, therefore, are quite unreliable as a guide in choosing between the purchase of a new automobile and a payment on the family mortgage. The Joneses are waiting for inflation.

It is the opinion of the Jones family that Mr. Roosevelt is about to print a whole lot of new money, whereupon money will be so plentiful that they can pay off the whole mortgage with the family surplus of a single month. For this reason they think a partial payment now would be a very foolish gesture, particularly since they really need a new automobile and since some of their neighbors are buying new automobiles.

What the Joneses don't know is that if the "folks" are not stripped and skinned from believing in and following one fallacy, the "folks" are certain to be stripped and skinned from believing in and following another. Life for the Joneses and the other "folks" appears to consist solely in the pursuit of fallacies, in adopting and pursuing a second before complete recovery from the first. The weakness of the Joneses, when in the presence of fallacies, may explain their confidence in the prevailing wobbly structure of prices ranging from Adams Express to Zonite Products.

Since the Jones Family puts so little faith in the wisdom of ancestors, there is very little of it with which they are acquainted. No one of them has ever read the Decla-

ration of Independence from the preamble to the signatures. All have read the preamble but not one member of the family has ever read any one of the following passages from the text of the document:

I.

"The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object, the establishment of an absolute tyranny. . . ."

II.

"He has made judges dependent upon his will alone. . . ."

III.

"He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

IV.

"A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people."

That Mr. Roosevelt has created a few necessary commissions, as the Jones family puts the case, they know very well, but after all, some of the older members of the family voted for McKinley and "Manifest Destiny" and who are they to criticize and knock when America has a standing invitation to join the League of Nations?

Unfortunately, the Jones family who are behind on their ancestors on account of marriages, deaths, divorces and the servant problem, have not been able to keep up with Mr. Roosevelt, and the many charming alphabetical instrumentalities of personal power he has established for his personal amusement. They have never "subscribed" to the Congressional Record and are not even on the government mailing list for free seeds. They have understood that the list has been discontinued but they don't know whether Hoover or Roosevelt did it.

If the Joneses were to read Mr. Jefferson's note to George III, sent him on or about July 4, 1776, and thereafter were privileged to visit Mr. Roosevelt's workshop on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D. C. where he toys with the alphabet, every member of the family

would be horrified. Mr. Roosevelt, however, knows something about the Joneses that they don't know about themselves. Mr. Roosevelt knows that the Joneses are so much occupied with marriages, deaths, divorces and the servant problem they haven't time to visit his workshop and that is why he simply adores the Jones family. They are "the folks" he had in mind in his fireside chats.

If Mr. Roosevelt were to invite the Jones family to his workshop or if he were to lapse into a confidential mood on the radio, the Jones family would have to defend the *necessity* of the following "multitude of new offices" together with their "swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance":

SSB FHLBB FICB PCCA WPA FERA RFC FPMC FSLIC HOLC FHA CCC
NEC USIS NRC FDIC TVA E-IB SEC EHFA NLRB FCC FEAPW NYA NA
REA RA ECW RFCMC USMC NRA CCC CAA

The total number of new agencies is thirty-three, one for each year since McKinley was President. ccc appears twice because this letter is used exclusively to describe glibly the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Civilian Conservation Corps. Mr. Roosevelt showed a marked preference for this letter. It is the first letter of "commission" which, in the fall of 1932, Mr. Roosevelt used as a theme note when, as a Pied Piper, he first captured the Jones family with his pipe. The letter is used twenty-five times in the "multitude of new offices" created by Mr. Roosevelt. Second place goes to A which has rolled up a combined score of fifteen though closely pursued by F with a score of fourteen. The reason for the good showing of F is apparent when it is remembered that it is the first letter of "Federal." E and R tied for fourth place. Just why Mr. Roosevelt has shown a prejudice against G, J, K, Q and Z is not apparent. K was made use of incidentally when Mr. Roosevelt appointed the Hon. Hugo Black kkk to the United States Supreme Court. Perhaps the remaining letters are being held in reserve if the Economic Royalists should refuse

to operate their plants at a continuing loss; or, perhaps Son Jimmie has been so busy with his insurance business that he has had no opportunities in the workshop and they are being saved for his exclusive amusement; finally, there is Congress to be thought of. Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt has saved G, J, Q, and Z for sops to their vanity.

When the House failed to applaud and the Senate stifled Mr. Roosevelt's lust for more personal power in the late Summer of 1937, many trusting souls contended that the defeat of the court bill would finish him. They relied upon Congress, once awakened, to remain awake during the remaining years of his term. The special session in the late months of 1937 and the 1938 session show that these trusting souls were overconfident, in fact, mistaken. Always prone to slumber when conditions are most critical, Congress slept through the special session and were so completely exhausted from the whirl of holiday activities at Christmas time, that, on reassembling in January, 1938, they promptly went to sleep again.

As a consequence of some strategy through which most of the membership of Congress slept, the President's departmental "reorganization" bill was tossed into the wastebasket. Thereupon both houses awoke when the pork barrel was reopened.

Mr. Roosevelt regained their favor by reopening the pork barrel. From long experience, he knows how to waken them and to regain their favor. No matter how peevish they may have been, he knows they have a fixed common interest and not only will they wake up but that all of them can get together when he gives the pork barrel a kick.

It would appear that nothing short of a revolution will arouse Congress permanently to the point of independent thinking or of independent action. It also seems that a revolution will be required to restore the attention of Congress to some of the simple principles of life which everybody once held quite valid, principles which here-

tofore nobody dared to violate, principles which the ancestors of the Joneses practiced in solemn piety.

Congress has nodded so long under the hypnotic influence of the White House that the realm of sheer fancy has become more real than the realm of hard facts. Why think of tomorrow, particularly in view of the surplus left over from last month's pay check? After the House of Representatives dislodged Roosevelt and his secretariat from their position in the first "reorganization" skirmish with some heavy shelling, Mr. Roosevelt promptly counter-attacked behind the biggest mobile pork barrel ever seen at one time.

An artist may very well speculate, even now, about the picture he will paint of Congress in the act of rubbing its eyes when the recruits marshalled by John L. Lewis and Harry Bridges under the standards of C.I.O. discover they have been sold out, find themselves minus coal for their own hearths and start throwing bombs.

In 1932, the Jones family voted *against* Mr. Hoover. In 1936, they voted *for* Mr. Roosevelt. They said he had done many helpful things during his first administration. Some of their neighbors who also voted for Roosevelt became very critical of Mr. Roosevelt during the Summer of 1937 and voted the straight Republican ticket in 1938. They say that, even though Mr. Roosevelt did do many helpful things during his first administration, this furnished no excuse for his overturning the government and his continued waste of public money during his second; that Mr. Roosevelt had acted impudently in appointing a member of the Ku Klux Klan to the United States Supreme Court and in not recalling the appointment after he was warned; that they had been willing to give him their support until it appeared he wanted to be a dictator but that they didn't want any dictator, Mr. Roosevelt, or anybody else.

The Joneses have become very sensitive about the present widespread criticism of Mr. Roosevelt. They

had been very severe in their criticism of poor Mr. Hoover, who, they say had sold them out. They find it very difficult to admit that, whereas Mr. Hoover had caused them to lose two of their three automobiles and had threatened to foreclose their mortgage, Mr. Roosevelt is about to put them in chains, as some of their neighbors say.

The Joneses also say it is very nasty of their neighbors to say Mr. Roosevelt and his family are having a really good time in playing Santa Claus with other people's money. The Joneses resent the gossip that the Roosevelts are running a literary bureau for which the government provides the merchandise and the Roosevelts pocket the proceeds from its sale.

All of the Joneses, together with Mr. Bumble and Mr. Roosevelt believe "the law is a ass, a idiot." The Joneses even suspect that Mr. Roosevelt, had he been present at the creation, would have given many useful hints for the better ordering of the universe. This is what Alphonso the Wise thought of himself but the Joneses have never heard of him. Nor are they acquainted with a discovery made by Edmund Burke that the "folks" having "looked to the Government for bread, on the very first scarcity will turn and bite the hand that fed them."

The Joneses have heard it said the biting has already begun; that the Workers' Alliance, a Communistic organization of persons on the dole or WPA rolls, after a riot caused by the delay of the New York City Welfare Department in adding rioters to the relief rolls, demanded that Mayor La Guardia *reaffirm* "the right of the unemployed to bargain collectively."¹

One of the Joneses' neighbors who subscribes for the *New York Times* and who told them of the riot in New York City added some caustic comment:

"If God fails to save the country from its domination by such impudent rascals, which happy fate is unde-

¹ *New York Times*, July 9, 1938.

served, the end of the road is just around the next New Deal curve."

The Joneses seem to be the kind of people who, being chilled by the adverse winds of a journey, pray for a change in the wind on the return trip and consequently are buffeted by contrary winds both coming and going.

CHAPTER X

New Deal Morals

Satan and Machiavelli Get Together in New Deal Headquarters and Decide to Get Behind Social Security and Other New Patterns in Realm of Ethics and Good Manners.

"When precedents of sin our great ones give,
Few are the youths that free from vice can live."—*Juvenal.*

"We are aware of aspects of our world which are too hideous to dwell upon, which can only be borne, so to speak, by being daily forgotten."—*John Cowper Powys.*

IF DOUBLE dealing, shoddy ethics, sharp practice, deceit accomplished on a grand scale and prevarication fail to become firmly established as the American way of life during the reign of Franklin I, it will not be because of anything he has left undone to set an example for this and succeeding generations. Perhaps later generations will find additional cause for admiration in the success he enjoyed in assembling a legion of unspeakable aids to emulate and popularize his ways of life. Brain trusters, ghost writers, newspaper columnists, pedagogues, labor racketeers, political upstarts and potential brigands, mostly beggars on horseback, have strutted and fretted their hour upon the stage and bent their consciences to fit their dealings.

There is something pathetic to be remembered from the confusion of the Republicans in the 1936 national campaign in agreeing upon an acceptable policy as regards the Social Security hoax. The Republican mem-

bers of Congress had slumbered during the session in which the bill was considered in committee and on the floor, and lacked the courage or intelligence to point out the actual purpose of the legislation, namely, to levy an additional tax on industry to support the gigantic New Deal extravagances and thereby provide the funds necessary as a prop to the national credit.

The deceit is all the more diabolical in that its conception is founded upon acknowledged traits of human character, general respect and solicitude for the aged, a common purpose to provide for their necessities and an equally general abhorrence of all persons who would deliberately oppose a program that assured their fixed security. In the 1936 campaign, the Republicans were forced to grapple with both Machiavelli and Satan, operating out of the same political headquarters.

In explanation of the Republican confusion, it should be said that the country lacked the good sense to pay the slightest attention to what anyone said against Santa Claus. But "time and God give judgment." There is no longer any doubt about the motives of Santa Claus. He was a Greek in spite of the gifts he bore and industry, as a consequence of his gifts, has suffered somewhat the same fate as ancient Troy. The proceeds of the Social Security tax have already been squandered by Santa Claus but the funds have helped to maintain a fairly steady market in government bonds.

A few years ago, the Government tried to send Samuel Insull to prison as a result of his using, in a period of desperation, corporate funds to support the market in his corporate securities, yet that is precisely what Mr. Morgenthau does with the proceeds of the Social Security taxes. Sauce for the government is not necessarily sauce for a private citizen.

There is not the slightest expectation that any substantial portion of the funds being collected in the name of social security for the aged ever will be paid to the aged and there never was any such expectation among

those who conceived the legislation. What a notable example of deceit accomplished on a grand scale, not to mention shoddy ethics and double dealing!

No defense is offered in behalf of those Democratic Senators and Representatives in Congress who stood out valiantly against Mr. Roosevelt's program to seize control of the United States Supreme Court for the support they gave him in the campaign of 1936 because none is deserved. It would be difficult to prove that the Hon. Carter Glass, who supported Mr. Roosevelt in 1936, is unsophisticated in politics, but, perhaps he gave his support grudgingly. It should be stated, however, that Senator Glass and others had some grounds for surprise. To them the Court *coup* was unexpected. In his use of the Presidential power and patronage to defeat them for re-election, Roosevelt would make a virtue of the deceit he practiced on them.

Those who remember the ancient times when Franklin I first sought the supreme power, that is, in 1932, may remember his pungent criticism of poor Mr. Hoover for Republican extravagances and his own solemn promise to reduce government expenses twenty-five per cent and balance the national budget. The voters of America, unaided by Franklin I, made a grand virtue of that prevarication in 1936. To show their enthusiastic endorsement of the prevarication, they gave him the largest majority in the history of American party politics. They aimed at a majority sufficient to fit the scope of his prevarications and were no more interested in or concerned with balancing the national budget and with orderly and honest government than an Otomi Indian is interested in the Oxford movement. If Franklin I was cocky from November, 1936, to November, 1938, the reason lay in his surprising majority in 1936.

An understanding of what goes on behind the scenes in most of the courts of the country will not reinforce one's confidence in the practice of law or the judicial

system. At the moment, a known Republican has no more chance in the court of a Democratic judge than John the Baptist had before Herod. His chances are even less if the Democratic judge leans towards the more abundant life. In the latter case, it is more than likely that the judge is enjoying his first experience in the fleshpots and the New Deal counsel his first case outside the police court. If it is a receivership or a matter of bankruptcy, the estate is certain to emerge from court with most of the identification marks missing and the treasury empty. To the present date there are few estates that have emerged, the complete emasculation not having been concluded by court and counsel, *amici curiae*, trustee, attorneys for the trustees, investigators and experts. The law has never been entirely free of the racketeer but never before has the racketeer been so nearly dominant.

From the comment of a radio announcer at the time of Mr. Roosevelt's "quarantine" speech in October, 1937, in which he rattled his sabre, it was impossible to determine whether the announcer was on the payroll of Roosevelt or the munitions industry. His excited declaration that the speech would be remembered to the third and fourth generations appears overdrawn, particularly since Roosevelt's participation in the Munich accord. That the stage had been carefully prepared was evident later from the newsreels wherein Mr. Roosevelt appeared anxious to register "alarm."

The speech has already been forgot. At the moment, it was intended to divert the public attention from the Hon. Hugo Black, lately appointed a justice of the Supreme Court and who had just been caught with his pants off, and in the nightshirt of a Ku Klux Klansman by one of Paul Block's enterprising newspapers. In difficulty similar to that of Mr. Roosevelt after the Black appointment, Alcibiades, who owned a valuable dog whose principal ornament was his tail had it cut off and

jested afterwards he wished the Athenians to talk about this so they would not say something worse of the dog's master.

How was Japan to know that a domestic embarrassment would result in sharp reprimands and threat of a quarantine for what it had been doing with impunity and without protest for three years?

The New Deal was also responsible for an amendment to the income tax laws, since repealed, which, though it required the taxpayer to account in full for capital gains in a given year, limited to \$2,000.00 the amount of losses which he might claim, except his securities were worthless. This is another example of shoddy ethics, sharp practice and double dealing. Here again, sauce for the government was not sauce for the private citizen.

A recent impudence to spring from the shoddy ethics of the New Deal spendthrifts was the measure which undertook to levy a special tax in the nature of a penalty on income derived from the stock of corporations, the majority of which is owned by a single family or person. It is not illegal to own the control of a corporation and it has never been considered immoral or unrighteous to do so. There is a rule of private investment which warns against putting all one's eggs in one basket but nobody ever suggested before that the tax gatherer is entitled to more eggs because they happen to be found in one basket rather than three baskets. The Mexican Indian maintains that one who buys a dozen eggs should pay more per egg than if he buys two eggs because one who can afford to buy a dozen eggs can afford a higher price per egg but even the Mexican Indian recognizes the buyer's right to put the whole dozen eggs in the same basket.

A distinguished Industrialist,¹ beloved in his own city and state for his many charities, denounced the measure as un-American. It is even below the level of Mexican morals. It is an affront to common decency. It is such a measure as a bully might adopt, if he thought of it.

¹ Frank C. Ball, of Muncie, Indiana.

Robespierre, Danton and Marat might have employed it as a fitting corollary of the terror or it might fit into the schemes of Adolph Hitler in persecuting the Jews. It has no place in the laws of civilized people.

After all, perhaps, we may very well continue to spend ourselves out of the depression and think nothing of it. As to death and taxes, perhaps only death remains as an unsolved mystery. Armaments and agriculture, WPA and relief, Passamaquoddy and TVA, social security and negro palaces, dust storms and ship canals all are neatly disposed of in a profound study of taxation, published in *Fortune*. The proposed solution leaves one suspicious that the magazine is more pretentious than the solution is profound, that perhaps the mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse.

It was solemnly proposed that all taxes, nearly all taxes, be collected by tax gatherers, who, no matter where and by whom the money is spent, will get their mail where Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Ickes, Mr. Hopkins and Ben Cohen now get theirs, the rendezvous of our new bureaucracy, Washington, D. C.

Parenthetically, what a holiday these rugged individualists are making of the memory of one, T. Jefferson! Whatever history may have to say of them finally, it will not say that they failed to make a field day of opportunity. The radio and fireside chats were quite unheard of by Shakespeare but he did know the value of a "gracious voice"!

" . . . what plea so tainted and corrupt,
But being seasoned with a gracious voice
Obscures the show of evil?"

The money changers of the temple had no stated term, whence, compared to the Roosevelts the greater ease of driving them out. When the job is done and if the job is done, the "gracious voice" may nevertheless be heard to exclaim with old Rabelais, "How well I feathered my nest."

No matter what Jefferson thought about bureaucratic government or what he would think about collecting all taxes at Washington, selling insurance to the nabobs of industry on the White House steps, hiring out two more of the family to Hearst, swopping his wife's chatter and selected pages of the Congressional Record for substantial credits to the family bank account, there is no record of a sale by Jefferson of the "exclusive" right to publish the Declaration of Independence, of which he was believed by most Democrats before the New Deal to have been the author. It is interesting at this late date to speculate what James Madison, who reported the debates in the Constitutional Convention, might have made out of a scoop, or what Abraham Lincoln might have got in a private deal with some astute publisher for "exclusive" rights to the Gettysburg address.

To what lengths born reformers will go in their zeal to accomplish adjustments in human nature is illustrated by the otherwise brilliant comment of Walter Lippmann on the pro and con of the private contractual arrangement of the Roosevelts to pocket the proceeds from the sale of current state papers. When the blood strain is tainted with "reform," the solution to any mystery, the answer to any problem is a new law. The Prohibitionists, for instance, are not all dead. Far from it! Those still alive are alert politicians. They are about to revive the issue of Prohibition by law on the ruins of what was once the New Deal. So with Lippmann. He advocates a new law with teeth in it, the purpose of which is to improve the manners of the Roosevelt family. He proposes a law to forbid the sale, under severe penalty, while still in office, of the verbatim stenographic reports of Mr. Roosevelt's off-the-record wise cracks at the Washington Correspondents without the printing of what the correspondents think but don't say.

Lippmann still betrays some of the impetuosity and nervousness of youth. He is irritated by reason of the fact that in May, 1938, our financial ruin was not

universally admitted and that, as he concludes, "American resources are sufficient to support" frenzied spending "for a long time to come." Richard Whitney postponed a reckoning for eight years and the country already has shown even greater endurance. Whitney also was able to *borrow* until shortly before his final collapse but when the blow descended there was a suddenness which must have surprised even Whitney.

If our fiscal status was perilous in 1932, as Mr. Roosevelt, the candidate, asserted, what must Mr. Roosevelt, the President, think of the present peril? Or rather, what are prudent citizens who agreed with Mr. Roosevelt in 1932, expected to think in 1939 after Mr. Roosevelt has doubled the public debt and quadrupled the country's peril?

Doubtless, Mr. Roosevelt reads Shakespeare and if he does it is interesting to speculate whether, as Henry IV, he also has sleepless nights when he considers and weighs the famous final line of Henry's apostrophe to sleep:

"Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown."

There is a bare possibility that the taxpayer might be able to survive the last two years of Mr. Roosevelt and live in comparative tranquility if the present tax law could be amended so that there would be special application to the current activities and revenues of himself and family. The amendment ought to be directed, for example, to the income of those persons who make a special virtue of their dependence upon trust funds and trust estates. An exemption could be provided for those persons who, though beneficiaries of trust estates, still recognize the validity and reasonableness of personal effort, of private endeavor and of income from other than the accumulations of a frugal father, or got as a by-product of politics.

Such an amendment ought to levy no additional tax on the income from a trust estate wherein the beneficiary is a father or mother. It should provide that in the case

of a son receiving the distributive share, the portion so received should be subject to a further tax, in addition to all other taxes, of not less than seventy-five (75) per cent of the amount so distributed or received. Appropriate provisions also should be made for additional taxes wherein the beneficiary is a daughter, grandson, granddaughter, brother, sister, nephew and niece. Only to secure the permanence of such legislation, it might be made the subject for consideration as a constitutional amendment.

Such a law could very well be considered as a companion of the New Deal measure which undertook to levy additional taxes on persons or families who own more stock in one corporation than the envy of New Dealers can endure, the point being that knavery in high place has become the rule, not the exception; that the credo of old Mother Means, "git a-plenty while y'ur gettin'" has a wider vogue today than the creed of Jefferson, or of another great Democrat, John C. Calhoun, who also thundered a different creed:

"The very essence of a free government consists in considering offices as public trusts, bestowed for the good of the country, and not for the benefit of an *individual* or *party*."

What a delightful opportunity presents itself to the many learned organizations of Pennsylvania to finance an examination of ex-Governor Earle's entanglements with John L. Lewis, Senator Guffey and that disinterested contractor who was so generous in loaning money to the ex-Governor. The Indiana and Michigan historical societies should arrange to divide the cost of an inquiry to determine whether Murphy, of Michigan, or McNutt, of Indiana, is responsible for the project of building a million dollar palace in Manila, which we are shortly to abandon to the Japs.

How widespread is the perversion of our mental processes, and to what extent this perversion has attacked our best native stock is apparent daily. No more striking

proof of this perversion is available than appears in the solemn averments made in the Senate of the United States and the high courts of the country that the Tennessee Valley Authority was conceived primarily as an aid to navigation and flood control and that the production of electric current is an incidental objective. No one believes such nonsense and no one ever will believe it, though the United States Supreme Court solemnly declares it to be true. Such a proposition is a reflection on the integrity of any mind save the most callous.

A new and all-time low in the level of public morals was reached when it was proposed in Congress that Mr. Ickes should determine whether public utilities had been offered a "fair" price, as a condition precedent to their acquisition by municipalities with funds provided in appropriations for the current spending orgy. This proposition was presented in apparent seriousness as a compromise between Congressional factions which divided on the question whether such appropriations would be available for such purposes, under any conditions.

Ickes emerged from oblivion when the first Roosevelt asked for the third cup of coffee in 1912, since which time he has been considered to be the prize nuisance of Cook County, Illinois, and still is so regarded. If a blasphemer got a "fair" trial by the pious churchmen of the Inquisition, then the public utilities would be safe to put their property at the disposal of Mr. Ickes for he would be equally "fair."

Ickes is one of the political hitch-hikers who thumbed their way to Washington on the beginning of the New Deal, only Ickes is the lone hitch-hiker who managed at the outset to thumb his way into the cabinet. His good fortune is said to have been wholly a matter of luck since, at the outset, there were more offices than applicants. Ickes invited himself to a return trip to Chicago with the mayor's office as the first stop but a group of Chicago radicals who offered encouragement did not seem able to deliver the keys.

Future historians may undertake to assemble the necessary data and publish a treatise on the moral standards in politics of the present Dark Ages, introduced and revealed by Mr. Roosevelt. Perhaps these standards may be epitomized in an anthology or dictionary but the undertaking is altogether beyond any contemporary effort. It ought to be a fascinating project at a much later date to examine the history of the very common expression, now scarcely remembered, "as good as a government bond."

Gasset, who calls America "the paradise of the masses"² in another place³ asserts that "the tonic that keeps the mass in form is insincerity." The survival of the New Deal in America and especially the popularity of its chief magician evidence also the popular appreciation of insincerity. So also do the extravagant promises of candidates for office, the ambiguous generalizations of party platforms and the hypocrisy inherent in such laws as social security enactments where the taxes collected are promptly dissipated for altogether different purposes. The masses have countenanced and condoned the insincerity of counting the Southern negro as a voter in apportionment laws even though he has been disfranchised by state laws in the South since the departure of the carpetbagger. The camaraderie between drunken lawmakers and Anti-Saloon League lobbyists was the delight of the masses and kept them "in form" during the Prohibition era.

The National Government, alias the New Deal, has committed ten thousand major crimes, that is, major crimes if tested by standards applicable to individuals or standards previously applicable to official conduct. Uriah Heep was no more serene in his complacency or diabolical in his hypocrisy. Every crime is an overt act in the conspiracy to attain subversive ends by any means

² Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses" (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 128.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

whatsoever, not even excluding the most despicable.

One seemingly valid explanation of the present low state of legislative morals in Washington lies in the circumstances under which many Senators and Representatives were elected in 1936. The country was no more surprised by the magnitude of the Roosevelt landslide than many candidates who got on the Democratic ticket when they had no hope of being elected. The local Democratic organizations not only were careless in selecting candidates but these surprised gentry, once elected, were not unmindful of the primary reason for their success. Since many of them were not bothered, inherently, by high moral standards, they supported the outlandish program of Mr. Roosevelt with slavish loyalty. What many of them didn't know was that they would be as much surprised by defeat in 1938 et. seq. as they were by victory in 1936.

Only a very few members of Congress have any financial standing in the communities from which they come, even though Jim Watson* "never knew one single individual who would sell himself for cash." They are accustomed to living from hand to mouth and are completely lacking that sense of responsibility which inheres in an individual who has accumulated property of his own. Very many of them are considered poor risks by the grocer, the baker and the butcher.

Not long ago, a member of Congress was convicted of selling or offering to sell an appointment to West Point. Possibly Jim Watson missed an introduction to this member.

The assassination of the Louisiana Kingfish, the late Huey Long, early in the first Roosevelt administration, left the White House without a single adversary competent to cope with its machinations. Long understood Roosevelt perhaps better than any other contemporary politician and since Long was ruthless in pursuit of an

*"As I Knew Them" by former U. S. Senator James E. Watson (Bobbs-Merrill) p. 280.

enemy and possessed great ability to dramatize an attack, until Long's death, the New Deal bureaucracy had a worthy foe. There has been none since his death. Before he went to Washington, Long involved the state of Louisiana in a huge debt but there was this difference in his spending, the state has roads, bridges and other needed public works to show for the debt.

The country has learned to doubt and to discount or utterly to disbelieve all White House pronouncements that are unsecured by a bond guaranteeing their truth. The pronouncement of Mr. Roosevelt's disinclination and incapacity for dictatorship, his great renunciation, was doubly strange because of the subject matter and the circumstances of its release to reporters who had to be called out of bed.

Mussolini, ex-Socialist agitator and ex-hod carrier, was up to his neck in Fascism as early as 1919 when he shouted in a speech: "We utterly oppose all ideas of dictatorship." As late as August, 1921, he solemnly asserted that "Fascism is tyranny. . . ." Not long afterwards, the blacksmith's son became prime minister and was given a personal title by the King. Late in 1922, after he was a "Prince" and prime minister, he also gave an interview in which he said, "There will be no reason for the continued existence of the 'black shirt' army. . . . I love the working classes."⁵ Six months later, however, he wrote the death knell of liberty in *La Gerachia*: "Fascism . . . is not afraid to call itself illiberal or antiliberal. It has already passed over the more or less decomposed body of the goddess of Liberty and is quite prepared, if necessary, to do so once more."

If Mr. Roosevelt makes the same progress as Mussolini

⁵ Since Mr. Roosevelt's present concern for the one-third who are ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed is reminiscent of Mussolini's initial passion for the "working classes," the sincerity of the former may be tested by the known insincerity of the latter. Gasset explains Sr. Mussolini and Mr. Roosevelt ("The Revolt of the Masses," p. 202) very well when he says "the apparent enthusiasm for the manual worker, for the afflicted and for social justice, serves as a mask to facilitate the refusal of all obligations, such as courtesy, truthfulness and, above all, respect or esteem for superior individuals."

in repudiating his own great renunciation with respect to dictatorship, i.e., declarations in his speech of September 17, 1937, and in his midnight interview some months later, American Fascism should be an accomplished fact on the adjournment of the next Congress. It is necessary to believe that Roosevelt's veracity and morals are superior to those of Mussolini to trust the one more than the other. Those who can remember any of Roosevelt's many speeches, when a candidate against Mr. Hoover in 1932, will not be baffled for want of many examples of the veracity and morals that now prevail on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Moreover, the Russian debacle and Mussolini's apostasy furnish every thoughtful American workingman a pungent foretaste of the ultimate fare if Mr. Roosevelt continues to sit at the head of the table and do the serving.

Not only have the past five years marked a palpable deterioration in public morals but the causes of the lowered standards are equally manifest. Every man who reads knows the reasons for the moral "recession." Long established pride in the fundamental ethics of the National Government, the heritage of pioneer idealism, which could have been sensed as definitely in the village grocery as the New York subway when men and issues were reviewed, is becoming an extinct emotion.

No one any longer trusts the government, not even its present dependents. No one believes any permanence or stability attaches to its laws or that any fixed measure of equal and exact justice will be observed in their enforcement. No one relies on the undertakings, promises or contracts of the National Government. No one reposes the slightest dependence in the good faith of any of its agents, employees or officers. No one expects any uniformity of principle in men or measures of the New Deal when tested by performance and application yesterday, today and tomorrow.

In America's horse-and-buggy days, the social status of

a known Communist was equivalent roughly to that of a horse thief and if the country had not all but lost its wits, the Communist and the Roosevelt "liberal" would be no better off today. Since March 4, 1933, the country has declined from successive reactions to evils in high place, cumulative in their effect, and against which Pope warned in his "Essay on Man":

"Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

Along with our loss of self-respect, our sensitivity to the incongruous, the gross, the vulgar and the false has gone with the wind.

The conservative American, to whom the country is indebted for most of its achievements, in the prejudice aroused against "Great American Fortunes," the "Sixty Families" the "Robber Barons," the "reactionaries" and the "red baiters," has vanished from the scene. Contemporaneously, the increasing popularity of so-called "Liberalism" has been greatly overcapitalized by a horde of Jacobins, Communist-New Deal model, whose morals differ from those of Daniel Drew, Jim Fiske and Jay Gould in one respect only. The latter were devoid of all pretense while the former would rob the whole country and save their faces too.

If the government itself were not treason bent, measured by the departure from policies thought to be American prior to March 4, 1933, many of the first names of the New Deal camarilla either would be enrolled on indictments for treason or those who answer to them already would be serving sentences for high crimes against the public peace.

CHAPTER XI

Mrs. Roosevelt Adds the Feminine Touch

*President's Spouse Rolls Up Her Sleeves in Midst
of Premises, Inferences and Assumptions, Where-
upon World Peace Emerges Bedecked in
Ruffles, Ribbons and Lace.*

"Her reasoning is full of tricks
And butterfly suggestions,
I know no point to which she sticks;
She begs the simplest questions,
And, when her premises are strong
She always draws her inference wrong."

MRS. ROOSEVELT has written another book. It is a small volume of forty-seven pages entitled, "This Troubled World," * and may be purchased for a dollar, if you are interested. Its theme is world peace and not merely domestic peace. The subject is, therefore, broad enough to permit the good woman considerable range of thought, more than necessary if authors are expected to blanket the range of thought they preëempt with ideas that don't topple over when the author takes a nap. The volume contains more than a dozen major propositions intended to point the way to world peace which are founded solely on the strength inherent in the English conjunction "if." Other assumptions are prefaced with an English word, so useful when facts are disconcerting and an arbitrary conclusion is to be reached, "granted." Mrs. Roosevelt "grants" and "takes for granted" the fulfillment of her "hopes," her "dreams," her visions. When the dear lady finds herself embarrassed by a fact which would get her

* Published by H. C. Kinsey & Co., Inc.

crossed up in a nursery, she does not try to explain, she dismisses it.

On the subject of "differences between nations" which the League of Nations was intended to adjudicate, she says that "many of us have become convinced that the League of Nations as it stands today cannot serve this purpose. The *reason for this is unimportant.*"

On the contrary, the *reason* is the only fact which is important. The reason is that avarice, egomania, selfishness, the spirit of conquest, the passion of the strong to prey on the weak, are so firmly implanted in the human heart that such instrumentalities as the League of Nations are destined to fail. The illusions of Woodrow Wilson, in this respect, may have been pathological. They are a mystery in the absence of such an explanation.

In "This Troubled World," Mrs. Roosevelt neglects to say whether she has read Spengler's "The Decline of the West" but it is a safe guess that the good lady has omitted this rather ponderous volume from her luggage, since she travels both lightly and often.

"War is the primary politics of *everything* that lives," says Spengler,¹ "and so much so that in the deeps battle and life are one, and being and will-to-battle expire together."

This observation, Mrs. Roosevelt, in all probability, would find it necessary to dismiss. If she were able to dispose of this observation, willy-nilly or hocus-pocus, Mrs. Roosevelt might then apply herself to a further observation by Spengler,² on world peace, to-wit:

"Even world-peace in every case where it has existed, has been nothing but the slavery of an entire humanity under the regimen imposed by a few strong natures determined to rule."

The author seems to be impressed with her husband's achievements in Latin America where an "amicable un-

¹ "The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf & Co., Inc.) Vol. II, p. 440.

² *Ibid.*, p. 441.

derstanding" has been reached. She believes "we have a thoroughly sound working basis for solving all misunderstandings." Perhaps Mrs. Roosevelt failed to submit this optimistic observation to the Hon. Cordell Hull whose notes to Cárdenas have become almost as frequent and voluminous as those of Woodrow Wilson to Kaiser Wilhelm. So long as we continued to buy their silver and to pay them ten cents an ounce premium we had a right to expect the aforesaid "amicable understanding" and good will to continue, their good will to be weighed on the same scales as their silver and to approximate the premium we paid. Unfortunately, the premium on silver was insufficient to sustain their good will. Mexico had already confiscated small farms owned by Americans valued at more than ten million dollars and shortly after Mrs. Roosevelt's book appeared, Cárdenas confiscated the entire oil industry, valued at four hundred million dollars. The esteemed Secretary of State should refer the collection of these small items to Mrs. Roosevelt, whose optimism seems to exceed her understanding.

Mrs. Roosevelt inclines to the belief that some international policeman may be necessary since "every nation in the world still uses policemen to control its unruly element." Her notion is that such a simple matter as policing the Rome-Berlin axis, not to mention the axes at Leningrad, Madrid and Shanghai, is not more important than the calling of a policeman from the nearest precinct when a burglar is found under the bed. She also thinks "we need to define what an aggressor nation is." There was no disagreement about the definition of what Mussolini did in Abyssinia, what Japan is now doing in China, or what Hitler did in Austria and Czechoslovakia. None of these forays can be charged against the errors and ambiguities of the dictionary.

The munitions business is handled with the care one might expect if Mrs. Roosevelt had to enter a coal bin wearing a new pair of white kid gloves. "Certain families in Europe" are said to be engaged in the business

and Mrs. Roosevelt suspects they would like to continue but there is no reference to "certain families" in this country, namely, those of her own son, who are similarly engaged and who, so far as Mrs. Roosevelt discloses, also would like to continue. The idea of government control of the munitions industry produces "no great trepidation" in Mrs. Roosevelt. All the Roosevelts are lacking in "trepidation" when government control and ownership are at issue, but this attitude seems to have developed since the Roosevelt family became the government, not before.

The key to Mrs. Roosevelt's thinking, if it is "granted" that she does think, is found first on page 17. "Who's Who" states that Mrs. Roosevelt was educated in private schools. The sentiment on page 17, and it recurs in slightly different language on pages 23, 24, 26, 38 and 45, would indicate that Mrs. Roosevelt's education ended with the finishing school. Perhaps the private schools Mrs. Roosevelt attended omitted history from the curriculum. If Mrs. Roosevelt were acquainted with certain historical facts perhaps she would have less confidence in her formula, which is the same formula Maximilien Robespierre and Rabaud Saint-Etienne proclaimed just before the French Revolution (see p. 21). On page 16, she says:

"Our real ultimate objective must be a change in human nature."

One gathers from Spengler that this objective is characteristic of Western Culture and that its pursuit will lead inevitably to a socialized state, to decadence and chaos.

On page 26, Mrs. Roosevelt discloses that this change in human nature is to be brought about "through education." Either the dear woman has a poor memory or the manuscript was hurried to the publisher, "dictated but not read," because on page 3 she has already observed that the "size of this problem is apt to make you feel that

even an attempt to solve it in the future by education is futile."

One wonders at the publication of such nonsense, so much drivel and why it should be dignified in a book until one recalls that, after all, Eleanor is the lawful spouse of the President of the United States. Even so, the volume is a reflection on the intelligence of a sewing circle. Nine out of ten high school pupils could do a better job. Imagine the giggles in Downing Street! Such a hodgepodge of silly notions will do the country further damage. Some morons who believe that Mrs. Roosevelt is a good mother and wife are apt to conclude that she also is a historian and statesman and volunteer for service in the New Deal army to make over human nature.

The dear woman's approach to the problem of world peace, admittedly a problem of considerable magnitude and one entitled to the sustained thought of trained and informed minds seems to have been derived from the realm of phantasy, from Burns, Spenser or Cervantes. The last gentleman, in Don Quixote, is the most likely source of her inspiration. On page 3 of "This Troubled World," Mrs. Roosevelt discloses the secret of her approach to the problem of world peace in a quotation from Don Quixote and her own application of the romantic gem:

"Faint heart . . . ne'er won fair lady, nor did it ever solve world problems."

Don Quixote, when deeply moved, had the good sense to confine himself to windmills but Mrs. Roosevelt seems to have been wanting in equal modesty.

There is a thought in Scene 3 of "Richard III" which Mrs. Roosevelt may not have remembered from her finishing school days and which, if she had, might have saved the country from the embarrassment of another book by the President's wife:

". . . wrens make prey where eagles dare not perch."

The only thing missing to make Mrs. Roosevelt's latest opus a first-rate musical comedy is the music.

Of course, there is a standing declaration from the pulpit that the world *is* getting better but a cursory examination of the supporting data is unconvincing. It is unconvincing that the world is getting better because more plow hands are enrolled in Latin and Geometry, because this generation gets a free ride to school and the last walked; because children who formerly ate "greens" and drank sassafras tea in season now have spinach and orange juice; because of the present emphasis on shorter hours and more gasoline.

It was argued that the world is better in that cruel and unusual punishment has been abolished or abated, but this argument is omitted since the aerial bombing of unfortified cities in Spain and China. The curious aspect of this argument is that in the whole history of mankind, the most cruel punishment has been inflicted in the name of the organized church and carried out by the duly constituted authorities of the church. If the organized church has been able to purge itself of these cruel practices, there is no evidence that it has not been driven to abandon them by influences independent of and outside the organized church. Even so, civilization is entitled to whatever credit is to be had for the achievement. The Hitler and Stalin hegemonies, however, are not particularly inviting as time marches on.

The fanatics of Salem, Massachusetts, who pursued the local witches, were pious churchmen. While Cortez forced the Indians of Mexico to desert old gods and thereby put an end to human sacrifices, curiously enough it was at a time when the Inquisition flourished in unabated fury in his native land. The persecution of Jews and orthodox churchmen by the Central European dictators is not exactly convincing evidence that religious toleration is firmly established in the world, particularly since no one can foretell the limits of the growing brutality.

If it is contended that the status of children has improved, the obvious answer is that no one may be certain the pendulum will not shortly reverse itself as a direct consequence of weakened character from overindulgence, idleness, training in pauperism by the New Deal and an excess of silly sentimentality. Much evidence to indicate the results of these influences is already apparent. Moreover, if our so-called Democracy is about to be laid waste by our own Huns and Vandals, or we are to yield up our liberty to some Caesar or Napoleon in this twentieth century, as Lord Macaulay long ago predicted and as many contemporary students believe, is it reasonable to expect that children will escape the degradation that touches the multitude?

There is positively no evidence that the human heart has changed. There is no proof of any greater human intelligence. Hitler and Mussolini and Roosevelt have been more loudly cheered than Washington and Lincoln. Stalin in Russia and Cárdenas in Mexico surpass Peter the Great and Juárez in perfecting the native goose step. The technique of the New Deal Goose Step is constantly improving.

There is no obvious improvement in the pulpit fare of the living present. The pulpit has been taken over by politicians whose morals now and again scarcely excel those of politicians who make a full-time job of the business. For example, what may be expected as the moral consequences of such a career as that of Bishop James Cannon, Jr. whose political activities in 1928 were more devious than the ways of a Sachem of Tammany Hall? The moral consequences of that campaign to regiment the nation in behalf of Prohibition and the low moral tone of the scoundrels active in its enforcement, were important factors in the political revolt four years later. In 1932, Hoover was the symbol not alone of economic stagnation but also of the moral and social stagnation from fourteen years of Prohibition.

Not that the Bacchanalian revels of the socially élite

are objectionable *per se* or that the necessary self-discipline of the debutante in the presence of scotch and soda is devoid of human values but only that those who do object to very common practices which make self-discipline indispensable themselves are entirely responsible. Prohibition fixed the habits in polite circles and bitter experience has determined the required measure of self-discipline. Many generations will witness the degradation of the weak and the despair of their self-appointed keepers because of our "noble experiment" in changing human characteristics by law. The simple fact that Prohibition was a colossal failure is irrelevant to those simple souls who believed it would succeed. Many who pinned their faith to the "noble experiment" remain stubbornly steadfast for the simple reason that "no fact can ever rebut a faith."

Mrs. Roosevelt's "real ultimate objective," that is, "a change in human nature" not only was espoused by Saint-Etienne and Robespierre but at a much later date the sainted Lenin took a hitch at his suspenders and spake as a prophet.

"The vulgar economists, including the bourgeois professors" Lenin said,³ "constantly reproach the Socialists with forgetting the inequality of mankind and with 'dreaming' of destroying this inequality. Such a reproach only proves the extreme ignorance of the bourgeois ideologists."

Marx, Engels and Lenin proposed to balance the inequalities of human nature by conferring upon the unfit, through the dictatorship of the proletariat, an extra measure of "rights."⁴

Mrs. Roosevelt's "real ultimate objective," that is, "a change in human nature" should be submitted to Dr. Sigmund Freud, the world's contemporary authority on dreams, or else left to languish in the same fate it suffered

³ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 197.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

from the ministrations of her distinguished forerunners, Saint Etienne, Robespierre and Lenin.

Mrs. Roosevelt is entitled to a medal either from the war mongers or from the advocates of world peace, it is uncertain which, since she asserts⁵ that she has "fought for peace for many years." Mrs. Roosevelt also assures us that the sale of our latest designs in aeroplanes to France was an "open transaction," though she omits the circumstances, a catastrophe with a French agent aboard, which made the sale an "open transaction."

Walter Lippmann would "allow American manufacturers to sell arms to all comers who can pay for them and carry them away"⁶ which basically differs little from the policy announced by Woodrow Wilson's State Department in January, 1915: "The markets of this country are open upon equal terms to all the world, to every nation, belligerent or neutral." Of course, vital differences in the application and enforcement of such a policy can arise, as for example in the manipulation of the two billion dollar stabilization fund to the advantage of a favored nation, in which the markets of this country would not be open upon equal terms to all the world.

In an effort to describe a new "American Foreign Policy in the Making," Lippmann quotes Mr. Hoover as having "gone much further than the President has ever gone in telling Hitler and Mussolini to count on American intervention if they attack France and England." He recalls the threats of Mr. Hoover's Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, and cites Stimson's present advocacy of an embargo against Japan. He omits any reference to Stimson's recent advocacy of lifting the embargo against the shipment of arms to the tottering Loyalist government of Spain.

Mr. Lippmann overlooks a rather important fact, namely that neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Mr. Hoover nor the two of them can proclaim and maintain a foreign

⁵ "My Diary," February 3, 1939.

⁶ "American Foreign Policy in the Making," February 6, 1939.

policy which does not accord with the good sense of the rest of the country. This conclusion follows from the same logic that disputes the arrival of summer when one swallow has appeared. Upon at least one issue, this country has been steadfast, that is, relentless opposition to internationalism, whether its sponsors were Republicans or Democrats. The added might of the Communists will hardly affect the preponderance of sentiment against meddling in foreign affairs. It is still necessary to remember that the vision of the country is not limited to the range of Mr. Roosevelt, or Mr. Hoover, or Mr. Stimson, or to that of all three. It is also necessary to remember that while American foreign policy may be determined *tentatively* in Paris by Messrs. Litvinoff, Bullitt, Morgenthau and Blum, their disposals and their manipulations are *only* tentative.

CHAPTER XII

The Dictator Marches On ¹

*Aristophanes, On Being Asked to Say a Few Words
About the New Deal in the Open Forum, Pre-
sents Vivid Portraits of Paphlagonian and
the Sausage-Seller in Ancient Greece.*

"Whoever tries to deprive reasonable men of their liberties, tries to destroy moral responsibility, and is consciously or unconsciously a confirmed enemy of morality."—*Everett Dean Martin.*

ANYONE CAPABLE of divorcing hope from reason must know that the easier economic conditions of the present moment cannot last; that these easier conditions are due principally to the insane dissipation of money from the public treasury and at cumulative peril to a budget woefully out of balance; that, in due course, every possible contrivance to raise money from the public will have been exhausted and so will the treasury; that, for instance, the real purpose of the social security legislation was not to secure wage earners against diminished earnings in old age but for a time to protect the bureaucrats in Washington against a diminishing treasury balance.

No one knows the truth in actual figures but the present number of unemployed, plus the number on the dole, plus the number added to the public payrolls, in the aggregate, is probably equal to the number out of work on March 4, 1933, when the country had its introduction to the more abundant life. That Roosevelt is fully aware

¹ Published in *The American Mercury*, June, 1937, over the name of James L. Mason, Chicago, Illinois.

of the facts, if not the actual figures, is certain. He has only to think of Hoover and his repeated promises of a prosperity that was just around the corner to realize that finally the country may catch up with the New Deal doctrine of spending to save. In normal times, the country would have caught up with the New Deal and Franklin Delano Roosevelt in not to exceed four years. That he has any substantial popular support for any new panaceas today is only a bit short of miraculous. It is explainable only on the theory that he has fully mastered the technique of operating behind a screen and that fundamentally the American people admire the rascal who operates in a grand manner and over a wide area.

In 1932, the screen was the promise to fulfill the Democratic platform 100 per cent and in 1936 it was his studied silence with respect to the United States Supreme Court and what he purposed to do about those tyrannical measures which the Court had tossed into the ash can. Twenty-seven million *Americanos*, at least 21 years old, voted in effect that they didn't give a damn. Hence, the Supreme Court as the *pièce de resistance* for economic royalists, 1937 model.

That the resources of the taxpayer are inexhaustible save for the Supreme Court; that there could be no empty treasury if to his present executive and legislative prerogatives, the judicial prerogative were added and he were permitted to write the decisions of the courts; that a recurrence of the 1929 debacle would be impossible if Congress would prolong its nap for a few more months while he takes over the judicial functions of government is a fair statement of the issue and the arguments to support it.

That Roosevelt is seriously worried about the prospects of an empty treasury, come 1940, and another collapse that will eclipse the Hoover day of doom appears highly probable. That Roosevelt is actually concerned about the virility of Supreme Court justices of three score and ten, or a crowded docket that is non-existent,

or the ravages of dust storms and floods, or their relation to the elasticity of the judicial trek on Pennsylvania Avenue is just about as probable as that he will abandon his career of deception.

In these troubled days, if one seeks a deadly parallel, "The Knights" of Aristophanes contains a passage that deserves consideration. The infamous tyrant Cleon, called the Paphlagonian, is thus described:

"His eye is everywhere. And what a stride! He has one leg on Pylos, and the other in the Assembly; his rump is exactly over the land of the Chaonians, his hands are with the Aetolians and his mind with Clopidians."

A little knowledge of Greek, of course, would add to an appreciation of these lines. But no Greek is necessary to describe our American Paphlagonian whose eyes see beyond the optician's chart additional letters for naming new agencies of personal power; who has one leg in Leningrad and the other in a drawing room of a DuPont or in Vincent Astor's yacht; whose hands reach deep into the pockets of Economic Royalists while his heart lingers fondly with sit-down strikers; who has his mind on the Supreme Court and his rump poised exactly over the Congress of the United States.

Only because our form of government is different from that Mussolini found in Italy, Hitler in Germany and Lenin in Russia did their processes towards dictatorship vary from the processes pursued by Roosevelt. Mussolini from time to time personally assumed new and additional functions of state and always with the sober declaration that some new crisis made it necessary. Some of his earlier photographs led one to suspect, however, that he spoke with his tongue in his cheek. Hitler and Stalin are dictators only because in themselves they have consolidated every major function of government. Nothing of any importance has escaped.

Napoleon's career is an exact parallel. First, he was one of three consuls, then sole consul, then consul for life, then dictator, then Emperor with the right of suc-

cession to his heirs. One does not have to argue whether he was a benevolent despot since the parallel lies in the steps whereby he attained sole power over life and death in all of France.

That Roosevelt already controls the legislative department of government, save and except for the residual power to give or deny him control of the courts is indisputable. How he obtained this control is beside the point. His strategy is interesting as a sidelight but not otherwise. If Congress hands over the Supreme Court to Roosevelt for any reason, for one or all of the reasons he has urged in demanding control or because he has made his demand a party issue backed up by public money and the patronage he already controls, the country is finished. The issue is that simple. He will thereupon control the three departments of government and that is all there are.

Perhaps he will need an army. Perhaps he does not rely wholly on the regular armed forces of which he is the commander-in-chief. Perhaps he looks forward to a reciprocal good turn at the right time from the sit-down strikers under the command of that unselfish subject, John L. Lewis.

The Paphlagonian also had a subject of some parts—a Sausage-Seller whose superior knavery triumphed, all of which is according to the comedy as Aristophanes wrote it. As a matter of history, however, the tyrant Cleon died with both hands in the Athenian treasury and when the populace was still fully satisfied with three obols a day.

Will history repeat or reverse itself? In 1940, the Sausage-Seller may overcome the Paphlagonian with or without six buoyant additions to the Supreme Court, New Deal model. What can six new judges plus nine old judges do with an army that sits down when the Sausage-Seller nods his head?

CHAPTER XIII

New Deal Corridor Below the Rio Grande

*Social Revolution in Mexico Supported by Red
Paint of Diego Rivera While "Good Neighbor"
Buys Silver, Cheers State Socialism and
Considers Government-subsidized
Siestas.*

"And there's a lust in man no charm can tame
Of loudly publishing our neighbor's shame."—*Stephen Harvey.*

IT IS doubtful whether Mexico has changed much since Charles Flandrau wrote his delightful "Vive Mexico" thirty years ago; or, for that matter, since Madame de la Barca published her own classic "Life in Mexico" one hundred years ago. Mexico is still Mexico, and so it will remain—hard-surfaced highways, American tourists, Cárdenas, six-year plans and Rivera's murals to the contrary notwithstanding.

Ethically, Mexico probably has lost ground. There is something to admire in a people whose ways being devious lay no claim to virtue, make no pretenses as was Mexico in the days of Diaz. It is something else when a people set about to glorify their own shortcomings; when their assurance permits them to expect or pretend to expect the outside world to condone, accept and even approve their puerilities.

Fascist, Communist and Socialist; Catholic, Protestant and Atheist; Spanish, Mestizo and Indian! Mexico is all of these now and so it will remain. The principal of the village school whom they dignify with the title of

"professeur" and where Mexican history and simple arithmetic only are taught, on being asked how he could be a Catholic and a Communist at one and the same time merely shrugged his shoulders and recited poetry in his native Indian dialect. For any substantial progress in Mexico there is too wide a gulf between a cave and a palace, between pulque and scotch whiskey, between tortillas and a balanced diet.

Education, bah! The donkeys are well enough educated to give the right of way, leisurely, of course, to a motor car but they are none the less donkeys. Diego Rivera¹ may now employ a chauffeur but he is a Communist, because Communism is the best vehicle through which he may express that feeling of race inferiority which dominates his soul. His murals are masterpieces of the art of whining propaganda. Whether the peon is oppressed by the hacendado, or both are oppressed by the swashbuckling "General" acting on authority of the President, is not very important.

The operations of the Mexican mind are incomprehensible to the American, excepting, of course, the New Dealer who has the same bent for evading issues and for stressing inducements that don't materialize.

An Italian hostess, whose mental processes were Mexican, presented a bill for ten pesos when her daughter, whom she had delegated to bargain, had agreed to eight. The hostess asserted that she always got twelve pesos and the daughter by way of ending the argument, observed, "But the food is so good." The food, however, was paid for separately. The bill was settled for nine pesos. The dispute had to do with the temporary occupation of the poor mad Carlotta's apartment at Cuernavaca. The daughter had pointed out an adjoining bath in response to an inquiry but it turned out that the bath was more for exhibition than use as a bathroom. It was made a thoroughfare for waiters serving early risers in the garden,

¹ In Mexico, Rivera is thought to be an Indian. He is listed in "Who's Who among American Jewry" as a Jew.

scrub women, gardeners and tourists. After all, poor mad Carlotta hadn't much greater trials than an obscure occupant of her apartment in the year 1938.

In Mexico today, the dominant thesis of the so-called social revolution is the inherent obligation of Capitalism to exhaust itself in good work, that is, to furnish the substance necessary to make over the Indian and provide a good living for the Mestizos, and other mixed breeds, in the meantime. This dominant thesis does not differ essentially from that of the New Deal and it is argued in Mexico that the country might have a better prospect if the United States were able to rid itself of the horrible example north of the Rio Grande.

When the railroads, telephones and telegraphs come to resemble the ruins of Borda Gardens, as in due course they will under state operation and management,² it is the thesis of the Communist dictatorship that Capitalism should rebuild the ruins in order to provide the opportunity for another spasm in state socialism. Until the Japanese militarists complained of China's failure to co-operate with their invading army and until Mr. Roosevelt complained of the failure of Economic Royalists to co-operate with him in a new orgy of madness at Washington, it could have been maintained successfully that Mexico had a monopoly in the field of infantile whining.

Communism, Socialism, Fascism in Mexico, as elsewhere, are mere terms in current use to describe, as inoffensively as possible, the schemes of the *have-nots* to appropriate to themselves the lands and chattels of the *haves*. Such offensive terms as attainder, banditry, burglary, piracy are taboo in Mexico. The Communists of Mexico have a softly-sounding generic term, expropria-

² In January, 1938, more than twenty telephone poles on the Pan-American highway within five miles of Monterey, second largest city in Mexico, were laying on the ground. Stones had been placed under the ends of the cross arms to keep the wire out of the dirt. Apparently the poles had been down for a long time. Failure to receive a telegram filed January 1, 1938, at a station north of Mexico City and addressed to Mexico City was explained by the statement that the telegraphic "workers" were having a five-day vacation.

tion. In any event, the haciendado comes to the same end. He is lucky to have escaped across the Rio Grande with one pair of pants and even if he got over the boundary with two pairs, he would promptly be suspect in Washington as an Economic Royalist. So far, the fleeing haciendado has escaped a demand to furnish his successors, in interest, new tractors and seed for the next planting.

Communism in Mexico and Russia, Fascism in Italy, Naziism in Germany, the New Deal in the United States and outcroppings of one or all of them in many other countries do not present a cheerful portrait of human progress at this moment. In essence, they are all atavic, a reversion to the primitive and presuppose the abolition of the "fundamental nature of the human mind as the ages have produced it." As John M. Zane⁸ put the case, "no one but an imbecile can hope for such a transformation or expect it."

Any licensed guide in Mexico will make it perfectly clear how the tractor is to be substituted for oxen and the combine for the flail in successive seasons and how the Indian who has operated a hand loom for four hundred years will emerge as an Economic Royalist long before time has run on the Cárdenas six-year plan. Meantime, the Indians, who comprise one-third of the population, monopolize the country's devotion to the saints and martyrs introduced by Cortez and continue to trudge the weary miles to market with zarapes, blankets, baskets, pulque and tame pigs, undisturbed by and unconcerned with the social revolution of Toledano, Siqueros, Rivera, Orozco and Cárdenas. There is no evidence that fiestas and fireworks are any less popular because of the social revolution and the bulletins and manifestoes concerning it. Morones may be all things said of him, gross, corrupt and lustful for power, but there is no evidence that the peon of Tepoztlan has anything to gain

⁸ "The Story of the Law" by John M. Zane (Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc.) p. 12.

from a choice between Morones, satellite of Cálles, and Toledano, satellite of Cárdenas.

Perhaps it has not occurred to the native Indian artists whose broad strokes of flaming red (possibly a hang-over from the Sun worship of pre-conquest days) portray the good life in the land of Stalin that, thereby, they reverse the current of the history of their own race. This history has to do with a never-ending conquest for and defense of the most fertile lands. Cortez found the Aztecs in possession of the most desirable lands because they were the most valiant warriors. The survival of the fittest was the rule of life when Cortez came. Shades of Huitzilipoohtli! After four hundred years, Diego Rivera, whether Jew or Indian or both Jew and Indian, armed with no more formidable weapons than a brush and a bucket of red paint, carries on for the ancient war god of the Aztecs.

Yet strangely enough, we are told by Bertram Wolfe,⁴ himself a Communist and collaborator with Rivera, that when Cortez arrived in Mexico, "*tribal democracy and primitive communism were in full decay and there was a growing caste system of priests and warriors. . . .*"

So that, in and of itself, this admission against interest by a noted Communist is illuminating, because it may explain what has moved such great reformers as Maximilien Robespierre, Rex Tugwell and Eleanor Roosevelt in behalf of a social program which undertakes as its *chef d'oeuvre* the making over of human nature.

Mexico is permitted to confiscate the property of American citizens with little interference from Washington and with some indication that such acts have the tacit approval of the New Deal. The Secretary of State, in a spineless statement to the press, "hopes" that a plan somewhat akin to a receivership may be substituted for confiscation of oil properties valued at \$450,000,000.00.⁵

⁴ "Portrait of Mexico" by Diego Rivera and Bertram Wolfe (Covici Friede, Inc.) p. 73.

⁵ If an American traveling salesman were to waste his firm's money on postage and telegraphic charges to the same extent as our distinguished

In the meantime, the New Deal continues to purchase Mexican silver but the premium is temporarily withheld.

The whining attitude of a thieving government at bay, one in felonious possession of property that has already been seized by force, was well expressed by Dr. Alejandro Carrillo, Mexican Communist, before the University of Virginia's Institute of Public Affairs, July 8, 1938. He whined as follows:

"Already the State Department (U. S.) has recognized Mexico's right to expropriate the oil companies. The next logical step would be to prevent Mexico from suffering financial and economic strangulation."⁶

The thief not only would retain the stolen property. He invites the help of altruists and "good neighbors" in holding on to it and administering it with greatest possible benefits to the thief.

Japan and Germany can provide oil tankers in which to market the oil which, in the absence of such facilities, has no outlet. Japan needs the Mexican oil for military operations. Herein lie the seeds of an armed conflict which the New Deal has planted, in high hope perhaps, that a harvest of international ill-will may spring up, come 1940; that is, if Franklin I should decide that a war is necessary to perpetuate the New Deal and the delightful arrangements now prevailing for support of the Roosevelt family at public expense.

One mistake has been known to start a chain of events that, because of the psychological effects from brooding over the reaction of public sentiment, has ended in a great catastrophe. Lorenzino Medici, in order to erase the infamy caused by his mutilation of some ancient statues at Rome for which he was pilloried in a pamphlet by Molza, murdered his kinsman, Duke Alessandro of Florence. Strangely enough, he expected to expiate a

Secretary of State is wasting money on long diplomatic messages to the Cárdenas government regarding the confiscation of American property, he would be discharged on his first appearance in the home office.

⁶ *New York Times*, July 10, 1938, p. 13.

minor offense by committing a major crime. If Mr. Roosevelt should succeed in involving this country in an external war, such a calamity could result only from a panicky fear of infamy as a sequel to the tragic collapse of his domestic policies.

While the President's younger son, Elliott, did not explain his personal motives for his radio broadcast of December 26, 1938, he did disclose sufficient interest in the cause of American oil in Mexico to indicate that, as a Prince of the blood, he is losing faith in our "good neighbor" policy. Except for Eleanor's broad treatment of the "good neighbor" policy in her last book, other members of the royal household are yet to speak.

From a strictly moral point of view, the New Deal, which has practiced the confiscation of private property on a large scale in this country, can hardly raise the moral issue in Mexico. The New Deal is in no position to raise any question anywhere which has to do with human dignity or good morals and Cárdenas fully understands this as the replies of his foreign secretary to Mr. Cordell Hull's pious notes clearly show. The publication by Mr. Roosevelt of extracts from the questions and answers of his press conferences, illustrated as they are, with the customary dental art from the White House, leaves whatever had existed in this country of human dignity, completely flat. Cárdenas seems to surpass Roosevelt in dignity and they appear to be evenly matched in morals.

It is no surprise that a thoughtful Mexican business man should suggest that Mexico's greatest hope of relief consists in ridding our own country of the awful example in the White House.

Future generations, however, are apt to regret the accident of Mr. Roosevelt's birth in a country that, up to March 4, 1933, was reasonably well civilized and fairly well possessed of such elemental virtues as self-reliance, respect for a neighbor's rights and property, common honesty, industry and frugality. If these were not the dominant ideals before Franklin I came to the throne,

nobody dared assert the contrary. After five years, these dominant ideals have been reversed, so far as act and example are controlling influences. A transvaluation of ideals has taken place and dependence upon the state has been substituted for self-reliance. Envy, shoddy ethics, idleness and spending have replaced the other ideals named.

Economists and sociologists, yet unborn, are apt to speculate with respect to what their forefathers would have escaped in loss of virtue and moral strength and what they could have escaped in crushing taxation if Mr. Roosevelt had contended against Cárdenas rather than Hoover and Landon. The speculation may extend far beyond these primary considerations; how the slaughter of little pigs would have affected the Nahuatl vote; what political support could have been assured from a housing campaign among the Tarascans; whether the Otomis, who spin maguey while they walk to market, would have preferred to sit down and spin and, if they had such a preference, whether Mr. Roosevelt would have provided benches or petates; whether free fire works for fiestas would have been appreciated at the polls and the direct political consequences of government subsidized siestas.

It is regrettable Mr. Roosevelt's political fortunes were not limited to Mexico. The United States already had enough to overcome, whereas what Roosevelt might have done as head man in Mexico is really unimportant.

CHAPTER XIV

Present Phases of New Deal

*Indiana Prepared to Present Self-made Dictator,
with or without an Emergency, While "We Re-
formers" Befoul the Atmosphere with
Kettle of Dead Fish.*

"So many laws, yet never more disorders"—Robert Burton.
"The purification of politics is an iridescent dream."—John J. Ingalls.

SINCE A cross section of the whole country is found in almost any township of the nation, the state of Indiana may be said to present national conditions and prospects in miniature.

The 1938 candidates for United States Senator, in Indiana, included the incumbent Mr. Van Nuys, elected in 1932 as a Democrat but later excommunicated by the McNutt hierarchy for "contumacy" in voting against the court-packing bill and who became a candidate to succeed himself as an independent; also two self-confessed New Dealers, one of whom had expected to be nodded to a nomination by the McNutt overlords; the Hon. James Eli Watson, ancient mariner of the G.O.P., three reasonably worthy Republicans from the provinces and, finally a former satrap of the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan.

In 1932, Indiana elected as Governor a darling of the American Legion, described then as a soldier who never fired a gun, a lawyer who never tried a case, a teacher who never taught a class. His struggles for self-aggrandizement and his repeated affronts to good taste have shocked

the most callous sensibilities. Some members of his personal party, who hope to get to the main section of the public crib with him, added a touch of superstition by offering wagers that he would be nominated for President in 1940 on the thirteenth ballot. But that was *prior* to the 1938 elections in which the Republicans of Indiana elected a Secretary of State, seven out of twelve Congressmen and their candidates in most of the counties, townships and cities. They also elected a majority of the members of the lower house of the general assembly.

Inability to get a front seat at the White House fireside no doubt cooled off McNutt's enthusiasm for the New Deal but threats of Van Nuys to strip the gears of the McNutt machine compelled McNutt to accept Van Nuys for renomination which was accomplished by frenzied cables from Manila to Indianapolis.

Jim Watson's permanent retirement from office was sanctioned by the Republican Convention. The state still awaits the fulfillment of the Van Nuys threats to expose the income tax returns of Democratic politicians, Van Nuys having finally received the Democratic nomination to prevent his threatened exposures. He was able to defeat the Republican candidate in a close vote, so close it was contested. Poor Mr. Minton, a holdover, might have been saved the embarrassment of the Van Nuys' renomination by a recess appointment to another job, except that he is eminently satisfactory to Mr. Roosevelt who surely would have lost two Senators as a consequence of giving him a judicial appointment.

The marked deterioration of the Republican party in Indiana during the twenties is undeniable. Its leadership was dishonest or incompetent and frequently was both. But it was never insolent. The state's benevolent, penal and educational institutions either were bi-partisan or non-partisan, principally the latter. No one ever thought of soliciting campaign contributions from officials or employees of these institutions. The universities

and normal schools were far removed from party politics. The up-and-coming Mr. McNutt changed all this.

In a "re-organization" of state government every state institution and department was brought under his heel. A slush fund, computed at the modest rate of two per cent of the state payroll was established and profits from the state purchase of materials and supplies were quickly regimented to the pockets of faithful party hacks. When the newspapers complained of the two per cent levy, the McNutt legislature promptly "legalized" the slush fund.

When Prohibition shot its Parthian arrow at the McNutt parvenus, they promptly added to the state's disgrace by regimenting the beer business under the name of "ports of entry," with a notorious political hack stationed at each "port" to collect tribute.

Mr. McNutt has added something to Hoosier ways. With befitting insolence, he has "legalized" practices, formerly considered disgraceful and dishonest by stupid Republicans. At odd times, he has also practiced showmanship, particularly showmanship which features his remarkable dental endowments.

It is small wonder that the virtuous Mr. McNutt, restrained by the limitation of a tax of only two per cent on the public payroll in Indiana, has ants in his pants whenever he considers what the Roosevelts could do if only they had his impudence. Amos Pinchot may write open letters to Mr. Roosevelt on his Plan of Reorganization of the Federal Government and tear his hair out by the roots because of the dictatorial power Mr. Roosevelt seeks, but Mr. Pinchot probably doesn't know that Mr. McNutt, who wants to succeed Mr. Roosevelt in 1940, five years ago did exactly everything in Indiana which Mr. Roosevelt wants to do in Washington. His "re-organization" of the Indiana state government, save for control of the press, made him as much of a dictator as Mussolini. From his control of the state's educational system, he has saved for himself, should his presidential

ambitions be ignored, the presidency of Indiana University, the board of trustees being his own puppets. Through control of the liquor and beer racket and indirectly of liquor and beer advertising, some country editors were being brought to their knees.

The only voters who were completely convinced by the April, 1938, fireside chat of the wisdom of more spending were Ben Cohen, Tommy Corcoran and others of the Secretariat who wrote the speech. At that time, Mr. Roosevelt seemed to lack some of his former zest for a permanent life on Pennsylvania Avenue. He was still motivated by the impulses of a pedagogue in front of backward children, a pointer in one hand and a switch in the other.

While the same pandering psychology, I-will-not-let-you-down-so-long-as-I-have-your-votes, dominated the President's return to the fireside, his voice indicated that perhaps the embers had cooled off in the preceding five months. Either the fire or his soul lacked the customary warmth.

The President seemed to be thinking of tin soldiers rather than blocks in a playroom when he spoke of a necessary third round of ammunition, to bowl over such stubborn Economic Royalists as might be left standing after two rounds had been discharged. All the ammunition, it appeared, would be got from the Economic Royalists and nobody likely to vote for the continued merry-making in the playroom on Pennsylvania Avenue would be expected to contribute.

As to the X billion dollars, constituting a full complement of three rounds of ammunition needed to bowl over the last surviving taxpayer and prevent a New Deal rout in the 1938 elections, the President made it clear that the consequent increase in the public debt was scarcely worth discussing since it was planned to resort to gold desterilization, alchemy and other less familiar feats of black magic. There was some disappointment among the WPA workers at Granada, Mississippi, because

the President failed to make a seasonal recommendation of a good spring tonic.

Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal enjoy the advantage of a political technique vastly superior to that of Caesar, Crassus, Cicero and Pompey who had to depend upon the spoils of foreign conquest and private loans for the cash needed in elections. Crassus loaned Caesar twenty million sesterces before his creditors would permit him to depart for Gaul. Thereafter, the votive treasures of the Gallic temples, which Caesar seized, together with cash extorted from Ptolemy by himself and Pompey, equipped Caesar adequately for Roman politics. He was the richest man in the world.

By way of proof that there is nothing new under the sun, Mr. Roosevelt bills and coos on the radio as did Pericles, according to Plutarch, "caress" the people. "Finding himself come short of his competitor in wealth and money," Aristotle says Pericles "turned to the distribution of the public moneys" and Cimon, in spite of his "glorious victories over the barbarians," was banished. In a political contest with Thucydides, Pericles engaged in "coaxing his countrymen like children" with frequent public shows, banquets and processions, i.e., parades. He inaugurated five resettlement projects. Pericles also sponsored a huge public building program like that of the PWA and WPA.

The New Dealers provide the cash needed to win elections by appropriations from the domestic Treasury, for purposes which they call pump priming even if the cash is borrowed by the Treasury at the price of a first mortgage on the income of countless generations. The Roman treasury was bulging with a surplus when Caesar was assassinated. Except for extortions laid on the backs of our own citizens in current taxes and deficit borrowings, our own Treasury would now be as empty as the pockets of Richard Whitney before he went to Sing Sing.

Before Congress adjourned in June, 1938, it made provision to squander several billion dollars on a new mer-

chant marine. The spending was reinforced with assurances by radio commentators who had reached maturity since our previous disasters in maintaining a merchant marine or who, in any event, are unacquainted with our previous failures on the sea, that we are to have a new and thriving enterprise. The new law contains provisions for the adjustment of labor disputes but what the law and Congress blithely ignore is the differential between American wages and conditions of employment under the Seaman's act and wages and conditions of employment on ships under foreign registry. Subsidies to balance this differential would soon bankrupt a solvent country. The consequences of the folly are foreordained.

The latest opus of Stuart Chase, ghost writer for the New Deal, which he calls "The Tyranny of Words"¹ aspires to present a philosophy to end all philosophical thought. Chase who has the record of holding a government job continuously since 1917, which qualifies him to enter the finals of the leech derby with the Roosevelts and LaFollettes, like many pen-minded reformers, operates on a single track which involves him in apologies for nonsense in earlier works, to-wit: "A New Deal" (1932).

"The Tyranny of Words" is little more than a hodgepodge of New Deal propaganda in which filth is meant to be concealed by a new cloak called "semantics."² As a study in semantics or philology, Chase seems to be unduly impressed by elemental discoveries and now and again shows the same wonderment as an infant who has first discovered his own feet.

While it belongs to the chapter on the "morals of the New Deal" rather than the philosophy of its chaotic manifestations, attention should be called to his comment

¹ "The Tyranny of Words" by Stuart Chase (Harcourt, Brace & Co.).

² In "The Antichrist," Nietzsche uses "semiotic" which Mencken translates as "semantics," and Count Alfred Korzybski, following the publication of "Science and Sanity" (Science Press) in 1933, founded the "Institute of General Semantics" in Chicago with funds supplied by Cornelius Crane.

on page 374 where Congressman E. E. Cox, of Georgia, is said to have declared the South will defeat "collective bargaining." As quoted by Chase, he said nothing of the kind. He denounced the terroristic practices of John L. Lewis and threatened retaliation. That is all.

The inference suggested by the language on page 286 that the New Deal is justified because of what happened to the Bourbons of France, the southern planters, the haciendados of Mexico under Diaz, the Russian nobility, is an example of the sloppy thinking to which all special pleaders are subject. A little knowledge of history and a few minutes contemplation would tag the inference as absurd since one has to recall only that Robespierre's New Deal, which first attacked the Bourbons, ended by enslaving those workers who were not finished on the guillotine; that citizenship and the ballot given to four million illiterate negroes in retaliation against the southern planters have produced a network of "Tobacco Roads" in the south and have not much improved the negro; that a food shortage in Mexico from destroying the haciendados was as certain as the decay of Mexican industry and that the current good life under Stalin and his atrocious "purges" leave something to be said in behalf of the old Russian nobility. A Mexican food shortage with rising prices is a present fact.

The outstanding fallacy of the Chase "semantics" is the assumption that a people, once hell-bent for disaster, can be saved by palliatives. Louis XVI went to the guillotine because of his error in granting, not withholding, reforms. He made himself a helpless victim, only because of his complete surrender to the *canaille* whom he called "my people."

When Chase uses such terms as "social legislation," as he does on page 285, he appears to need some of his own "semantics" and when he asks on pages 288-9 "What would have happened had there been no federal spending?" since the question is unanswered, he presents an

issue from which "semantics" will not save him. Only an embrace or a sly kiss will satisfy the feminine heart when bubbling over with silly questions.

The implication that chaos would have followed our failure to dissipate the national credit by waste and extravagance is far-fetched and it is well to remember that we are bankrupt and that absolute chaos is just around the corner anyway. To assert exactly "what would have happened had there been no Federal spending" invades the realm of speculation but it is no speculation to assert that we are substantially where we were on March 4, 1933, minus twenty billion dollars and minus the freedom we then enjoyed to grope ourselves out of difficulty.

"If the social legislation is thrown out in toto, the result might well be a *new boom* * and an even *grander smash*,* quite destroying popular confidence in the financial system," is a fair sample of Chase nonsense. Of nonsense, there is little else. He is doubtful about thrift; "when unemployment is growing . . . thrift is a deadly enemy of financial stability" and "we persist in *thinking* * about money as it behaved two hundred years ago." He is so cocksure "capitalism" is declining that again he asks a question: "Why worry a dry bone?"

The lady has grown so bold with silly questions that one in his right senses might think "her" entitled, at this point, to a "sock on the chin."

The program of "we reformers," as proclaimed by Chase on page 304 is a kettle of dead fish—the ballot, social legislation, collective bargaining, co-operative associations, the TVA structure, conservation programs, holding company regulations, stock market control, central banking and public ownership "if, as, and when the context of situation, after study, gives promise for an advance."

"*Advance*" to what? To a socialized state and the dictatorship of the proletariat, as Marx, Engels and Lenin prescribed? To the final destruction of the "State" for

* Our italics.

the greater freedom of the unfit from the responsibilities of citizenship? Chase is ominously vague or silent in describing the goal to which his "*advance*" leads. Does the reason for his ambiguity lie in his certain knowledge that a now potent minority would resist any "*advance*" to such a goal as Chase contemplates, if he were fully understood? Since Chase is manifestly a special pleader, his motives are transparent even if his language is vague.

The so-called "*advance*" in the program is "*hash*" plus "*blab*" plus "*blah*" raised to the *nth* power. Such language was familiar to Boies Penrose when he was accustomed to require the G.O.P. platform to be produced for his approval, but Penrose has been dead these many years. Chase ought to consider the peril to the public health in this kettle of dead fish and particularly its bad odor, which would be subject to abatement in many jurisdictions.

The Chase book is more extensively dealt with than the contents justify only because it is typical of New Deal ghost writing.³

One wonders where the Labor Bureau housed Chase when the Puddler from Elwood, Indiana, held the Labor portfolio and before Mr. J. P. Morgan was threatened by Chase with a seat "on the pavement with Adam." It is sad to reflect that Chase failed to give poor Mr. Hoover the advantage of doctrines that actually must have been hatched in an incubator provided by the sage of Palo Alto himself during those fateful years from March 4, 1929, to March 4, 1933.

It is indeed refreshing, the fragrance to be had from turning one's nostrils away from Chase's kettle of dead fish, and inhaling deeply from another source, the wisdom of Oswald Spengler:⁴

"Men finally give up, not this or that theory, but the belief in theory of any kind and with it the sentimental

³ See Appendices I and II.

⁴ "The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) Vol. II, p. 454.

optimism of an eighteenth century that imagined that unsatisfactory actualities could be improved by the application of concepts."

Such wisdom has the essence of eternity.

Due to the emphasis put on money and private possessions by the Occidental mind, Capitalism flourishes best under Democracy and next best under Parliamentary Monarchy. But it also flourishes after a fashion and to a degree under Absolutism, under Naziism and Fascism, even under the revolutionary dictatorship of the Soviets. Capitalism is adaptable to the Occidental mind, Socialism is not. Sincere Socialists are doomed to disillusionment and disappointment for this reason. Socialism is one political cult which has no hope of fulfillment in Western culture.

Between Hitler and Congressman Dies of Texas, the American Communists are sorely beset. While bedeviled by a frontal attack at home, they have had to endure the collapse of a "Democratic" flank to the south of Berchtesgaden and while they very well know that, in this instance, Mr. Roosevelt betrayed them, all they can do is whine. Through the late Paul Y. Anderson, *The Nation*⁵ lamented the "sad week for democracy" and added that "sadder ones probably are in store." Anderson "never had the slightest faith in Chamberlain" and out of the Munich accord developed the suspicion that Chamberlain "does not really believe in democracy." What a naïve suspicion from one thought possessed of sufficient sophistication to answer Congressman Dies on the radiol

Anderson was a frequent contributor to *The Nation* and *The New Republic*, both of which are Communistic, and it therefore was daring of the New Deal to select him to attack the Dies Committee which had been attacked by Mr. Roosevelt for not suppressing evidence of treason against the sit-down Governor of Michigan. Mr. Roosevelt's involved reasoning that Governor Murphy could not possibly have condoned the sit-down strikes, i.e., law-

⁵ *The Nation*, October 8, 1938.

lessness (and thereby be guilty of treason as charged by a witness before the Dies Committee), *because of his religion* is disposed of by the fact that he *did*, in effect, condone the sit-down strikes, something which everybody, particularly the voters of Michigan, knows. Mr. Roosevelt's insolence in ignoring facts which everybody knows was matched by the New Deal impudence in selecting Anderson to attack the Dies Committee.

The Boston police strike which elevated Calvin Coolidge from Governor of Massachusetts to the White House is not entirely forgot and sit-down strikes in America will not soon be forgot as Murphy's defeat shows. Murphy's way should have pleased Moscow but Murphy's way is hardly the American way though Mr. Roosevelt has adopted it and confided to the Washington correspondents that the Murphy way is his notion of the American way of dealing with anarchy.

Until ants and bees and beavers change their ways of life, human nature is unlikely to change its way and armies unlikely to win battles without generals. Until the tail wags the dog and water flows up hill, no socialized state west of the Vistula is possible.

We are all Socialists, however, in the same way that we are all Christians. We are just as incapable of establishing a socialized state as we have proved incapable of practicing the tenets of Christianity. We dwell on both as desirable objectives but ignore the means to reach the objectives because we cannot adapt ourselves to the necessary means.

There is no choice, therefore, between Capitalism and Socialism. The choice is limited to a selection of the government with which we are acquainted from experience or a totalitarian government, either of which may be punctuated with anarchy. In any event, Capitalism, though badly emasculated, will survive.

The New Deal may utterly destroy those now in control of our present Capitalistic state. The renowned Mr. Lilienthal may emerge in the place now held by Wendell

Willkie and the famous New Deal "Economist," Leon Henderson, may succeed to the power once enjoyed by Harley L. Clarke or Floyd B. Odum. Son Jimmie may be able to seize a sizable insurance company as a diversion from Hollywood and Ben Cohen may get Tom Girdler's place. If the motion picture industry will send Will Hays to the block to make room for a New Deal successor, no doubt one satanic "monopoly" will be purified, *ipso facto*. Son Jimmie's employment has already contributed to the purification of Hollywood. There are many ways by which to effect wholesale changes in masters *under* Capitalism. Having discarded all moral standards, the New Deal bureaucracy is freed of the necessity to observe any inhibitions of public or private conscience. With obvious candor, the New Deal Vandals have adopted the system of politics described by Ambrose Bierce as "the conduct of public affairs for private advantage."⁶

Whatever can be accomplished before the country catches up with them (if it does) in a redistribution of the wealth represented by the railroads, the electric industry and the more desirable "monopolies" will be accomplished for the sole and exclusive benefit of New Deal henchmen who enjoy more than a speaking acquaintance at the White House. Individually, "my friends" of the radio who have made it possible for these henchmen to satisfy their greed and their gluttony will have to be content with the crumbs that, as usual, fall from the rich man's table.

The number and extent of changes in masters *under* Capitalism⁷ will depend upon the ambition and greed of

⁶ As, for instance, the collection by Jerome Frank of a \$30,000.00 fee allowed him by the SEC for "services" in connection with the reorganization of the Missouri Pacific Railroad and \$75,000.00 for which John Lord O'Brian, Republican candidate for U. S. Senator in New York State in 1938, was employed to act as special counsel for TVA.

⁷ The technique of the changes in masters of vast enterprises, in an epoch of "dying Capitalism," is very well illustrated in a recital of recent events in the history of the Byllesby Engineering and Management Corporation and its related Standard Gas and Electric Company, as presented in a Washington dispatch to the *Chicago Tribune*, published January 28, 1939. Under the Holding Company Act and the SEC Act, this vast public utility empire first

reigning bureaucrats which, in turn, will determine the depth of bitterness and the resultant damage from the present struggle—not to save Capitalism, which is safe in any event—but to save the country from a government akin to that of Russia, Germany, Italy and Spain.

No one can justly deny the sincerity of a portion of the American Left Wing and this applies as well to some avowed Communists and some of their more genteel brethren of lighter hue who, being touched with a psychopathic urge to make over human nature, mistake an *ignis fatuus* for the pole star. Such beings have the heart of a poet and so long as they are treated as poets all is well. The difficulties of the world arise, however, when the world begins to accept them for what they pretend. Some pretend to a wide understanding of sociology, others venture into anthropology and still others feign a familiarity with history but their most common weakness is their daring in the realm of economics and political economy.

The Jews have given the world its most inspiring poetry and this dormant talent may explain in part the current Jewish contribution to the propaganda of Communism.

Waldo Frank, with two degrees from Yale and an honorary degree from the National University of San Marcos at Lima, Peru, is the author of thirty books and undoubtedly one of the foremost Jewish intellectuals. In "Our America,"⁸ "The Rediscovery of America,"⁹

was set upon by the SEC. When its "reorganization" was begun, Bernard W. Lynch was president of the Standard Gas and Electric Company. "In a maneuver last October," says the *Tribune* dispatch, "sanctioned by the SEC, (Victor) Emanuel succeeded Lynch as chairman and (William J.) Hagenah . . . replaced Lynch as president . . . Emanuel was placed in control with SEC blessing because he favored quick integration of the system under the public utility holding company act of 1935." The *Tribune* dispatch neglected to state that one Jew as a member of SEC, namely Jerome Frank, plus another Jew not adverse to bargains, namely Victor Emanuel, altogether made two New Deal Jews in this particular "reorganization." It is only fair to guess that Mr. Emanuel was willing to favor either a "quick" or a slow "integration," so long as the empire, in the "integration," came under his mastery.

⁸ "Our America" by Waldo Frank (Boni and Liveright).

⁹ "The Rediscovery of America" by Waldo Frank (Charles Scribner's Sons).

"Dawn in Russia,"¹⁰ and "In the American Jungle,"¹¹ Frank exhibits the most profound mastery of human affairs, i.e., be *seems* profound to one who likes political economy in blank verse.

"Persons thrive better today in the true collectivism of Russia than they do in the false individualism of the United States," he asserts. "What is taking place today in Russia is the most precious *social* * event, the most precious *social* * life of our crucial epoch. . . . We must defend the Soviet Union with our spirit; if need be, we must defend it with our bodies. . . . The challenge of Communism is not bread for all or even cake; not freedom from insecurity and war—all of which might conceivably be assured to the fatted underlings of some other system. Communism proposes nothing less than the recreation of the world in the unitary image of the toiling masses . . . the proletariat will not long be satisfied with enough to eat—nor with leisure—nor even with luxury. It will want to rule. . . . The peoples of the world will insist . . . that their spirit, their mind and art, shall make the world over."¹²

This is not political economy, or history, or sociology, or even good reporting. It is poetry. It was written after Frank's visit to Russia in 1932 and as an example of accurate reporting would be rejected by most county seat weeklies whose editors first would want to know what detains Frank in America. It does explain why sophomores at Williams, Yale, Princeton, Chicago and Harvard begin to pity the old man, who signs the necessary expense checks, for his lack of familiarity with such masters of human destiny.

Frank "hopes against such miscarriage" as "intellectual

¹⁰ "Dawn in Russia" by Waldo Frank (Charles Scribner's Sons) pp. 243, 271-2, 270-1.

¹¹ "In the American Jungle" by Waldo Frank (Farrar and Rinehart).

* Our italics.

¹² "Dawn in Russia" by Waldo Frank (Charles Scribner's Sons) pp. 243, 271-2, 270-1.

and spiritual enslavement” and founds his hope “on the universal education of the Russian people.”

True to the traditions of the Jew, Frank emphasizes the objective in Communism of human *social* * equality.

• Our italics.

CHAPTER XV

Future of the New Deal

*Jews and Catholics Scamper to Cover When Mr.
Roosevelt Offers Reminder to Minorities in Black
Appointment, Whereas Cash-and-Carry
Following Develop Internal Troubles
Over the Cash.*

"Plato himself tried to transform Syracuse in accordance with an ideological recipe—and sent the city downhill to its ruin."—*Spengler*¹

SO LONG as Mr. Roosevelt is able (a) to provide for the *have-nots* out of the public treasury and (b) to deceive them with more promises reinforced with the right amount of melodrama and (c) to nourish their inherent envy, jealousy and hatred of the *haves* with the right amount of pretense, the New Deal is politically secure. Roosevelt is a symbol of his times as were Nero and Genghis Kahn in their days and Boss Tweed in his.

Had Count Tolstoy been spared to this day, he would have seen in Mr. Roosevelt merely an "unconscious instrument in bringing about the historical ends of humanity," a fatalism and predestination ordained out of our repeated blunders in self-government and hastened by their growth in number and importance. Such fatalism and such predestination are inevitable in what Tolstoy calls the "elemental life of the swarm" and Presidents and Kings are not the causes but only the labels of such mass movements in history. They only lend their names for the purpose of identification by the historian.

¹ "The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf & Co., Inc.) Vol. II, p. 454.

The brain trusters, the debauchery of the public service, the saturnalia of waste and extravagance, the insolence of all the Roosevelts in their ingenious methods of corrupting the masses after the manner of Greek and Roman tyrants, together with their diabolical schemes of harassing the industrious, the thrifty and productive few are all natural consequences of our previous blunders in self-government.

While evil work, the evil of bad example in high place has a persistence that surpasses any and all "sins of the father," only a few personalities live beyond their own generation. The most hated tyrant, the very wicked are easily remembered. Everybody knows about Nero and Jesse James. Al Capone and John Dillinger will outlive the memories, for example, of the two distinguished junior United States Senators from Indiana and Illinois. Ten years from now, nobody will remember any of the New Deal Senators, now so welcome at the White House portals, or know whether Earle was Governor of Pennsylvania or Michigan.

As a stooge, Charlie McCarthy will outlive all the Senators and Representatives in Congress who voted to pack the Supreme Court and regiment vast sections of the population. In ten years, even Mr. Ickes will have returned to his previous state of oblivion. Eleanor and Jimmie will suffer from waning vividness. Only Mr. Roosevelt will be remembered. How long the taxpayers will remember him depends largely upon their fecundity. If they are able to reproduce at all when he is finished with them, they must depend upon the luck of Hermes and the benefit of miracle.

From WPA, from the relief contingent, from the municipal, state, and national bureaucracy segment, out of the Federal Housing projects and from the regimented and subsidized youth of the land may spring a new and different race, quite unspoiled by such obnoxious habits as that of paying taxes and doing any work. Perhaps this is Mrs. Roosevelt's hope expressed in her last book in

which she asserts that we must change human nature.

Mr. Roosevelt's chances to win another nomination and to be re-elected to a third term in 1940 have been greatly impaired by some of his own witless blunders. Of course, he faces a natural disintegration of the cash-and-carry political organization he has built up but this alone might not be fatal.

Numerically, the Jews are not important in party politics but the influence they wield is not measured by their numbers. Mr. Roosevelt's repeated gestures to their vanity in the advancement of many Jews to key positions in his bureaucracy at Washington, when weighed against his deliberate insult to Jews in the appointment of the very odd Mr. Hugo Black, *κκκ*, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States merely evidences Mr. Roosevelt's own confusion in purposes and principles. This appointment not only paralyzed the vanity of many thoughtful Jews but it also deeply offended many thoughtful Catholics. Both the Jews and Catholics were compelled to pause and consider this appointment in terms of its actual meaning to them as individuals. No great imagination was necessary to foresee its implications as a threat to minorities, as an ominous shadow, as a solemn warning.

By considering the consummation of Mr. Hitler's delightful program of regimentation in Central Europe, the Jews and Catholics could get a fairly clear idea of what happens to minorities when regimentation is an accomplished fact. Though Cardinal Mundelein's luncheon for his friend, Mr. Roosevelt, in October, 1937, may have stilled the protest of some Catholics and confused others, in respect to the Black appointment, not a few Catholics resented the luncheon and the publicity given it as a compromise of the Church which the esteemed Cardinal ought to have avoided.

There is no more convincing evidence that the orderly, peaceable and long-continued functioning of Democracy, where the suffrage is universal, is beyond any reasonable

expectation than appears in the short-lived domination of any political party or of the dominant element within a particular party. The drift of any political party and the controlling faction within that party is toward greater arrogance, tyranny and corruption. Ultimate defeat follows a boring from within, or the loss of cohesive strength within the party or faction, from desertion and rebellion. Boss Guffey lost his grip on the New Deal autocracy in Pennsylvania because of his own tyranny and because of the conflicting ambitions of men he had elevated to place and power. So bitter did the resentment become that men who once served his purposes and were disappointed in their share of the spoils preferred to give secret or even open support to the candidates of the opposition party. Thus was smashed the petty tyranny he had created.

The struggle between two New Deal factions, one led by the Mayor of Chicago and the other by the Governor of Illinois, eventually will defeat both factions.

The arrogance of the New Deal faction in Indiana resulted in a rebellion that would have annihilated it completely in 1938, except for the cash distributed by Mr. Roosevelt. Even so, it suffered a major disaster in Indiana.

The long success of Tammany Hall, the dominant faction of the Democratic party in New York City, is peculiar to the history of political parties. As a dominant faction in any party, it has survived longest because of the diversified character of the population of New York City, the discipline within its own ranks and its candid adoption of the principle that politics is a year-around business and ought to be conducted on a cash basis. The alert Mr. Dewey came very close to defeating Tammany.

Due to the inevitable drift of political parties and factions within political parties to greater arrogance, tyranny and corruption, the political wheel of fortune is forever spinning. As Major Bowes says when he has marshalled the amateurs, "Around and around it goes,

and where it stops, nobody knows." Thus, the economic fortunes of more than one hundred and twenty million persons are determined from time to time. Thus is sound social progress to be attained. Thus, it would appear why the way to any progress does not appear to have been found. In our struggle for *more Democracy*, we have failed to take stock of achievements. We have falsely assumed that the achievements had followed because, perhaps we have confused our capacity to make an improved automobile with our capacity to govern ourselves. Improved citizenship is not subject to the same test as greater machine efficiency.

Perhaps we have erred in confusing social and civic progress with progress towards mechanical conveniences. There is no evidence that an electric sweeper or power tractor has the slightest relation to better government. There is no evidence that human nature has been changed in any way by all the inventions plus all the scientific discoveries from Galileo to Edison.

The cliché of the so-called "liberals" that "more democracy" is possessed of curative properties is fully supported by Nikolai Lenin:² "With an immense *expansion of democracy* *—for the first time becoming democracy for the poor, democracy for the people, and *not* * democracy for the rich folk," he says, "the dictatorship of the proletariat will produce a series of restrictions of liberty in the case of the oppressors, exploiters and capitalists."

Our Economic Royalists, our industrial managers, our embattled farmers already have become acquainted with "restrictions of liberty."

Lenin goes on to say:² "We must crush them in order to free humanity from wage-slavery; their resistance must be broken by *force*.* It is clear that where there is *suppression* * there must also be *violence* * and *there*

² "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 193.

* Our italics.

cannot be liberty or democracy." * The present plight of the poor mujik, the terror in high Soviet circles, Siberia and the firing squad attest the force, the violence, the suppression, as mileposts on the way to the "new life" of Lenin. The mileposts which mark the way to "the more abundant life" of Roosevelt should be familiar.

If *more Democracy* has failed to provide us with better government, so has the educational system upon which it was thought we could rely. Together they have produced, after a span of years, what Gasset calls³ the "sovereignty of the unqualified individual." In the life of Pericles, Plutarch relates that Ephialtes gave the people "so copious and so strong a draught of liberty" that they became "wild and unruly, like an unmanageable horse." Too much "democracy" has had the same effect in America.

There is one paragraph in the writings of the late Mr. Lenin⁴ which, if read and understood by farm owners, home owners, or property owners of any category, would finish Mr. Roosevelt's Communistic career with a completeness that would impress even the stolid Mr. Stalin. The paragraph is condensed for brevity and clarity:

"The more complete the democracy, the nearer the moment when it ceases to be necessary . . . the more rapidly does every form of the state begin to decay."

In other words, universal suffrage operates to destroy the state, or organized government, as now understood. This means nothing more nor less than that the control of elections by voters who (as they may believe) have nothing to lose (no property of their own) from the decay of the state will quickly bring about the collapse of the state, or organized government, and thereupon the end of the private ownership of property.

Perhaps we shall have to stop spending so much money

* Our italics.

³ Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses" (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 25.

⁴ "Imperialism and The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin (Vanguard Press) p. 205.

for education, or rather so much money in the name of education. Perhaps we shall find that so many things that are now "free" really cost money which we can't afford to provide. Perhaps we will be better off when we cease to provide them at all.

Due to our persistent failure to pause and consider, perhaps we are to go through the wringer. If we do that, we are bound to conclude that *more Democracy* has not been especially helpful. It is altogether possible that those who get through the wringer in any fashion, at the suggestion of the Caesar who will turn the crank, may conclude not to be so generous with the suffrage as were their ancestors in pre-wringer days. It is also possible that the survivors of the wringer, with the consent and approval of Caesar, will know better what to do about Progressives, New Dealers, Liberals, Socialists, Communists, the C.I.O., KKK, Prohibition, the *new life*, the *more abundant life* and spending ourselves out of bankruptcy.

Of the pre-wringer days, it may be said the country had become acquainted with and capable of repelling a plague of locusts every seven years but until the New Deal swarmed, the country was unaccustomed to a perpetual plague.

"The government that destroys the confidence in it of its people never survives it, and this government is fast destroying that confidence."⁵

Robert Burton anticipated the New Deal in his "Anatomy of Melancholy":

"Where such kind of men swarm, they will make more work for themselves, and that body politick diseased, which was otherwise sound."

If the moral aspects of the career of Richard Whitney in its last phases and of the New Deal in its relentless course since March 4, 1933, are disregarded, there remain the economic aspects of a deadly parallel so striking that

⁵ Raymond Tiffany, general counsel National Small Businessmen's Association of New York before University of Virginia's Institute of Public Affairs, 1938, *New York Times* July 9, 1938.

the outcome of Whitney's offenses clearly foreshadows the consequences of New Deal policies.

Whitney became involved originally as a result of the stock market crash of 1929 which, because of property values and current income that were destroyed, in due course, involved the fiscal policies of the Federal, state and municipal governments. Whitney borrowed from relatives, from friends, from anyone who would lend. As his situation became more desperate, he "borrowed" securities in his personal possession but held by him in a trust capacity and hypothecated them for personal loans in the futile hope that by postponing disaster, he might avert it altogether. His debts grew as his crimes multiplied. There came a time when all his resources, legal and illegal, were exhausted, when no more collateral could be "borrowed" or stolen and when nobody trusted his personal honor.

From the beginning, the New Deal borrowed almost exclusively from friends of the United States Treasury, that is, the banks. A friendly relationship between the Treasury and the banks was cultivated by means of such minor deceptions as the open market purchase of bonds, which was found necessary to maintain a stable price, and by means of loans on frozen assets for which the RFC took the pledged assets as collateral. Gradually, the banks converted miscellaneous assets into government bonds with the encouragement, of course, of the Treasury and as early as the summer of 1936, the banks held such a large share of the entire public debt that their capacity to absorb additional bonds was considered doubtful.

At this period in the career of the New Deal, a clever means was devised of borrowing an additional billion dollars annually without further tapping the capacity or credit of the Treasury's very cordial friends, the banks. Since the New Deal was pledged not only to "recovery" but to "reform," it was proposed to collect one billion dollars annually from business and industry for the pretended security of the aged, indigent and unemployed.

The collective mind of the New Deal and that of Richard Whitney appear to have been working in parallel grooves at this point, since the Treasury began hypothecating the funds received for current spending as soon as they began to arrive in Washington. The Treasury thereby avoided offerings of bonds in an equivalent volume to its good friends, the banks. But this was only an intermediate phase.

All the previous borrowings, plus all the previous new taxes, plus the hypothecation, expropriation or confiscation of social security trust funds are insufficient for the mounting debts of the New Deal. Another election generated its own independent spirit of desperation and the New Deal, as lately we saw Richard Whitney, is approaching its last phase. Desterilization of gold, a lowering of bank reserve requirements, widening the tax base and increasing rates and new borrowings which surpass any prior recklessness are born of the same despair which carried Richard Whitney to his inevitable doom, since he had borrowed from Peter to pay Paul. In the end, Whitney robbed Peter to pay Paul which is more than the New Deal will accomplish for while Peter will be robbed, Paul will not be paid.

A limited number suffers from the consequences of Whitney's undertaking to borrow himself out of financial difficulties and to relieve the stress of a debt burden by deceptive practices, which, engaged in by an individual, society labels as crimes. The suffering which similar practices by the New Deal buccaneers will cause is incalculable and the number involved is equivalent to the population of the whole country. What penalties will be inflicted on those persons most responsible for the distress is within the realm of speculation but the conjecture does not seem far-fetched that they will not accept the penalties with the same candid admissions and the same unflinching courage as the former president of the New York Stock Exchange. After all, there may be a difference in the blood that courses through the veins of Richard

Whitney and that which flows through the veins, for example, of Senator Sherman Minton of Indiana.

The theory is frequently advanced that Mr. Roosevelt is being dignified with purposes and designs of which he is biologically incapable and that factual measurement of the man would strip him of all armor save the will of a meglomaniac and the mind of a simpleton. There is some evidence to support this hypothesis, particularly his persistence in pursuing by way of pseudo-Marxian formulae his own political ruin. If he had read widely, if he were possessed of the power of analysis, if he were a really deep thinker, it is argued, he would be something more than a novitiate in political economy and, in such event, would know how shallow and superficial and how much at variance with facts is the logic, for example, of Upton Sinclair, Stuart Chase and the juvenile "intellectuals" and visionary pedagogues. Whatever the biological truth may be, the consequences are the same.

The mere fact that all Socialists and Communists, once they have won the power to write their own part in a political drama, quickly are metamorphosed into Fascists, Nazis, dictators, i.e., Caesars, ought to be convincing that Socialism and Communism are not rooted in the human soul; that they are illusions, fantasies, camouflage, scare-crows, "such stuff as dreams are made of." Their nature is such that theirs is a most natural appeal to the pedagogues who go through life in the delusion that the classroom is a cross section of society. The college seminar is no more than an advanced kindergarten and because it wants, and necessarily so, the atmosphere of broad human experience, it is never able to rise above the commonplace. But all this also explains the many weird alphabetical concepts born in the kindergarten of the brain trust and now manipulated by Cohen, Roosevelt and Corcoran.

It is very natural for Mr. Roosevelt to be most generous with the accumulated savings of his fellow man because his own economic necessities were insured by

frugal ancestors but his confusion arises in his inability to create applicable dogmas. Marxian formulae have been seized upon in the same reckless spirit with which Greenwich Village overflowed a generation ago when the long-haired boys set the tempo of the "class struggle."

A shift from the scholarly thesis of Oswald Spengler's "The Decline of the West" to Upton Sinclair's soap-box harangue "America's False Democracy"⁶ is enough to destroy the rhythm of the human soul. Sinclair's vision of "Democracy in industry" may be merged with the first imperial decree of an American Caesar. It so happens that Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Roosevelt are taking their separate political pitchers to the same well.

The picture of present-day legislative assemblies, whether in Washington, Springfield, Columbus or Harrisburg, is a sordid background from which to expect any wise legislation. Not much should be expected, in the circumstances, and not much of helpful value, in any event, is to be had.

The so-called solid and substantial citizens, meaning those having a net worth of at least \$5,000.00 and who produce something besides a stench, could if they only would, call the tune for the gentry they send to Washington; either that, or they might enforce their combined wills upon the populace in various and divers ways. They are not likely to make a complete job of either until driven to it by a complete economic collapse and unless, in the meantime, they do some thinking on their own account they are apt to be devoid of ideas, when the crack-up comes.

In spite of the assurance of the Joneses, that God's in His Heaven, Mr. Roosevelt is in Washington and all's right with the world, it is better than an odds-on wager that comes 1941, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, if he lives so long, will depart from the mansion on Pennsylvania Avenue, where he has enjoyed free rent for eight years, the most thoroughly discredited President in the whole

⁶ *The American Mercury*, June, 1938.

history of the country; also, the most generally hated.

Andrew Johnson, William Howard Taft, Woodrow Wilson and Herbert Hoover each left the White House under a cloud of unpopularity but the disfavor which marked the end of their terms, with one exception, was not accentuated by personal bitterness. Andrew Johnson was the innocent victim of a political conspiracy. Mr. Roosevelt can scarcely escape the disdain and contempt of the multitude he has coddled since the New Deal "recession" has surpassed the Hoover "depression" in intensity, scope and duration.

Undoubtedly, Roosevelt has lost the confidence and respect of all persons who have had time to think. There is no chance for him to regain their good will or confidence. The music of a "gracious voice," plus tangible benefits had and received to this date, have lured the multitude but the charm of the music alone can hardly be depended upon when the benefits have ceased or proved insufficient. As a Pied Piper in 1939 and 1940, Mr. Roosevelt will need more than a pipe.

Too long has Mr. Roosevelt scoffed at the opinions of those persons who have asked themselves, whither are we drifting? to be entitled to any more sympathy than he will receive, which is exactly none at all. What if he does summon Economic Royalists and Little Business to Washington for conferences now and again? Everybody knows his purpose is to capture their political fealty and support. His objectives are as transparent as those of a debutante at her coming out party. Nobody expects him to accept and act on any warning or advice and all know that what he seeks is approval of what he has already done or is about to do. All know one further thing which is that if he fails to get the plaudits of the conference, the meeting is promptly adjourned.

If the objection is made by those who still hold Doctor Roosevelt in esteem because they live off what he extorts from the taxpayer that our pathology on March 4, 1933, was so critical no medicine was powerful enough to arrest

the full course of the disease, the answer is that this is the same diagnosis as that announced by the learned Doctor Hoover. There is this further thing to be said of the diagnosis. It was announced by Doctor Hoover long before March 4, 1933, and *before* not *after* the Nation had invested some thirty billion dollars in the quack remedies of Doctor Roosevelt and to promote his ambitions to become a dictator.

After the 1932 election, Roosevelt made it very clear that the Hoover "depression" was not his "baby." The "recession" appears to have put an end to the Hyde Park variety of wise-cracks which is a step, at least, in the direction of greater decency in high place and for which the country may be grateful, though the price is high. If Big Business, however, fails to pay off the New Deal debts by 1940 or inclines to interfere with any of the fantastic agencies created out of the alphabet by Mr. Roosevelt, there are already signs that a "baby," about whose parentage there is not the slightest doubt, will be totally repudiated as utterly illegitimate. One of Mr. Roosevelt's favorite columnists already has referred to the "recession" as a "Tory depression."

Although many able newspapers and magazines have strenuously opposed the New Deal, until lately their influence has not been apparent. The cumulative effect of their opposition plus a realization of the country's approach to absolute chaos now seem to be felt. Roosevelt's reversion to the repriming of a squeaky and a leaky pump has frightened some of the politicians who previously were blithely indifferent to solemn warnings.

David Lawrence, Dorothy Thompson, George Sokolsky, Frank R. Kent, Ray Tucker and Walter Lippmann all have done masterful writing, *vis-à-vis*, the imbecilities of the New Deal. Lawrence, Sokolsky and Lippmann are Jews. Miss Thompson is now engaged mainly in picking daisies to adorn the Jewish refugees and, to borrow from the wit of another, when not so engaged, appears to have her feet firmly planted on a cloud. Lawrence and

Lippmann have become so entranced with the magic of "Democracy" that they are entitled to prepaid fares and a nonstop flight to Elysium.

Lawrence has discovered ⁷ what, in fact, no one else of discernment believes, that "Mr. Roosevelt . . . is deeply and fundamentally opposed to war," if war is necessary to prolong the tenure of his bureaucracy. The imminence of a dictatorship in France from the weakness of a Communist-Leftist coalition government and the notorious caste system which dominates British politics reflect the rashness of Lawrence's statement that "France and Britain are today the bulwarks of *democracy*." * When Lawrence parades "the long list of insults to the United States, presented through American diplomatic representatives abroad, by the Fascist powers in the last two years," he is dragging forth a red herring that will excite little emotion in Maine and Vermont. The rugged Republicans of those states are apt to conclude that any "insults to the United States" have been due (a) to the personal meddling of our diplomats in affairs that are outside our concern or (b) to the many official invitations to be insulted, extended by Mr. Roosevelt and his State Department during the past two years.

Some columnists, who enlisted in the New Deal for the duration of its nonsense, seem to be undone by the late turn of events. Heywood Broun, who has collected a satisfactory salary for moronic nonsense from Roy Howard's newspapers for many years, seems incapable of the same spontaneous humor he exuded before Socialism became a fact. Jay Franklin, sponsor of the New Deal, was dangerously near apoplexy when Pat Harrison and John J. O'Connor violated the sanctity of the person of the Great White Father by giving him a couple of kicks on the shins. Franklin's emotional heat, to insure a sound recovery, may require the attentions of the New Deal sanctuary for stray dogs constructed at Memphis.

⁷ *Indianapolis News*, February 2, 1939.

* Our italics.

Whether the issue of the moment is incompetence and pillage in the administration of TVA; wastefulness and extravagance in government departments generally; bewilderment in business; shifting the burden on Economic Royalists themselves to end the depression or suffer new regimentation; or the obstruction of recovery by means of some outrageous tax measure, those forlorn and despairing creatures who cry in the New Deal wilderness seem to forget that all the confusion, every kind of disaster, any new and monstrous imposition on the taxpayer contribute to the fulfillment of Mr. Roosevelt's main objective, that is, the redistribution of wealth.

It is necessary to remember this objective. It would be fatal to forget it. Even his inconsistencies have added to the general confusion.

The super curious may ascertain the future of the New Deal with more or less exactness by consulting a learned Boston scientist⁸ who has discovered a new calculus whereby he is able to predict what happens in a state of complete confusion. By the same calculus he is also able to determine how far a drunken man will stagger in a given time, and the new calculus should be useful, therefore, in charting the course of inflation under the New Deal.

Everything Mr. Roosevelt suggests, does, omits, approves, tolerates, or condones may now be tested by the probability of whether it is not a further contribution to the confusion he has already caused.

Nobody has pointed out Mr. Roosevelt's obvious interest in maintaining unemployment in sufficient volume to insure his continued political success though a very impressive case has been presented⁹ to show his opposition to economic recovery. So long as unemployment continues in excess of 10,000,000, the continued maintenance of the WPA and other such agencies is not likely

⁸ Dr. Norbet Weiner, professor of mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, *New York Times*, September 13, 1938.

⁹ "Roosevelt Does Not Want Recovery," *The American Mercury*, November, 1938.

to be attacked, whereas the combination presents a popular front when the polls open that Mr. Roosevelt must consider invincible. "An 'unemployed' existence is a worse negation of life than death itself," says Gasset¹⁰ but what are "negations" and what is "death" when the New Deal tenure is threatened?

Undoubtedly, Roosevelt reasons he has made such progress in creating class hatreds—a mass psychology entirely favorable to himself and completely hostile to every possible competitor—that come strikes, come riots, comes violence, comes a revolution, in the language of the street, he is *sitting pretty*. In 1935, according to Mr. Roosevelt, he and his advisors "*planned it that way*."

¹⁰ Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses" (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 148.

CHAPTER XVI

Constructive Hints Looking to Liquidation

Disposition of New Deal Personalities and Related Spirits Are Suggested as Helpful Acts of Preliminary Nature Even Though Art Will Suffer When the Stage is Emptied.

"When vice prevails, and impious men hold sway,
The post of honor is a private station."—Addison.

"See them clamber, these nimble apes!! They clamber over one another, and thus scuffle into the mud and the abyss."—Thus Spake Zarathustra.

IF THE country goes through the wringer as a consequence of previous bad judgment, it may be that certain dominant personalities and groups of pre-wringer days will become extinct as a matter of course. Or, it may well be that the survivors will know what to do about these particular personalities and groups as a matter of future self-preservation. Profound students of history expect the reaction to be both sharp and severe. In the meantime, it is perhaps a prudent precaution to consider the disposition of the numerous personalities in the new bureaucracy, as a contemporary duty.

"There is only *personal* history and consequently only *personal* politics," says Spengler.¹ "The struggle of, not principles but men, not ideals but race qualities, for executive power is the alpha and omega."

In the realm of the personal, Mr. Roosevelt has ac-

¹ "The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) Vol. II, p. 441.

knowledgeed the existence of a widespread fear in the land which, in due form he tried to dispel with an epigram and to which Eleanor Patterson addressed herself in a letter to the President. Spengler, also in the realm of the *personal*, has provided Mr. Roosevelt with the only valid explanation of the fear:² "It is the officer who makes cowards into heroes, or heroes into cowards, and this holds good equally for armies, peoples, classes and parties."

Barnum might have organized another dime museum around two Senatorial personalities, the Hon. Jim Ham Lewis, of Illinois, and the Hon. George L. Berry, of Tennessee. Lewis could have doubled for any of the Barnum freaks and Berry easily could have performed to the credit of the most colossal fraud ever exhibited by Barnum. Both Lewis and Berry would have been equally valuable to Barnum as circus attractions in the later days. The versatility of Lewis is such that he might have been exhibited in, or employed in front of the tent.

Both Lewis and Berry slipped into the Senate with the ease and daring of an eel in pursuit of its breakfast and in two of the many incredible periods of history when an eel has been too slick for the native yokel to manage. Lewis got under way after the first Roosevelt had mastered the ways of the cuttlefish, whereas Berry darted to distinction after the second Roosevelt had confused the yokels.

Since Barnum has no worthy successors and a carnival would be beneath the dignity of Lewis and Berry, they are suggested as possible sources of new and additional claims on behalf of pump priming, or spending our way out of bankruptcy. Having been retired from politics by the Tennessee Democrats in the 1938 primary, Berry is now available for some new venture in the uplift of mankind if the compensation is attractive.*

The junior United States Senator from Indiana, a fair

² "The Decline of the West" by Oswald Spengler (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.) Vol. II, p. 442.

* The senior Senator from Illinois has just been liquidated by the Grim Reaper.

sample of the intellectual poise and moral eminence produced by the McNutt Juggernaut, pleaded insolvency to avoid the full payment of a bank loan in his home-town, yet he is supposed to be on the Roosevelt waiting list for appointment to the Federal judiciary. He has been one of the noisiest New Dealers in Washington. Since Minton pleaded insolvency to escape full liability on his note, he was the nominal host at a feast of Lucullus in Washington to celebrate the static glory of the esteemed Mr. McNutt when more than 3,000 statesmen, lobbyists, newspaper correspondents, party hacks and bar flies passed through the turnstiles. Since then he has suffered a brain storm from exposure to the biting criticism of New Deal objectives and morals. Minton could qualify as a policeman under Hitler.

Aside from the energy being dissipated by our present High Commissioner at Manila and his cohorts to prepare for seizing the Democratic presidential nomination in 1940, other political Warwicks have already emerged. Joseph Patrick Kennedy's attractive spouse and their nine children are photographed frequently. Mrs. Kennedy squared accounts, more or less, with the blue stockings of the Back Bay District when her husband was appointed to the Court of St. James and while blue stockings don't yield to the tender passion, as Tolstoy says, they may now be able to overlook the fact that the Kennedys are only Boston Irish. If not, the presidency would be a crowning achievement.

In 1932, Kennedy thought Mr. Roosevelt "the only man in sight with the imagination and guts to get us out of this mess." This vibrant prophecy may be embarrassing in 1940.

J. Edward Jones, in his book, "And So They Indicted Me," specifically charges Kennedy³ with giving the order to the SEC to "get a case" on him and "make it a cinch." The persecution of Jones which began with his disagree-

³ "And So They Indicted Me" by J. Edward Jones (J. Edward Jones Publishing Co.) pp. 133-5.

ment with Ickes over a national oil policy and which was carried on by the SEC until Jones was vindicated in court is reminiscent of Jefferson's conniving against Aaron Burr, though Jefferson was more successful. Because of the many jobs Kennedy has held under the New Deal, he is commonly referred to in Washington as "Hit-and-Run Joe."

Harry Hopkins should be employed in Community Chest campaigns or loaned to the Salvation Army. The country fully understands the elevation of this palace favorite to cabinet rank. Perhaps it will serve to accustom the country to the whims of court life and fortify native citizens against the time when a regularly employed court jester is conceded to be a necessity.

Harold Ickes should be able to find an expression for his feminine talents in some school for girls in need of a housekeeper. Henry Wallace should be furnished with a pair of overalls and a hickory shirt and allowed to roam between Kansas wheat fields and Wisconsin logging camps.

The lure of adventure, the opportunity for excitement, the instinct to revolt against the *status quo* explain the attachment of second and third generations of secure economic independence for Communism and its allied activities. All three elements operated on the late Lincoln Steffens, Lorado Taft, Paxton Hibben and Raymond Robins though Robins was said to have made his own fortune in Alaska. Harold Swift, Corliss Lamont, Curtis Bok and Alfred Bingham are typical examples of living prototypes. The leanings to Communism of Theodore Dreiser, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Sherwood Anderson and John Cowper Powys, all of whom are artists of first rank, is explainable only on the theory that they got their education in economics and political economy from trying to read the stars. It is no cause for surprise that Stokowski and Bodansky, the latter a Jew, both foreign born conductors, who have done very well in America, nevertheless, incline to Communism. The

direction of an orchestra is an emotional vocation. Moreover, Spengler has already pointed out the kinship of Beethoven's symphonies and Communism since both are regarded as "end" phenomena in Western culture. Stokowski seems to have had more success in solving the mysteries of Garbo than those of economics and political economy. The liquidation of artists, no matter what their vagaries, is not advocated. The country is entitled to entertainment at whatever cost.

Madame Perkins should be paroled to John L. Lewis, both pushed off the Statue of Liberty and permitted to swim to Leningrad for their personal safety. Robert H. Jackson, William Orville Douglas and the other New Deal judges should be supplied with a 1938 edition of the United States Revised Statutes and a shingle bearing the name of each, delivered across the river at Laredo, Texas, and required to practice law in Mexico. The members of the National Labor Relations Board and the National Bituminous Coal Commission should be confined in a madhouse and their staffs of examiners, agents and *provocateurs* sent to a concentration camp for ultimate deportation to Mussolini's new empire in Abyssinia. Our pro-consul in the Philippines, the Hon. Paul McNutt, should be isolated from all connection with the public payroll and thereby required to work or starve. Tommy Corcoran should be paroled to Jack Dempsey and used as an entertainer in his night club.

The Wrigley family might be able to use Jim Farley to advertise their chewing gum. Prof., now Judge Felix Frankfurter, Mordecai Ezekiel, Ben Cohen, Jerome Frank, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., David Lilienthal and all of the Harvard intellectuals should be deported to Palestine or Russia, as each prefers. Morgenthau might be given a third choice, that of working off his part of the national debt on a chain gang at the rate of a dollar a day. Those sit-down Governors of Michigan and Pennsylvania, Murphy and Earle, together with the C. I. O. organizers of John L. Lewis, might be disposed of to Mexico

with the understanding that they should be kept in jail there, unless Jackson, Douglas and other New Deal judges could keep them out. A goodly number of c. i. o. hoodlums from Illinois are likely to be found in some of our own jails when a search is made.

All the Roosevelts, those from Hyde Park, those from Oyster Bay and those from divers and sundry other parts, including all relatives near and remote, male and female, adults and infants, should be disfranchised for three hundred years, rendered incapable of holding office for a like period and, on penalty of the stocks, be denied all access to microphones and loud-speakers.

If all the Roosevelts would tell all they know about each other, the country might be better off. The reigning chieftain of the Oyster Bay clan called Cousin Franklin D. a "maverick" in 1932 while Cousin Nicholas⁴ has since described Franklin D. in terms even less polite. Franklin D. in a burst of confidence, however, has disclosed that he voted for Cousin Ted rather than the Democratic candidate in 1904 so that the picture of family loyalties is somewhat blurred. One may well wonder whether the Oyster Bay branch did not make speeches for Landon and vote for Cousin Franklin D. Uncle Theodore has been exposed by his favorite niece, Eleanor, as having once expressed the wish "that for five minutes I could be President and Congress too." Perhaps some other member of the family knows whether he also wanted to be the Supreme Court as well. The family seems to be so carefully divided politically that one or another branch of the clan will always be in office.⁵

The penchant for "reform" and "uplift" is common to many mortals and is said to be derived basically from an inferiority complex and from its kindred genie, the bio-

⁴ "Franklin Delano Roosevelt" by Nicholas Roosevelt, *The American Mercury*, November, 1936, wherein Franklin D. was said to be "vindictive," an "opportunist," "chameleon-like," a "spoiled child," "smart but not deep," possessed of "the easy optimism of the sheltered rich," "whose ideal of the more abundant life is a butler in every home" and to have "confused novelty of labels with fresh ideas."

⁵ See Appendix III.

logical bent to exhibitionism. The New Deal worship of the straight-jacket and the Square Deal devotion to petty despotism and the "strenuous life" had their origins in the same psychological and biological founts. There is a striking similarity in the careers of the two Roosevelts in their choice of intimates, in their partiality shown many men of minor importance, which is explainable only on the theory that the adulation of their benefactors by such upstarts is less restrained.

Roosevelt I exalted many nobodies and Roosevelt II has given free play to the sadistic impulses of a legion of muddled pedagogues and other intellectual shysters. The portraits of the least civilized, though best known, Roosevelts are incomplete, save and except they are surrounded by shadowy figures out of oblivion suddenly catapulted to the dizzy heights of fame by the weird accidents of American politics in its last phases. That the masses have been exploited politically by the two Roosevelts and finally will have to pay a price they don't possess for their ignorance and folly are the natural consequences of stressing political privileges to the exclusion of civic responsibilities, at any time in world history, in Greece, in Rome, in France, in Russia, in America.

While disposing of New Deal personalities, the Republicans might also canvass their own ranks. In order to dispose of the Hon. William E. Borah, it might be necessary to abolish the pocket borough he represents which is commonly known as the State of Idaho. Borah's oratorical power is deservedly well regarded but his speeches are "like cypress trees, stately and tall and no fruit comes of them," which is what Phocion said of the speeches of Leosthenes. That Borah possesses great ability is indisputable. That he lacks consistency, constancy of purpose and great courage is also indisputable. That he can be depended upon for leadership in any cause is equally without proof. In big league baseball, Borah might have been used infrequently as a relief pitcher or, on occasions, as a pinch hitter. He could not

have held a place in the regular line-up on any team.

While this purge is in process, there ought to be a thorough canvass of the country, a kind of census of all persons of either sex and of any color or origin who has ever been called a "Liberal," either by himself or by his neighbors. The purpose would be to inform the sane portion of the population, if any remains after five years in the New Deal laboratory, of future prospects of further dismemberment. For this reason the names should be posted at the Court House or in the post office of each community.

An outstanding example of a "Liberal," New Deal model, is our present Ambassador to France and our first Ambassador to the land of Stalin, after recognition, William C. Bullitt. A product of Yale, whose mother was a Jewess, Bullitt went to Europe on the Ford peace ship with Rosika Schwimmer, the Hungarian Jewess, to "get the boys out of the trenches by Christmas," helped Woodrow Wilson save the world for Democracy at Versailles and in 1923 married the widow of John Reed, who helped found the Communist Party in America and who did so much for Lenin that his remains are buried in the Kremlin.

"Liberals" solemnly discuss the "fair" distribution of wealth, the "just" and "wise" arrangement of our economic life, "tolerance" with respect to their obvious imbecilities and seemingly, it never occurs to them that the issue turns on what is "just," what is "wise" or to what objective "tolerance" leads.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose current pose is that of the country's outstanding "liberal" would vanish from his self-erected pedestal and from the microphone, if measured by the definition of another "liberal" pretender,⁶ to wit: "the liberal condemns any tendency to bind and impose dictation upon men." This same "liberal" pretender, inadvertently it would appear, explains the political success of all "liberal" pretenders in

⁶ "What is a Liberal," E. Haldeman-Julius.

his revelation that "liberalism" is a "*natural attitude*" among "*uneducated and unthinking people*," particularly "among workingmen." All of which, if true, fully illuminates and explains the political successes of the Bryans, the LaFollettes, the Roosevelts, the Square Dealers, the New Dealers and the Double Dealers generally.

Gasset defines "liberalism" [†] as "that principle of political rights, according to which the public authority, in spite of being all-powerful, limits itself and attempts, even at its own expense, *to leave room in the state over which it rules for those to live who neither think nor feel as it does*,"* that is to say as do the stronger, the majority."

Mr. Roosevelt and the Communistic oracles of the New Deal, who provide him with their ready-made political philosophy, would find it a little difficult to synchronize the primary purges undertaken in 1938 with this definition. The imaginary bridges discussed by Mr. Roosevelt in Maryland before the primary were hardly intended for use by Senator Tydings when he crosses the Potomac.

Preachers who begin their careers as Fundamentalists and who later find it more exciting and profitable to denounce the orthodox religions call themselves "Liberals" to avoid the stigma that is apt to attach to a renegade.

Women of easy virtue have always been known as "liberals." Their liberality is a fair standard by which to test the inherent virtue of a political liberal and one may as well make a covenant with the first that she will be faithful as depend upon the second to perform according to any particular code. The public consciousness, however, is still kindly disposed to the term "liberal" just as it is to charity with which it may be confused. To be "liberal" is erroneously thought to be "generous" or "agreeable," which again suggests a confusion with feminine willingness to yield.

Because the term enjoys a good reputation, though un-

[†] Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses," (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 83.

* Our italics.

merited, our most celebrated rascals have used it freely, particularly when they desired to divert public attention from the mischief they were doing or were about to do, declaring before man and God that their virtue was to be assumed from the fact that they were "liberal." "Patriot" is another word that has been subjected to the same abuse as "liberal" and each has been employed roughly as a connotation of the other. Samuel Johnson declared that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel."

Journalists who work under great pressure may be excused for their misuse and misapplication of "liberal" but other writers who bill and coo when they use or apply the term have no such excuse. Propagandists use the term with malicious and insidious design when they espouse an unworthy cause or when they seek to present a contrast with something of inherent worth to which they object. The good favor of the term is not readily apparent. There has never been a "liberal" party in this country. Two or three generations ago, Gladstone, noted English "liberal," was popular in America but his popularity is another mystery. The country was introduced to a wide variety of cure-alls by the first Roosevelt and since his time, the native imagination has been strained, if not exhausted, as the cure-alls have multiplied in number and absurdity.

Every "liberal" is a potential Communist, a fact well understood in Leningrad and other cultural centers of the Left Wing. "Communism professes to aim," says Prof. Hans Kohn,⁸ "at the realization of complete democracy and the consummation of liberalism."

⁸ "Communist and Fascist Dictatorship," an essay by Hans Kohn, professor of history at Smith College in "Dictatorship in the Modern World" with an introduction by Guy Stanton Ford (University of Minnesota Press) p. 160. Prof. Kohn is a Jew and confirms the Jewish psychology stated in Chapter VIII. "Communism . . . believes in the equality of mankind, of races and nations," he says at page 151. "The Russian Revolution," he says at page 155, "a social Revolution representing the rise of the Fourth estate would usher in not only for Russia but for mankind an age of social democracy and internationalism." On the same page, he adds: "Its future society is professedly one in which there are no classes, states or nations . . . it would continue the work of the French Revolution."

It is the "liberals" of America who are largely responsible for the New Deal.⁹ They have led the country towards Fascism to escape, as they have contended, the horrors of Communism though for all practical purposes, there is no difference between Socialism, Communism, Naziism and Fascism. In any case, there is complete regimentation of men and property. The state is everything, the individual nothing. In any case, elections are mere gestures of pretense, the cost of which, in this country, ought to be saved for Passamaquoddy, the Florida ship canal or some new and delightful housing project for negroes.

The country's most outstanding "liberal" who describes himself in the last edition of "Who's Who" as a "Republican" and as "chairman of the National Progressive League for Roosevelt as President" is the Hon. George W. Norris of McCook, Nebraska. No purge would be complete that did not include the foremost citizen of McCook. Norris is now occupied principally in saving from infamy the dam which bears his name. He is distressed that the Chairman of TVA declined to "co-operate" in the consummation of new imbecilities invented by young Mr. Lilienthal, arrived not so long ago via the LaFollette hegemony from the laboratory of Prof. Frankfurter at Cambridge. "Hindrances" of the chairman, which Norris deplures, happen to be the country's only hope of a limitation on further extravagance and any decency in administration. Norris is a queer *hombre*. He combines the zeal of a martyr with the innocence and

⁹ The career of Lewis Browne, an English Jew who came to America in 1912, who took a degree from the Hebrew Union College, a degree from the University of Cincinnati and did graduate work at Yale, illustrates the Jewish tradition of Leftist thinking and the wide influence of Jewish intellectuals in our colleges and universities. He was "forced to resign" as rabbi of a Waterbury, Conn. synagogue after conducting a protest meeting under the auspices of the American Civil Liberties Union to gain freedom of speech for pacifists and anti-Fascists but later was co-rabbi with Stephen S. Wise in a synagogue at Newark, N. J. In 1925, he founded the Newark Labor College and later was visiting professor at the Pennsylvania State College, University of California and the University of Hawaii. Browne has written several books that have been widely read.

gullibility of a yokel. An ascetic celibate in the times of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, the TVA was conceived in his old age. Long considered the Dorothy Dix of the Senate, perhaps his previous bent to criticism of G. O. P. behavior has made him sensitive respecting the incorrigibility of his own child.

An ancient Jewish group, the Essenes, who were neither a party nor a sect, who preferred solitude, who were filled with disappointment and who practiced Communism, lived on the shores of the Dead Sea two thousand years ago. George Norris was born two thousand years too late for the enjoyment of a life he might have had among such kindred spirits.

The Roosevelt formula should be adopted in disposing of the LaFollette family. The brothers LaFollette are not going to be caught in any pogrom directed at the New Deal, which apparently they very much fear since they have now organized their own party. The new party is explained on the ground that Mr. Roosevelt delayed kicking the pork barrel during all of three vital months in which the LaFollette constituency were neglected. Meantime, as the brothers LaFollette well knew in advance, they have received much national attention, they got a new grip on the imagination of local woodsmen, cheese makers, and restless Swedes and what is most important while they were willing to share the happy days with Mr. Roosevelt they have no intention of holding his hands or of suffering with him when the melancholy days have arrived. The brothers LaFollette are a couple of slick operators. They are even too slick for New Deal legerdemain, including the joint strategy of Cohen, Roosevelt and Corcoran. Since the 1938 election, however, the brothers LaFollette are not so well prepared to keep the home fires burning. The younger brother was thereby retired to the lecture platform as a sole source of income for an uncertain interval and the elder brother must face an aroused electorate in 1940.

No liquidation of Liberals would be complete that

omitted *The New Republic*, *The Nation*, John T. Flynn and a legion of lesser sentimentalists all of whom would be squatting over hens' nests to share the hen's work if there were no underprivileged to coddle.

The New Republic has "seen nothing in the way of substantial evidence" as to what have been the effects of the tax on undistributed profits. By way of explanation, the editors of *The New Republic* probably have failed to observe equally obvious phenomena which fail to fit the economic picture puzzles of their own conception. Nor is it likely that Mr. J. P. Morgan or Mr. Ford or Mr. Schwab or the Ball Brothers of Muncie, Indiana, would think of any of the editors of *The New Republic* if they were seeking some one to uncover "substantial evidence" of any kind or connected in any way with their far flung industrial enterprises. Even Mr. Tugwell, who is a contributing editor, found the molasses business distasteful after a brief experience and his experience is the sum of all experiences of *The New Republic* editors in the marts of trade and commerce. The objections to the tax on undistributed profits being erroneously stated in the first place, the editors make a perfect score in bowling over objections of their own invention.

Flynn, who is also a contributing editor, was on the air just before the April, 1938, fireside chat. He was visibly moved by Mr. Henry Ford's technique. Mr. Flynn adores Mr. Ford's Sunday night symphonic programs but he objects to the disturbance caused by the guest artist, Mr. W. J. Cameron, whose regular political solo he thinks is off key, that is, off the key preferred by Mr. Flynn.

The Progressives of the first Roosevelt, the idealists who operated the Ku Klux Klan, the New Dealers of Franklin I and the "Liberals" from first to last, by and large, have been an odd assortment of neuropathic sadists, psychopathic palookas, breezy ne'er-do-wells, intellectual green-horns, political soldiers of fortune and common crooks. Generally speaking, they would not have been

trusted in the capacity of bank messengers, except under heavy bond. Yet they are the ones who now call the tune to which Henry Ford, et al. are expected to dance.

One striking phenomenon of universal suffrage is the value of a name that has been well advertised. Another "Will Rogers" ran for Congress in the nine-foot-bedsheet state a few years ago with the surprising result that he is now an established member. Frequently, men who have already died have been nominated or elected to office because of the inherent power of their name while they lived. Another "George Norris" confused the yokels of Nebraska who didn't know the difference between a "liberal" and a grocer. "Roosevelt" is honey on the table and beer in the growler. "LaFollette" is the only name a newly-arrived Swede in Wisconsin can pronounce. In Ohio, anyone named "Taft" should enter a Republican primary with a handicap to his opponent of 200,000 votes and this is true in spite of the fact that the late William Howard Taft liked to take a nap at the luncheon table. Aunt Jemima, Spearmint, Moon Mullins, Andy Gump or Charley McCarthy should be entered by the Republicans against Roosevelt in 1940 if, otherwise, there is any doubt about the outcome.

All this is offered in the name of reform, is meant to be included in a program of constructive measures intended to be helpful to the country and is proposed in advance of an anticipated criticism that nothing better than spending ourselves out of the depression is offered by any New Deal critic. The constructive measures proposed, it is admitted, are ventured at the expense of art which might sanction the emasculation but would not allow the annihilation of such interesting subjects as those disposed of herein. Be that as it may, when realism and romance are judiciously blended by the artist, no excuse should be necessary for adding the flavor of reform, in true Oriental style. That was the way of Ivan the Terrible in his liquidations and he has had many imitators since the World War.

CHAPTER XVII

Final Liquidation of New Deal

Observation, Criticism, Art and Reform Discussed in Their Proper Relations to New Deal and Suggestions Intended to Avoid Recurrence of Present Irresponsible Leadership.

"In nothing else do men fear truth as much, and avenge it so, as in politics."—*Merejkowski*.

IT IS a very common criticism of the critic that he is a mere knocker; that he offers nothing to take the place of what he tears down; that no edifice is planned to occupy the vacant site of the razed structure; that no new law or formula is advocated in lieu of the law that is shown to be unworkable and futile; that pending the time when he has something better to offer, he should wince and suffer in silence, but in no event complain and criticize.

The premise of much reasoning is the assumed obligation of the critic to undertake the duties of a reformer and thereby prejudice his detachment as an observer. Many observers and critics are not reformers. They are mere artists. They may be able to describe a rainbow, or to paint its colors but not to improve the design or the pigments. With a chisel, they may reproduce the human form from a block of cold marble but in no event can they reverse the circulation of the blood or modify the instincts of the human soul. They may be entirely capable of producing a dramatic version of present-day politics, i. e., "I'd Rather be Right," or even to simulate the

role of a New Deal President but indifferent to or quite incapable of the formulation of workable policies to end the depression. They well know their inadequacy for dual parts. They only point out what is absurd and foolish and have no feeling of an obligation to change conditions. It is altogether possible they get a fiendish glee out of mere observation of human frailties and it is doubtful whether they feel obliged to disclose remedies about which they might happen to know. The assumption that the critic should simulate the talents of the architect on the site of recent ruins, that is, be constructive, is lacking in good sense. The critic has no obligation as an architect to rebuild, no obligation as a physician to prescribe a remedy, no obligation as reformer to proclaim a new inanity for one that has just been exposed.

The reason why the shoemaker should stick to his last, the artist to his art and the critic to his criticism is obvious. As a practical matter, the remedies for our ills are so elemental and near at hand that they are obscured by their simplicity and unrecognizable because of their proximity.

A manicurist who had complained of poor business wanted to know what would happen if those who could afford to buy suddenly would refuse. She condemned the cautious Mr. Coolidge for a remark he made to encourage the use of half-soles. Thereupon, she was shown the half-soles of her customer, who observed icily that a buyers' strike might bring such persons as herself to their senses. An Economic Royalist didn't care whether he did much business because, as he thought, very much worse conditions are necessary to restore human sanity. He had the same idea of reform as the manicurist's customer. In neither case was there any thought of any new law, any new formula, any new kind of government or even a new tax or appropriation by Congress.

Such simple remedies might not be widely acclaimed and they are not such as can be recommended for incorporation in the platform of a political party expected

to defeat Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal. The simple remedies, in each instance, happen to possess curative properties and they were not prescribed on the basis of a mistaken diagnosis or founded on a false assumption. These simple remedies were prescribed in light of the acknowledged fact that the witlings are in complete control of the politics of the country and that the only approach to their mentality is via their elemental necessities, their requirements of food, clothing and shelter.

To put the case another way, the reformer begins where the observer, the critic, the artist leaves off. If the artist is skillful, if the picture he paints is a true likeness of the subject, if the technique is accurate and the lights and shadows inspiring, the reformer is bound to appear. Some restless soul will be moved to action.

Just as the acrobat, trained to tread a tight rope with apparent ease, is not uniformly sure-footed, so the observer, the critic, the artist has his own peculiar difficulties, chief of which is to remain in character. The serenity of the critic is forever subject to the peril which pursues every human contact, that is, the inclination to try to influence human behavior in the concrete. The temptation to preach may become overpowering, either plus or minus compensation for the role, and the temptation to make suggestions which obviously would eliminate the need to preach is beyond all but superhuman resistance.

The reformer, however, is forever subject to the lurking danger of overlooking the obvious. From an observer turned reformer, it may be said the Republicans, who are still looking for an issue and striving to formulate a platform, are apt to miss the possibilities of the only constructive program available to them, to-wit: The forthright repeal of every law and the abolition of every commission and government agency created since March 4, 1933.

It will be said that some of the New Deal program has been beneficial to the country and deserves to live. It is

beside the point to argue otherwise. The country would not suffer now from complete abandonment of the program and that is the only practicable approach to solid ground, if any such approach remains. Any plan which involves a selection between what is to be retained and what is to be cast out is foredoomed to failure, the same inevitable failure which the program as a whole has already suffered.

Only because John Garner, William Green, Tom Girdler, Frank Knox, Carter Glass, Henry Ford and the embattled farmers could never agree on what is to be saved from extinction and because they might agree to scrap everything derived from the Washington bureaucracy in the past five years is the latter solution suggested as the only one of any promise.

Some immediate relief from the general bewilderment that wings its way to the remotest provinces could be had now if Congress would shut off appropriations that sustain the numerous White House secretariat and affiliated seats of pestilence in the new bureaucracy. The miseries let loose from these quarters are more withering than those which escaped from Pandora's box. To shut off appropriations would be a preliminary exhibition of statesmanship and it ought to be done promptly, under a suspension of rules.

The elasticity of the calendar is not sufficient for Mr. Roosevelt alone to have conceived more than a pittance of devastation visited on the populace since March 4, 1933, and if he were reduced to the position where he would be the sole source of all new scourges, they would promptly diminish in quantity and virulence. The country thereupon would have its first breathing spell, in fact, its first chance of ultimate recovery. The peril of the secretariat and the legion of its collaborators in the bureaucracy is no more apparent than the remedy, and Congress which has sensed the former should have been able to see the latter.

Liquidation is inevitable and the longer the postpone-

ment, the more severe and drastic will be the processes of liquidation. The deeper the country goes in the direction of financial exhaustion, the more violent will be the shock of the ultimate disaster. If perchance we should succeed in liquidating nearly a century of political nonsense—universal suffrage and therein the irresponsibility now patent to the obligations of citizenship, universal education as prescribed by our ruling oligarchy of pedagogues, universal economic dependence upon the government, at least seventy-five per cent of government aid to, meddling in and interference with strictly private or local affairs—the price paid for such liquidation cannot be regarded as excessive by those who survive the disaster.

Nothing is more truly symbolical of our decadence as a nation than our indifference, not only to the operations within our borders of Communists and their "fellow travelers" but indifference, as well, to the operations of Fritz Kuhn and his German-American bund. Their active or potential contributions to the disturbance of our domestic peace and our general welfare are widely recognized. The puny imitators in the New Deal, "liberals," progressives, leftists, Mr. Roosevelt's "B" men, could be fetched up for conspiracy and disposed of by segregation, the germs of which are found in the municipal management of other prostitutes. The California climate might be attractive and in the light of recent political trends in that state, the gentry discarded by other states would find a home atmosphere. The fragrance of New York City's "Little Flower" will attract those who are not interested in climate. With such voluntary or enforced segregation, the hinterland might live in comparative peace.

If our virility, our self-esteem, our confidence in our own future were not quite exhausted, trials for treason and deportation long ago would have become very common.

The future is dark. The way back to the happier days

is obscure. The optimists, of course, will be believed and followed for the simple reason that disaster is unpleasant to contemplate. They will continue to present a plausible syllogism, the major premise of which is a false assumption and the minor premise of which inherently is hope plus faith, even when disaster has become general. As late as 1932, was not prosperity just around the corner?

Eight years ago, and before the beginning of the Spanish civil war, Gasset predicted ¹ that thirty years will suffice to send Europe back to barbarism if the mass man continues to be master. "Legislative and industrial technique will disappear with the same facility with which so many trade secrets have often disappeared," he said. "The whole of life will be contracted, the actual abundance of possibilities will change into practical scarcity, a pitiful impotence, a real decadence."

That this country lacked the intelligence and courage to avoid these troubled times does not augur well for the needed intelligence and courage to escape the full consequences of our many mistakes. A Roosevelt rampant, in spite of present peril, will prolong the confusion and postpone the final reckoning. Meanwhile the chances to escape the deluge are less each solemn and eventful day. Another spending spree may fail to accomplish a modicum of the previous stimulation of business. That such a spree will do as much as the prolonged spree of 1933-37 accomplished, no sane person actually believes, yet the Congress of the United States made the necessary appropriations for another spending spree because it wanted the courage to be realistic when only realism can be helpful.

If the objection is made that this contemporary sketch of dominant political and social forces lacks exhilaration and buoyancy, the objection ought to be laid at the feet of the subject and not the artist or critic. While some-

¹ Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses" (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.) p. 36.

thing is to be said in behalf of the art of forgetting what it is unpleasant to remember, this formula is meant to be used guardedly. It is hardly available to a besieged garrison or a people on the threshold of Caesarism.

Nor is it necessarily fatal to be a pessimist. If there is a chance of survival, the pessimist is thrice armed: He is on the lookout for danger; he has already chosen his weapons and, from long contemplation, he will know best when to strike in his own defense. The optimist, with the innocence of a country bumpkin on his first visit to the city in gawking at a riot, is certain to be picked off by a stray bullet before our own reign of terror will have become general.

As an example of stark realism, offered to the Republicans and to thoughtful citizens of any or no party, for their consideration, the following tentative draft of articles of impeachment is appended. It is believed that these specifications, as drafted, express roughly the substance of the country's grievances against Mr. Roosevelt. Action might be forthcoming in 1939.

A report on the Matanuska Valley resettlement project in Alaska, appearing in the January, 1938, issue of *The American Mercury*, is sufficient cause for provoking whatever remains of indignation, resentment and retaliation in the human heart. No people whose instinct for self-preservation is not in decline, whose intelligence and courage have not already disappeared, would tolerate this scandalous disregard of decency in government longer than is necessary to furnish Franklin Delano Roosevelt a return ticket to Hyde Park. Furthermore, anyone capable of foisting upon the American people the obligation to pay for Matanuska Valley is lucky to escape a more spiteful ejection from the high place that has been dishonored.

I.

He has continuously endeavored to alter the form and substance of our government and in a large measure has succeeded in changing the character of our institutions.

II.

He has surrounded himself with a multitude of counsellors without practical experience in large affairs, who, nevertheless, have been allowed to write the formulæ for and to regulate, control and manage vast enterprises in accordance with their own irresponsible whims.

III.

He has allowed members of his own family to assume responsibilities in the operation of the government to which they were not elected and to commercialize their personal relationship with the President to the advantage of their own purses and to the disadvantage of accepted standards of ethical conduct which tradition has established to guide the President and the members of his immediate family.

IV.

He has repeatedly sought to array class against class, group against group, the mass against the responsible few and to arouse the baser impulses of great numbers of our people in his struggle for supreme power over all our citizens.

V.

He has exhibited the resentment of a spoiled child on many occasions in his references to persons who had disagreed with him, who had questioned his wisdom or had expressed doubt of his motives.

VI.

He has encouraged dissension, promoted ill will among our people and degraded the country among the family of Nations, at a time when unity of purpose and act has been of utmost importance to the whole country.

VII.

He has dissipated the resources and wealth of the country in extravagances, waste, prodigality and foolish undertakings of such number and magnitude as to fill the hearts of our thoughtful and responsible citizens with loathing and disgust.

VIII.

He has set before our people such a low standard in the realm of personal honor and the sanctity of the pledged word or promise, that corruption, sharp dealing and shoddy ethics threaten the whole fabric of our society.

IX.

His public appeals to the country have been calculated to persuade the more ignorant, gullible and impoverished part of the population and in impudent defiance of all principles of sound reason, of practical experience and of ordinary good sense.

X.

He has continuously dominated and controlled, with a few possible exceptions, a majority of the members of both houses of the Congress of the United States by promises of patronage and public works or threats to withhold such patronage and such public works which is contrary to the spirit of our institutions, such practices differing little from bribery, which is punishable everywhere as a felony.

XI.

He has dared to demand and has received huge sums of money from Congress to repeat an undertaking towards economic recovery which has already been shown to be futile and in making his demands of Congress, he has given the same reasons to support them which he gave before the initial undertaking collapsed.

XII.

He has used vast sums of money, appropriated by Congress to reverse the stubborn tide of a national depression towards recovery, to promote the political success of himself and his henchmen and to perpetuate their grip on the throats of our people.

XIII.

He has consciously contributed to the confusion of all our people and to a continuing chaos in business and industry in the Babel of tongues and counsel from the bureaucracy he has built up in five years and so vast is the confusion created by his numerous henchmen that fixed standards, established practices, accepted codes and permanent requirements are no longer expected by business men, big or little.

XIV.

He has pandered to large blocks of voters and has endeavored to purchase their political fealty and insure their personal loyalty by enormous gifts disguised as "grants" of money from the public treasury and by encouraging the unlawful invasion of the rights of one class by another class of greater political strength.

XV.

He has lost the unified support of the political party whose candidate he was in 1932 and 1936 and in two years he has inspired a depth of bitterness throughout the land which is only feebly expressed now by the silence or the jeers and hisses which greet an exhibition of his likeness.

XVI.

He has surrounded himself with and is supported by a legion of bureaucrats who not only "harass our people and eat out their substance" but who secretly conspire to overthrow the government they are sworn to cherish and serve. Their conspiracy is apparent in the overt acts they and their allies have committed in pursuing the program of Marx, Lenin and the enrolled Communists of Earl Browder to accomplish a revolution which is intended to destroy the private ownership of property and bring on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

XVII.

He has proved himself utterly incompetent to cope with the perils which beset the Nation since the country is farther from recovery now than it was in 1932. He has trampled on our institutions, and mocked our serious efforts to save ourselves from oblivion by sane methods. He has forfeited the respect and confidence of a people to whom he promised so much and in whose behalf he has done so little. He ought to be removed from office for the widespread evil he has wrought, for the awful loss he has caused, for the irreparable damage he has done.

Plutarch is authority for the statement that Alcibiades, previously condemned as "contumacious"² by the Athenians "so won . . . upon the lower and meaner sort of people, that they passionately desired to have him 'tyrant' over them, and some of them did not scruple to tell him so, and to advise him to put himself out of the reach of envy, by abolishing the laws and ordinances of the people, and suppressing the idle talkers . . . so he might act and take upon him the management of affairs, without standing in fear of being called to an account."

The fear of "the most considerable persons in the

² Mr. Roosevelt used this term in referring to the ousted first chairman of TVA, the rebellious Dr. Morgan.

city" that he was about to usurp "sovereign power," Plutarch goes on to say, moved them to hasten Alcibiades "on shipboard as speedily as they could. . . ." A little later Alcibiades, who "could hardly allow his men three obols" daily was outdone by Lysander who paid four obols and a little later still, Alcibiades by common consent, was assassinated. What if John L. Lewis, Sausage-Seller of the C.I.O., should decide to play Lysander in behalf of the Workers' Alliance demand for bigger hand-outs to the relief army?

As a farewell gesture to those stalwart souls—a valiant minority—who are not yet on relief; who still gain their livelihood from *private* rather than *public* sources; who missed the advantages of college training in Communism; whose past and present labor still supports the destructive bureaucracy and the unproductive masses and whose reason, therefore, is untainted, recourse to Robert Burton for wisdom that has endured for three hundred years is suggested:

"We change language, habits, laws, customs, manners, but not vices, not diseases, not the symptoms of folly and madness—they are still the same."

Epilogue

"Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.

"Ye shall know them by their fruits . . ."—*Matt. 7:15, 16.*

THE THESIS of this venture in self-expression, as announced in the preface, was *the New Deal purpose to attain a socialized state and the abolition of the private ownership of property*. An attempt was also made to show, incidentally, that such objectives are unattainable but that their continued pursuit in a country where *universal* suffrage prevails and *universal* education has failed to educate the masses inevitably will lead to Caesarism, another name for dictatorship.

The similarities in the program of the Communists, as prescribed by Marx, Engels, Lenin and their disciples in America, and in the program of the New Deal have been pointed out again and again.

Lenin stressed the importance of "democracy" and so have Mr. Roosevelt and, without exception, all the Communists and self-styled "liberals" identified with the New Deal.

Lenin emphasized housing "workers" free and at half cost and the New Deal already has provided housing on a vast scale at half cost or even less when the cost of housing projects is compared with the current income. Moreover, the New Deal is expanding its operations in housing projects for the masses, one aspect of which is the vast resettlement projects already completed and in process.

Lenin stressed the sins of "monopoly" and the evils of "bigness" in business and industry. The New Deal's assault on business and industry began with the NRA and

has continued with practically no breathing spells to the present moment. Space limitations excluded an adequate recital of the details of a barrage that has been both incessant and vicious. The present Congressional investigation of "monopolies," demanded by Mr. Roosevelt, is an important corollary of the Communist program, as prescribed by Lenin. The ceaseless assault by the New Deal bureaucracy on "monopolies," on "Capitalism," on Economic Royalists, on private business, on bankers, industrialists, public utility managers, physicians, lawyers, is merely an American adaptation of the Marxian formula for the promotion of the "class struggle." Even if the adaptation has been arrived at by means of trial and error, the seeds of class antagonisms and class hatreds have been widely sown, as Marx himself, were he living, would warmly applaud.

The recreation and amusement sections of the WPA, the Federal theatre project of the WPA and the system evolved for feeding, clothing and housing the multitude, particularly just before elections, had their genesis in the political economy of Greece and Rome in the last days when tyrants competed for the favor of the masses, only the Greek and Roman tyrants got off ordinarily with a free bread ticket to the public oven or a free seat in the Colosseum.

Frequent use of the vocabulary of Communism by Mr. Roosevelt is revealing, as pointed out. Two important examples were cited, but there have been other instances of its use and whether by virtue of a lapse or from design is unimportant. His *more abundant life* is merely a mellifluous variation of Lenin's *new life* and both mean the same thing. In the Communist dictionary, "*transition*" (the imagined interval or phenomena between Capitalism and Socialism) is a key word. Mr. Roosevelt, as pointed out in Chapter I, has adopted the term as expressing his own conception of the prevailing state of political economy in America.

The testimony of a former Communist before the Dies

Committee that Communists support New Deal extravagance and waste, the spending program, with enthusiasm because it is expected to bring on a collapse of fiscal policies and thereupon a successful revolution by the masses, was cited to show their mutual co-operation in means and methods. There is no evidence that Karl Marx ever thought of hastening the proletarian revolution by such ingenious methods as pump priming, spending to save and confiscatory taxation. Nor did he think of hastening the proletarian revolution by aiming at national bankruptcy. Use of the taxing power to effect "reform" and promote the "class struggle" is still another invention of the American Communists who have dominated American politics since March 4, 1933. The Marxian technique has been much improved in America.

The sympathetic co-operation between the New Deal and the Labor Racketeers to elevate the Marxian "worker" and to prejudice, confound and ruin the employer of labor was pointed out with respect to many diabolical policies and measures. So also was the Communistic leadership of an altogether novel labor organization, the C.I.O. which owes its success largely to the support given by Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal bureaucrats, as they owe their success somewhat to the C.I.O. The sympathetic tolerance by the New Deal network of the sit-down strike, whereby private property was seized and held in violation of law, is only a variation in detail from the Communist purpose to seize, hold and administer all privately-owned property and can be regarded only as a preliminary exhibition of proletarian strength. It has no other meaning. If Premier Daladier of France ever heard of the "American way" of managing sit-down strikers, as described by Mr. Roosevelt just before the 1938 election, obviously he was not impressed.

The palpable examples of national undertakings in Socialistic enterprises, the most outstanding and costly of which is the TVA, are so numerous that a recital of all the projects would offend an illiterate alien since few com-

munities have been spared an example of New Deal prodigality.

No one with any practical experience in business and industry was capable of forging the New Deal shackles which oppress business and industry. These shackles were forged out of the imaginations of volunteer "economists" and pedagogues who were surfeited with the philosophy of Karl Marx and whose knowledge of the problems was derived solely from the library. As their contribution to the more abundant or *new* life, the Labor racketeers have driven spikes in the shackles.

Wages and hours legislation, sponsored by the Socialist party for half a century and by the Communist party since its birth in America, the country owes to Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal.

Perhaps some of the Marxian geniuses in the White House secretariat could explain the unanimity of support which Mr. Roosevelt enjoys from known Communists and "fellow travelers" in America but until they do, the inference is unavoidable that the Communist party line is well satisfied with the progress of the New Deal toward the Communist objectives.

It is a misfortune, indeed, that the late Dr. William A. Wirt, of Gary, did not live to experience a triumph of his predictions. Or, perhaps, it is not so much of a misfortune that he was spared the realities of current politics, including the moral abasements initiated in Washington and added since his death. Possibly Dr. Wirt, had he lived, might have been able to get from Madame Perkins a satisfactory explanation of her protection and defense of Harry Bridges, the well known Australian Communist and business manager for John L. Lewis on the West Coast. No one else has.

The personnel of the New Deal network—the salaried bureaucrats, ex-bureaucrats, "economists," pedagogues fresh from the campus, writers, journalists, columnists and especially the many geniuses contributed to the New Deal by Prof. Felix Frankfurter—all these are im-

pressive when their ideologies, antecedents and ethics are considered. No sane person would trust his private property to the management of any one of them. The simple fact that they have been entrusted with the management of our common affairs, so vast in their scope, of itself is convincing that the actual preservation of our country's resources is not a New Deal objective. Naturally, therefore, when *thrift* is attacked, *reality* scorned and Stalin's *commissary* defended by the New Deal network, the conclusion follows that they hew close to the line, i.e., the Communist party line.

In October, 1937, as pointed out in Chapter X, Mr. Roosevelt fetched his sabre to Cook County, Illinois, rattled it vigorously on the new bridge and threatened to "quarantine" Hitler and Mussolini. One year later, after a day's absence from Hyde Park, two days with no fish or vacation and three days off the front page, he was prepared to deify both for peace at any price in Czechoslovakia and a share in the spotlight they were enjoying at the moment. This strange denouement in our foreign policy, after all, was typical of our domestic policy since March 4, 1933, even if it disappointed the Communists.

The diplomacy of the New Deal polyglot thus was made to match the ethics of Downing Street, the Quirinal and Berchtesgaden. The American polyglot was not to be ignored by the Anglo-Saxon, the Teuton or the Latin, or by all of their maneuvering from the same side of the table. Even the harried Señor Cárdenas, having destroyed the haciendados and stopped the flow of oil in Mexico, was entitled at least to one chuckle in the midst of his negotiations for the purchase of beans and wheat with a falling peso.

Since the beginning of the World War this country has been under the spell of slogan makers. The politicians have found from experience that a slogan which catches and holds public imagination is more dependable than infallible logic in means and measures, more useful than honest methods of administration, more enduring than

efficient public service. All the slogans contain a *little* truth and a *little* truth is all that has been necessary. Thus it is that "civil liberties," "academic freedom" in the universities, "universal education," "industrial democracy," "peace and democracy," "more democracy," "pump priming" and a "New Deal" have served to conceal the mantle of Marxism and Communism.

The pedagogues have risen to front rank in the new order at Washington because of their superior capacity to confuse the multitude with phrase-making. Lately, the pedagogues appear to be more confused than the multitude. They are bewildered and confounded by their own confusion. With equal voracity they now snatch at any bait dangled by Mr. Roosevelt—Mr. Hull's reciprocal trade agreements, Mrs. Roosevelt's "good neighbor" policy, the repeal of the same neutrality laws they sponsored, the raising of embargoes they once demanded, alliances with Great Britain and France whose accord at Munich they denounced. They are equally willing to accept the Rhine, the Nile or the Yangtze-kiang as the American frontier, if only Mr. Roosevelt will make a selection.

The finger prints of the revolutionists are unmistakable. They are to be found in every new agency and bureau in Washington and in most of the agencies, bureaus and departments that are not new. They predominate in New York City and in the federal agencies of the industrial centers. They appear numerously in the vicinity of what goes under the name of "organized labor" in America and are found in many state capitols. Their smear will be found on every act which appropriates money from the public treasury, on every measure which tends to weaken the credit and resources of what is left of organized government in America.

The Jewish revolutionists in America are eager for and expectant of a new internationalism and "the confederation of the world" they have asserted repeatedly; that they favor democracy only as an aid to and fore-

runner of revolution is quite obvious; that social equality is their chief objective, the Jews have admitted in many ways. Paul Radin asserts¹ that Russia, the United States and the Jews inspired by Marx, Lenin, Freud and Jung will usher in the new social order. Since the Jews already control Russia and with the blessings of Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal are well established in our own bureaucracy, it would seem that the Jews are to be in sole charge of all great events in the immediate future.

With Litvinoff, first Soviet ambassador to Washington and now commissar of foreign affairs in Soviet Russia; Leon Blum, the former French premier as agent for internationalism in Paris; William C. Bullitt, one of the palace favorites as ambassador of New Deal internationalism to France and Henry Morgenthau, Jr., established in Washington to manipulate a two billion dollar "stabilization fund" provided by American taxpayers for the benefit and advancement of internationalism, it appears not only that Judaism is well entrenched in the seats of world power but also that its objectives are not beyond the reach of the dominant regime. Whether these gentlemen actually met together in Paris in 1938 or merely enjoyed a meeting of minds, a disputed subject between Father Coughlin and Mr. Morgenthau, is unimportant. Each fully understands what the others are thinking and doing just as James P. Warburg, the international Jewish banker, understood in 1936 when he made a last minute shift to Roosevelt because he could obtain no commitment from the Republicans for the "stabilization of currencies." With still another Jew, Laurence A. Steinhardt, in Soviet Russia to take Bullitt's place and share in Jewish manipulations with Litvinoff, *surface* indications point unmistakably to another American war and an increased measure of Marxian "democracy" throughout the world.

Paul Radin's "The Racial Myth" was published in the

¹ "The Racial Myth" by Paul Radin (McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1934) p. 140.

second year of Mr. Roosevelt's first administration and he seems to have been somewhat ahead of the late Dr. William A. Wirt in getting his political bearings. In the final chapter of the volume entitled "The Confederation of the World," he made a remarkable observation:

"The measures of the present administration make clear that even necessarily capitalistic administrators realize that the only problem confronting them is how the *new reorganization* * is to come about, the precise measures and the time required for putting it in effect. *Taking a leaf from the Russians* * they seem to be interested not so much in prophesying what forms the new movement shall assume as *in fixing beyond the power of change the general direction it will go.*" *

What more could be offered in proof of the thesis of this book?

The election of numerous Republican candidates for office in 1938 may impede our progress towards chaos, as charted by Mr. Roosevelt and his Communist allies, but if those selected are unwilling to perform a major operation on the bureaucracy and reverse the flow of red ink to the budget, the potential impediment in a stronger opposition will become meaningless. Comment on the political philosophies of some of the Republicans elected to Congress in 1938 is not reassuring. Whether the vicious system of misgovernment initiated by the New Deal is administered by officials elected as Democrats or as Republicans is of no importance whatever to the general welfare. If another Norris or another LaFollette turns up in the 1939 Congress with a Republican certificate of election, there should be no great surprise because some of the successful Republican candidates exceeded Mr. Roosevelt in promises of the more abundant life.

Those trusting souls who expect, because the 1938 elections indicated a notable repudiation of the New Deal, that a return to orderly living is now assured are due for further disillusionment. Even though the Re-

* Our italics.

publicans sweep the country in 1940, there is no certain promise of an attempt at orderly liquidation of New Deal nonsense, if they do win. There is no guaranty of such a liquidation even though they undertake in good faith to accomplish it.

Since the time of Moses—in Egypt, in their homeland of Judea, in Babylonia, in the empire of the Romans, in the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, in the domain of the czars of Russia, in the Germany of Frederick the Great and Adolph Hitler, in the Italy of Mussolini, in Palestine among the Arabs—every people in every age has been out of step, save only the Jews. Now in America the progeny of sturdy pioneers who pierced the forest and built a nation are out of step with Jews who came here with no special invitation *after* cities began to appear and who now demand a *new social order* which is expected to raise the Jew to the top of the heap. Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal cheerfully provide the shock troops to blaze the way while the Jews themselves contribute the essential propaganda.

Such are the simple facts which confront America in this year of our Lord and Savior, 1939.

Appendix I

THE EXPECTATIONS of the country from the investigation of "monopoly" which is now in progress are foreshadowed in "The Folklore of Capitalism" by Thurman W. Arnold,¹ a book which was published in October, 1937, and which by February, 1938, had had six printings. The writer managed to read forty-four pages at the first sitting; thereafter, to read thirty-two additional pages, whereupon, in disgust, the volume was laid aside. After some days, the writer proceeded to page ninety-seven and thereupon finally abandoned it. Seventeen pages of notes on the initial ninety-seven pages had been made.

Arnold, who became "socially minded" and a sworn enemy of "Big Business" at Princeton, Harvard and Yale from all of which he has degrees, practiced law in Chicago three years but after the World War, returned to his birthplace, Laramie, Wyoming, and since then has taught law at the University of Wyoming, West Virginia University and Yale. If he ever had any experience in business or industry, he is too much of a "thinking man" to admit it. Because of his grudge against industry and "Big Business" which, until the New Deal, had not found his talents indispensable, Arnold has epitomized the blunders of humanity since the advent of the Jewish money lender and laid them all at the feet of "Capitalism." He would have been equally justified in laying all his grievances to the Jews, or to the church, if such allocations had fitted his purpose.

One may gather from page 39 that the author's purpose

¹ Yale University Press.

is to provide the "social workers," the "younger economists, political scientists and lawyers" in the "universities" with a "*philosophy*," as Adam Smith provided the merchant and manufacturer with a philosophy. Arnold admits that his protégés "are often branded as unsound" and explains that their affiliates, "a class of engineers, salesmen, minor executives" (Karl Marx called them the "proletariat") subordinate their "reverence for the independence and dignity of the businessman." He might have added that such a group will need more than a "philosophy" to be able to hold the fleshpots of the "temporal government" around which they now make merry.

Arnold was wholly introspective when he observed, as he does on page 10, "men do not actually search history to avoid the mistakes of the past. They seek *convenient analogies* * to show the dangers in failing to adopt the creed which they advocate."

It seems that the discovery of quinine by the Jesuits in Peru three hundred years ago had some repercussions in Paris where, in spite of some opposition, it was used for malaria and because it was found to be an efficient remedy, Arnold argues at great length that it was a serious mistake to oppose the packing of the Supreme Court. Arnold likens heresy in the Middle Ages to the Communism of Karl Marx. The unsuspecting are supposed to infer that as the heresy of the Middle Ages became the orthodoxy of a later age so Communism finally will become established and respectable.

The author was much impressed by a conversation he overheard concerning a reduction in rates of the "bankrupt" New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad by the Interstate Commerce Commission. He has seized upon the contention of "one gentleman" (who no doubt gave a sly wink to the others) that traffic would increase, new trains would be added and employment increased as a consequence of reduced rates. The unanimity of the

* Our italics.

objections to the reduced rates, Arnold attributes to "pure mystical idealism," to "thinking as primitive and naïve as all such thinking must be when it is divorced from practical issues and involved in prevailing taboos." The learned discussion of the conversation concludes with the observation that "neither the writer, nor any member of the group, knew anything" about "the merits of the rate reduction." To concur in Arnold's opinion of his companions would necessitate reliance on hearsay evidence but with respect to Arnold's own knowledge, reliance upon hearsay evidence is not necessary.

Arnold was not pleased with the "The Folklore of 1937," the title of his third chapter. A stereotyped use of the past tense in all reference to the laboratory blunders of the New Deal is calculated to remove them from the domain of the debatable or rejected to the realm of the established and fully proved. This technique is certain to confuse many co-eds with a library assignment from Prof. Kohn and an early date. Just why the somnolent Swedes accept "the comforts of government-subsidized houses" and Americans insist on looking gift horses in the mouth puzzled Prof. Arnold in that ancient year, 1937. The future historian, he said, "will observe men refusing benefits obviously to their practical advantage when tendered by the government."

He may be called "Zeke." He had read somewhere that General Moseley is being pursued by the secret police of the New Deal and he did not want his correct name used. "Zeke" lives south of Anderson in Madison County, Indiana, owns some rental properties in Anderson and could enlighten Prof. Arnold. "Zeke" had just been asked to sign a petition to build additions to two Adams township consolidated schools at a cost of \$172,000.00 "Not by a God damn," said "Zeke."

It was suggested that the PWA was to provide \$120,000.00 of the money and that the WPA would do the work.

"Now I know damn well I'll not sign the petition," he retorted. "The WPA was supposed to improve a street in

front of a house I own at no cost to the property owners but it is going to cost me more than it would have cost if repaired by private contract. The township would be better off to build its own schoolhouses, if it needs more schoolhouses, and tell the PWA and WPA to go to hell. I worked for years in Anderson factories and saved my money. I made extra money working at night and have paid once for every piece of property I own. Now, I suppose I'll have to pay for them again in taxes or lose the properties because of the God damn fools in Washington and Indianapolis. I'm in favor of loading the Roosevelt family and the damned Jews Roosevelt has put in office on a boat for Russia, and I wouldn't worry if the boat sank."

These observations on the state of the nation were made in Chester Markle's general store at Emporia, Madison County, Indiana, on January 9, 1939.

Arnold reveals on page 35 that "the unbalanced budget . . . was actually pulling us out of the depression," and on page 51 that the sit-down strikes were a "fascinating struggle to develop labor unity." If W. P. Knudsen of General Motors was "fascinated," he failed to disclose it. If the Michigan voters were "fascinated" by the sit-down strikes, their fascination had vanished by November, 1938, when they turned Governor Murphy and New Deal hoodlums out of office. Arnold yearns for "responsible labor leaders like John L. Lewis" on page 88 where he characterizes the sit-down strikes as a "religious problem." Perhaps this was only a forerunner of Mr. Roosevelt's effort in his first message to the 1939 Congress to untie New Deal "democracy" from Karl Marx and tie another crown of thorns to the brow of Jesus of Nazareth. Since the message, Walter Lippmann and Dorothy Thompson also have put on frocks and entered the pulpit to uphold, as Miss Thompson puts it, Mr. Roosevelt's "concept of Judaism."

Hitler's persecutions are pointed out on page 41 and Stalin is referred to as a "practical politician" on page 93.

The persecution of Jews only is worthy of notice, it would seem. One may gather that Prof. Arnold likes Washington, D. C., and has a low opinion of our "checker squares of states." In spite of the fact that the national government is supposed to be one of delegated power and that all power not specifically delegated is reserved to the states or to the people (which ordinarily is taught to all eight-grade pupils), Arnold asserts, on page 93, the notion is "pure day dreaming" that the states have "power to conduct experiments."

The country will be surprised to learn that since Arnold was recognized as a statesman "a better class of political leaders is in charge of our political machines," his statement on page 44. "Grosser and more unpleasant forms of political chicanery are not used to the same extent as in 1900" and "political techniques have become less the exclusive property of unscrupulous people."

Thoughts of John L. Lewis, Jimmie Hines and Tammany, Tom Pendergast, the Kelly-Nash machine in Illinois, Mr. McNutt's Two-Per cent Club in Indiana, the Guffey and Earle Five-Per cent Club in Pennsylvania, the Brothers LaFollette in Wisconsin, Ickes, Hopkins and the purchase of votes with money from the Federal Treasury required the smelling salts. After a hurried departure for the golf course with its stimulating abundance of fresh air, the reader revived.

Opposition to packing the Supreme Court is described as "a way of taking away from a great popular majority the fruits of their recent victory at the polls." The "great popular majority" of 1936, however, went into a tail-spin in 1938 after the pilot had exhausted the fuel supply from too heavy drafts on the 1936 "mandate."

If any more printings are necessary to supply the Frankfurter recruits for the more abundant or *new* life with Arnold's guide to the fleshpots, a retitling is suggested. It should be titled, "The Demonology of the New Deal."

The folklore, the taboos, the mythology, the traditions

and especially the "priests" who steadfastly supported the conventions of political economy in 1937 were anathemas to Prof. Arnold when ghost writing for Communism and Mr. Roosevelt. As then constituted, he did not like the Supreme Court but his spirits may have improved about the time his book was finished when Hugo Black, kkk, was made a member. He had a low opinion of the American business man, the American Liberty League and the reluctance of the American taxpayer to be robbed by the bureaucracy to which Arnold belonged.

In 1937, Arnold was definitely opposed to any taboos or mythology or traditions that interfered with the more abundant or *new* life, particularly such enterprises as Passamaquoddy, negro palaces and the Florida ship canal, all of which he would have entered on the balance sheet of the bureaucracy as "assets." In spite of the assumption that Arnold was still a "thinking man" in 1937, the principles of accounting which he then defended were identical with those practiced by the late F. Donald Coster, alias Philip Musica, who caused a fictitious "asset" item of some \$18,000,000.00 worth of nonexistent crude drugs in nonexistent warehouses to be entered on the books of McKesson & Robbins.

The folklore of the nation in 1937 was still more or less hostile to selling securities in a rigged market, to prostitution, to extortion, to ballot box stuffing and jury bribing, but one infers that Prof. Arnold bitterly lamented the folklore of that remote cycle and would lift the taboo against all activities not already on the "approved" list of moral precepts as abridged and inverted by the New Deal.

Appendix II

THE CAREER of George Soule and the contents of his last book "The Future of Liberty" are both amazing when considered together but only because they are so typical of the gentry now at the "controls" of our regimented and planned society and of the nonsense being published by and on behalf of these gentry to promote a completely socialized state.

Soule has been the editor of *The New Republic* since January 1, 1924. Two of his previous books are "A Planned Society," published in 1932, and "The Coming American Revolution," published in 1934. He obtained his education for the more abundant life at Yale from which he was graduated in 1908. He was in the advertising department of a book publishing house for a time and joined the editorial staff of *The New Republic* when it was founded in 1914. In 1919, he was with the *Evening Post* for a time, employed as an investigator by the Inter-Church World Movement Commission on the steel strike, statistician for the *Nautical Gazette* and has been a director of the Labor Bureau, Inc., since 1920. He returned to *The New Republic* in 1924. In 1927, he was employed as a "special advisor" to the Secretary of Interior on reclamation and rural development. Born at Stamford, Connecticut, his special training in reclamation and rural development must have been obtained from the same sources which enabled him to draw the patterns for "A Planned Society" and to fill in the specifications of the more abundant life in "The Future of Liberty." In other words, Soule appears to have a vivid imagination and this seems to be the principal source of his economic wisdom. He is a lecturer in the Yale Law

School but if he practices medicine or sings in the village choir, he neglects to state the facts in his biography.

Soule is especially typical of the intellectual dilettants who now furnish the country its economic program and he is quite as well prepared to make over America as Leon Henderson, Thurman Arnold, William O. Douglas, Isador Lubin and Jerome Frank, no one of whom has had five minutes experience in business and industry. These six gentlemen from the Washington bureaucracy constituted the administrative group that are to investigate "monopolies," the object of which, according to *The Nation*¹ is "*to make the inquiry the first step toward a real grappling with the problem of socializing industry.*" * The appointment of Douglas to the Supreme Court is insurance against judicial disaster to any Marxian program later devised by the group.

The theme of Soule's last book is the "transition" from Capitalism to Socialism. Like Mrs. Roosevelt, Soule makes use freely of the English conjunction "if." But unlike Mrs. Roosevelt, he does not *dismiss* facts that are embarrassing. He makes an effort to *explain* and to *excuse* and so well is he pleased with his explanations of and excuses for the present low state of liberty in Russia, he ventures the opinion "there is little reason to expect that the United States . . . would have to suffer all the same disadvantages and endure the same privations, material and psychic."

Soule is more impressed by the language of the Russian constitution of 1936 which "provides for universal secret suffrage, responsible parliamentary government, equality for women and members of all races, the rights of voluntary organizations, the *inviolability* * of the person and the home, freedom of conscience, of worship, of speech, of press and of assembly" than he is by what he reads in the newspapers concerning their observance or enforcement.

¹ July 16, 1938.

* Our italics.

Anyone so utterly simple-minded as to quote the provisions of a "constitution" containing such guaranties, *vis-à-vis*, the atrocious purges of the last two years carried out in fulfillment of the "new life" of Lenin by his successor, the esteemed Mr. Stalin, qualifies for a passport to Russia and nothing else. It is to be remembered that Danton, Marat and Robespierre also operated *under* a constitution and that Mr. Roosevelt has promised to do so.

Soule admits that "with good reason we have to fear the violent upheaval that will probably come *if* * we do not manage a peaceable transition" which is equivalent to saying we will have war if we don't have peace. The "transition," he concludes, "is a critical and difficult problem, perhaps impossible of solution," and "if violence then breaks out, if . . . we are . . . confronted with civil war through the recalcitrance of those who will not recognize the authority of popular government, control of that government by those who favor the new order provides the best chance of eventual victory."

If Congress continues to appropriate X billion dollars for the purchase of votes before each general election, there can be no doubt that "control" of the government will abide with "those who favor the new order." When the money runs out, as it did in France and as it must in America, the fates of Louis XVI and his queen, may be contemplated by those in "control." Even now, they may engage in contemplation.

There is one very naïve admission in the Soule opus: "To show that Capitalism as we have known it does not work well is not to prove that Socialism would work any better."

Thereupon, Soule sets out to prove that it will work better. He is much impressed with the studies of Messrs. Harold Loeb and Walter Polakov financed with Federal Relief funds. The latter was born in Russia and was back there helping out Stalin in the last years of Hoover.

• Our italics.

With respect to "plain, inferior, standardized and Puritan fare of goods, such as was thought best for us by the national commissary," Soule is reassuring.

"We should not suffer," he says, "if we did not have to choose between hundreds of brands of canned fruits or vegetables whose relative merits we cannot know without laboratory experiments, or if we were not presented with quite so bewildering a variety of unreliable cures for newly invented diseases, or if we were not saddled with the impossible task of knowing whether we were getting our money's worth among the thousands of different suits, shoes, shirts and radios, furniture or safety razors . . ."

Soule would increase his own knowledge if he would visit the neighborhood grocery and observe the housewives, whose laboratory equipment consists of a sharp pair of eyes and two restless hands, in action. He seems to have suffered at some time of a hang-over from Peruna. Apparently he is unacquainted with the romance to be had from a Sears-Roebuck catalogue when in need of suits, shoes, shirts, radios, furniture, safety razors, farm implements, automobiles, garden hose and apple pie.

While Soule is by no means sanguine respecting the liberty and freedom to be had during the "transition," Heywood Broun declared in 1931, "One reason why I am a Socialist is that I have a stubborn predilection for freedom." These two distinguished economists should check each other.

Mr. Broun (pronounced like the surname of Andrew H. Brown of the Fresh Air Taxicab Company by Miss Blue, his secretary) issued a brochure in 1931, "Why I am a Socialist," that is reminiscent of Andy's knowledge and logic, incident to his several commercial ventures. Andy picked up his information in a pool room whereas Mr. Broun learned about economics, political economy, finance, industrial management, sales promotion, engineering, mining, agriculture, baseball and hemstitching at Harvard where he was a student for a few years. In

his gold coast penthouse, Broun has wept for years because of the hazards of coal mining and if the industry ever sees fit to engage his talents, he will "seek new and less hazardous methods of mining, using the tested tools that are at hand under the direction of engineers in whom," as he says, "I had a bit more faith."

How awfully simple it is and how very terrible is the misfortune of the miners that Roy Howard all these years has kept Mr. Broun in chains. Broun quotes the alert Princeton Socialist, Norman Thomas, thrice a candidate for President on the Socialist ticket, to show that dangers of a bureaucracy under Socialism will vanish from the "*application of the merit system*," * by "*the union*." * It is early enough in the country's trek to Caesarism to chart in advance the progress of the "merit system" under the sympathetic handling of "the union," for example, the C.I.O. of John L. Lewis and his sit-down strikers.

* Our italics.

Appendix III

A FRIEND of former years to whom this manuscript was submitted, returned it with the following comment:

"T. R. still has many Republican admirers who would take pleasure in what you say of F. D. R. but the one paragraph on page 207 would drive them nuts. They would organize a lynching bee, right resting on Indianapolis and you'd get the works."

After a few days reflection, a few volumes in the author's library thought to contain something apropos the Roosevelt family of Oyster Bay, were remembered. In a volume first published in 1920, it was revealed that another author who had written of the philosophical kinship of Teddy and Kaiser Wilhelm had received letters from all parts of the United States containing "forthright demands" to recant "on penalty of lynch law."

Since the author still lives, it may be of interest to repeat what else he said of the founder of what he called the "clown dynasty." The Roosevelt of the "strenuous life" which phrase is said to have been borrowed and paraphrased from Nietzsche is called "blatant, crude, over-confidential, devious, tyrannical, vainglorious, sometimes quite childish." But this is not all. "No man could have been more bitter against opponents." Elsewhere, he is called a "rabble rouser," a "popinjay," a "predatory mountebank," an "imperialist," a "comedian," a "glorified longshoreman," "incurably undemocratic" and a "charlatan of the very highest skill." He is said to have "played to the worst idiocies of the mob," to have believed in "the strict regimentation of the nether herd" and to have favored "a despotism of inspired prophets

and policemen." There are also declarations of his "insincerity," that "he was never even fair to an opponent" and that "no man facing Roosevelt in the heat of controversy ever actually got a square deal." The family likenesses are apparent in the "Square Deal" and the "New Deal" branches of the clan.

After re-reading the "Autopsy" of Mr. H. L. Mencken and his observations of later years, there was a natural impulse to deal more harshly with the Roosevelt dynasty. Three hundred years, however, should mark the end of Western Culture and any longer term would become inoperative by lapse of time, just as a term of ninety-nine years in prison imposed on an octogenarian.

Mencken seems to suspect, it is only fair to say, that had Roosevelt I lived he might have been "reborn." In any event, his untimely death upset the political apple cart. At a meeting held at Oyster Bay in 1918, the principal offices, if not the country, were divided among those present as follows: For President, Theodore Roosevelt; for Vice President, James P. Goodrich, then Governor of Indiana; for Chairman of the Republican National Committee, Will H. Hays, now the movie czar. The only other person present was the late George W. Perkins, who agreed to finance the program. Hays realized the agreed objective in 1920, in spite of Roosevelt's death in 1919, and became Postmaster General under Harding. Roosevelt said at the meeting, it should be added, that he might not live out his term, in which event, he wanted to be certain his successor would be worthy to succeed him. Had Theodore Roosevelt lived, the ticket agreed upon at Oyster Bay in 1918 would have been nominated in 1920 and, of course, elected.

INDEX

- AAA, footnote, 94; 95
 Academic freedom, 70, 231-232
 Achinstein, Asher, 96
 Addison, Joseph, quoted, 202
 Adler, Cyrus, biographer of Schiff, Jacob H., 103
 Afanasiyeff, 106
 Alcibiades, 137, 225-226
 Alexandrian Jews, destruction of Hellenic civilization, 111
 Aliens, on the dole, 27-28; in politics, 49; 71; as Communists, 93; Jews as, 98
 All-Russian Congress, Fifth, 106; November 29, 1936, 119
 Alphonso the Wise, 132
America's Sixty Families, 79
 American Civil Liberties Union, 67; footnote, 95; and Frankfurter, Prof. Felix, 102
 American Federation of Labor, wages and hours resolution of 1914-5, 59-61
American Freeman, The, 117
 American Jewish Committee, quoted, 116
 American Jewish Congress, 104
American Jewish Year Book, 113, 115, 119
 American League against War and Fascism, 67
 American Liberty League, 241
American Mercury, The, turns to Left, footnote, 112; 116, 200, 222
 American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia, *The*, 67
 American versus Jewish ideals, 123-124
Anarchism and Other Essays, quoted, 113-114
 Anderson, Indiana, 14, 238-239
 Anderson, Paul Y., quoted, 180
 Anderson, Sherwood, 205
 Angell, Norman, discussed, 15; quoted, 16
 Anglo-French loans, 103
 Annenberg, Moe, in Pennsylvania politics, 111
Antichrist, 120
 Anti-Saloon League, 41; and drunken lawmakers, 144
 Anti-Semitism, 107, 109; and Roosevelt victory of 1936, 115; 120; founded on identity of Judaism and Communism, 123
 Appeal to Reason, 117
 Argentina, Jewish population, 122
 Aristotle, 99-100, 175
 Armenians, compared with Jews, Greeks and Parsees, 112
 Arnold, Thurman, and "monopoly" investigation, 10; footnote, 72; *The Folklore of Capitalism*, 236-241, 243
 Aryans, 109
 Assimilation, of Jews, 109-110
 Astor, Vincent, 161
 Atlanta, Georgia, 49
 Aunt Jemima, 215
 Austria, 92, 151
 Babbitt, George W., as a "sucker," 90
 Babylonian captivity, 99-100
 Ball Brothers, 214
 Ball, Frank C., 138
 Barca, Madam de la, 163
 Baruch, Bernard, 80
 Bean, Louis H., 95
 Bell, Alexander Graham, 33
 Ben Davis, Indiana, 83
 Benjamin, Herbert, footnote, 94
 Berijev, Laventi Respi Pavlovich, 118
 Berle, Adolph A., Jr., 87
 Berman, Edward, 96
 Berry, George L., 203
 Bierce, Ambrose, quoted, 182
 Billings, Josh, 72
 Bingham, Alfred, 205
 Black, Hugo, as "odd man," 5, 7, 36, 37, 41, 56, 129, 137, 188, 241
 Block, Paul, 137
 Boss Tweed, 186
 Blum, Leon, director French "Democratic" front, 108; referred to, 158, 233
 Bodansky, 205-206
 Bok, Curtis, 203

- Bolles, Blair, quoted, 47
 Bolsheviks, 60, 102-107
 Borah, William E., 208
 Borda Gardens, 165
 Brandeis, Louis D., and "Liberalism," 102
 Brazil, Jewish population, 122
 Breslaw, Joseph, footnote, 95
 Brest-Litovsk, footnote, 102; 106
 Bridges, Harry, 19, 71, 131, 230
British Agent, quoted, 102, 106
 British White Paper, 103
 Brogan, Dennis W., quoted, 52
Brooklyn Eagle, referred to, 16
 Brookwood College, footnote, 95
 Broun, Heywood, 199; quoted, 245-246
 Browder, Earl, 78; footnote, 94
 Browne, Rabbi Lewis, footnote, 212
 Bryan, William Jennings, 27, 210
 Bullitt, William C., 158, 209, 233
 Bureau of Labor Statistics, 96
 Burke, Edmund, quoted, 132
 Burton, Robert, quoted, 35, 171, 192, 226
 Business and Industry, Chaos in, 80-92
 Byllesby Engineering and Management Corporation, footnote, 182-183

 CAA, 129
 Caesar, Julius, 18, 19, 46, 175
 Caesarism, as dictatorship, 9, 14, 61, 62, 84, 155, 192, 195, 227
 Calhoun, John C., quoted, 142
 Cálles, 167
 Cameron, W. J., 78, 214
 Cannon, Bishop James, Jr., political activities, 155
 Capitalism, "in transition," 9; and "high finance," 11; compared with Socialism, 15-16; recognition of inequalities, 110; in Mexico, 165-170; where it flourishes, 180; changes in masters, 181-183
 Capitalistic class, overthrow of, 13; third generation, 63; technique of changes in masters discussed, footnote, 182-183
 Capitalists versus "workers," 30-34
 Capone, Al, 51, 187
 Cárdenas, Lazaro, 12; and "good neighbor" policy, 151; and native goose step, 155; six-year plan, 166; referred to, 167; morals and dignity of, compared to Roosevelt, 170; referred to, 231
 Carnegie, Andrew, 63
 Carnovsky, Leon, 74
 Carrillo, Alejandro, quoted, 168
 Catholicism, and Communism, 163-164
 CCC, 129
 Cervantes, 153
 Chamberlain, and Munich accord, 180
 Chamberlin, William Henry, quoted, 106; 118
 Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1-2
 Chase, Stuart, 4, 18, 176-180, 195
Chattanooga Times, 113
 "Cheap power," as a slogan, 3
 Chicago, 19; school term and bankruptcy, 66; wealth of, 75
 Chicago Railways, operating statement, 54-55
Chicago Tribune, 41, 43; called "notorious" by Granville Hicks, 78; quoted, 119-120; quoted, footnote, 182-183
 Chicago, University of, and Communism, 71; referred to, 74; 184
 China, 92
Christian Science Monitor, quoted, 106
Christian Science Monitor Weekly Magazine, footnote, 118
 Christianity, and Communism, 110; decline of, 110
 Cicero, 18; and Roosevelt, Franklin D., 62; and Roman politics, 175
 C.I.O., 19, 33, 54-63; 71, 93; footnote, 94; and Jews, 109; 110, 131, 192, 226, 229, 246
 Citizenship, and education, 64, 69; and machine efficiency, 189-190
 Civil liberty, 70, 231, 232
 Civilian Conservation Corps, 129
 Clarke, Harley L., 182
 Class hatred, 79, 201
 "Class Struggle," discussed, 30-34
 Classical Culture, 109
 Clem, Elza, 14
 Cleon, 161-162
 Cohen, Benjamin V., 12, 22, 49, 88, 95, 99, 139, 174, 182, 195, 206
 Cohn, Fannie M., footnote, 95
 Collective bargaining, 62, 178
 College of the City of New York, 97; footnote, 112
 Colleges and Universities, increase in enrollment, 66; Utopian dreamers in, 69-70; dominated by disciples of Marx, 70; source of New Deal fallacies, 64-79; doctrines taught by Jews and non-Jews, 94
Collier's Weekly, quoted, 120
 Columbia University, and Communism, 71, 97; footnote, 112
 "Coming Crash of Capitalism," 13
Coming Struggle for Power, The, 79

- Commentator, The*, quoted, footnote, 122
- Commodity Credit Corporation, 129
- Communism, discussed, 3-15; and war, 6; and housing, 12-15; and Socialism, 30-34; and failures of, 15; and Jews, 93-124; in Hungary, 105; and Christianity, 110; and American Jewish Congress, 103-104; and Trojan horse, 124; and poetry, 183
- Communism, identical with "Democracy," "Liberalism," Socialism, Judaism as taught by Marx, 2, 3, 16, 101, 110, 112-113, 117, 148, 232
- Communist Manifesto*, 101
- Confiscation, of Mexican oil, 150, 167, 168
- Congress, and New Deal, 130-131, 135-136, 145-146, 161-162
- Constitution, U. S., address upon, 2, 22; and "reorganization," 6
- "Contumacy," and Roosevelt, Franklin D., 34
- Coolidge, Calvin, *laissez faire* character of administration, 30; 38-39, 41-42, 48, 86; 117; and Boston police strike, 181; 213, 217
- Corcoran, Thomas, 12, 22, 88, 174, 195, 206
- Cortez, and Inquisition, 154; conquest of Mexico, 167
- Coughlin, The Rev. Charles E., 85, 103-107, 117-118, 233
- Council of Peoples Commissars, 119
- Cox, E. E., 177
- Crassus, 175
- Crime and racial origins, 20-21
- "Crisis," 5
- Cuernavaca, Mexico, 164-165
- Czechoslovakia, 92, 151
- Daladier, Premier of France, 108, 229
- Dallas, Texas, 49
- Danton, 4, 7, 139, 244
- Das Kapital*, 62, 101
- Dawes, and RFC loan, 89
- Dayton, Ohio, bankruptcy of city schools, 66
- Defense Committee for I.W.W., 67
- Demagogues, in American politics, 27
- "Democracy," identical with "Liberalism," Communism, Socialism, Judaism as taught by Marx, 2-3, 16, 101, 110, 112-113, 117, 148, 232
- "Democracy," in Rome, 18-20; in America, 189-190
- Denmark, school system discussed, 74-75
- de Stael, Madame, quoted, 11
- "Destruction of bourgeois parliamentarism," 14
- Dewey, John, political affiliations of, 66-67
- Dewey, Thomas E., 189
- Dictatorship, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, 6-7; revolutionary, 14; of proletariat, 14; forecast in France, 108; comment of Aristophanes, 159-162
- Dies Committee, 16, 93, 109, 180-181
- Dillinger, John, 187
- Disraeli, Benjamin, quoted, 64; "manipulations" of alien politics, 111
- Doheny, Edward L., 106
- Don Quixote, 153
- Douglas, Paul H., quoted and discussed, 71-72
- Douglas, William O., 87-89, 206, 243
- Dreiser, Theodore, quoted, 95, 205
- Drew, Daniel, 148
- Dubinsky, David, footnote, 94; 117
- DuPont family, and Roosevelts, 43, 47, 161
- Earle, George H., and Five Per Cent Club, 24; triumvirate in Pennsylvania politics, 111; 142, 187, 206, 240
- Economic Royalists, 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 34, 42; of educational system, 67; 71, 81, 89, 129, 161, 165-166, 174, 190, 197, 217, 228
- ECW, 129
- Eden, Anthony, 126
- Edison, Thomas A., 33, 76
- Edman, Irwin, quoted, 68
- Education, failure of mass effort, 25; and incompetent government, 29; discussed at length, 64-79; footnote, 90; 184-185, 227
- Egypt, departure of Jews from, 111
- Egyptian bondage, 99
- EHFA, 129
- E-18, 129
- Einstein, Albert, quoted, 120
- Emanuel, Victor, footnote, 182-183
- Emporia, Indiana, 238-239
- Encyclopaedia Britannica*, quoted, 105, 107-108, 114
- Engels, Frederick, 4, 9-10, 30-31, 33, 101, 156, 178, 227
- England, proposed alliance with Russia, 108
- Ephialtes, 191
- Ernst, Morris L., footnote, 95; 97
- Essenes, 15, 213
- Ethical Socialism, 61, 181
- Exodus, Book of, quoted, 111

- Expropriation, and Communism, 12-16
 Ezekiel, Mordecai, 95, 206
- Farley, Jim, 4, 206
 Fascism, 61, 85; in Mexico, 107; and the Jew, 117, 119; and Mussolini, 146-147, 180, 198-199
 FCC, 85-86, 129
 FDIC, 129
 FEAPW, 129
 Feinsilver, Rabbi Alexander, quoted, 99
 Feinstone, M. C., footnote, 95
 Feis, Herbert, 96
 Fellowship of Faiths, 67
 FERA, 129
 FPMC, 129
 FHA, 12, 129, 187
 FHLBB, 129
 FITCB, 129
 Finland, Jewish population, 122
 Fireside chats, 1, 36, 174
 Fiske, Jim, 89, 148
 Fitch, Clyde, and poker game, 83
 Flamm, Donald, 86
 Flandrau, Charles, 163
 Florida, population of, 48-49; ship canal, 61-62; 114, 241
 Flynn, John T., 78, 213-214
Folklore of Capitalism, The, 79, 236-241
 Football, results of commercialization, 19
 Ford, Henry, 33, 78, 121, 214-215, 219
Fortune, 74; analysis of Jewish problem, 112-113; discussion of taxation, 138-139
 Fox, Abraham M., 95
 France, proposed alliance with Russia, 108
 France of Louis XVI and America of F. D. R. compared, 24
 Frank, Jerome, 95; footnote, 182; 206, 243
 Frank, Waldo, discussed, 116; as Jewish intellectual, 183-184
 Frankfurter, Prof. Felix, 95, 102, 110, 206, 212, 240
 Franklin, Benjamin, 126
 Franklin, Jay, 199
 Franklin, Rabbi Leo M., 121
 Free assembly, 70
 Free speech, 70
 Freed, Simon, footnote, 74
 French Revolution, 21-24; 108, 152
 Freud, Sigmund, 156
 FSLIC, 129
 FSRC, 95
Future of Liberty, The, 79, 242-246
- Gallipolis, Ohio, 41
 Gallup, George H., 41
 Garbo, Greta, 206
 Garner, John, and negro housing, 49; 219
 Gasset, Ortega y, quoted, 14, 25, 62, 65, 144; footnote, 146; quoted, 201, 210, 221
 Gay, John, quoted, 46
Genealogy of Morals, quoted, 100
 General Jewish Workers' Union, 113
 Genghis Kahn, 186
 Germany, proposed alliance against, 108; and martyrdom of Jews in, 120; and expulsion of Jews from, 121
 Gide, André, quoted, 15
 Girdler, Tom, 182, 219
 Gladstone, William E., quoted, 25; 211
 Glass, Carter, and Supreme Court *coup*, 136; 219
 Gold, Ben, footnote, 94
 Goldenweiser, E. A., 96
 Goldman, Albert, 96
 Goldman, Emma, 113
 Goldwyn, Samuel, 111
 Gompers, Samuel, 59-60, 63
 "Good Neighbor Policy," 150-151, 232
 Goodrich, James P., 248
 Gottschalk, Louis, footnote, 74
 Gould, Jay, 89, 148
 CPU, referred to, 118; also see footnote
 Graham, Frank S., 2
 "Grants in Aid," 43-44
 Gray, Herman A., 97
Great American Fortunes, referred to, 31, 79, 148
 Great Britain, offer of Jewish home, 121
 Greeks, compared with Jews, Armenians and Parsees, 112
 Green, William, 23, 219
 Greenbackers, 27
 Greenberg, Harry, footnote, 95
 Guffey, Joseph F., referred to, 38, 82, 111, 142, 189, 240
 Guggenheim, foundation referred to, 63
 Gumberg, Alex, referred to, 102-103
 Gump, Andy, 215
- Hagenah, William J., footnote, 182-183
 Hague, Frank, 65, 95
 Haldeman-Julius, E., footnote, 28; insolence discussed, 117; definition of "Liberal," 209-210

- Harding, Warren G., *laissez faire* character of administration, 30; 38, 42, 48, 213
- Hardy, Elmer, 14
- Harrison, Benjamin, 48
- Harrison, Pat, 199
- Harvard University, and Communism, 71; and Granville Hicks, 76-77; and Morris L. Ernst, footnote, 95; and Charles E. Wyzanski, 96; 184, 206; and Heywood Broun, 245-246
- Harvey, Stephen, quoted, 163
- Harwood, E. C., quoted, 75
- Havel, Hippolyte, quoted, 112-113
- Haymarket riot, 113
- Hays, Will H., 182, 248
- Hearst, William Randolph, 43, 79, 140
- Hebrew, suppression of, 107
- Heep, Uriah, and New Deal, 144
- Heine, Heinrich, 101
- Hell Bent for Election*, 116
- Hellenic civilization, destruction of by Jews, 111
- Henderson, Leon, 182, 243
- Hendrick, Burton J., on Jews and revolution, 108
- Herod, 137
- Hess, Moses, 101
- Hibben, Paxton, 205
- Hicks, Granville, quoted and discussed, 76-78
- Hillman, Sidney, footnote, 95
- Hines, Jimmy, 240
- Hitler, Adolph, 2, 4-5, 23, 60, 92, 95, 97; footnote, 112; 120, 126, 139, 151, 154-155, 161, 180, 239
- Hoffmann, William S., footnote, 74
- Hogan, Frank T., and Father Coughlin, 105-106
- HOLC, 12, 129
- Holding Company Act, 95; footnote, 182-183
- Hollander, Louis, footnote, 95
- Hollywood, and Jimmie Roosevelt, 111, 182
- Homestead strike, 113
- Hoople, Major, 2
- Hoover, Herbert C., and depression, 30; referred to, 39-42, 48, 59, 74, 89, 128, 131-132, 147; and our foreign policy, 156-157; 170, 197, 213, 244
- Hopkins, Harry, 25, 139, 205, 240
- Housing, and New Deal, 12, 15-16; and Communism, 12-15
- Howard, Roy, 199, 246
- Hughes, Charles Evan, 8
- Hull, Cordell, 151, 169, 232
- Hungary, Communism in, 105
- "Huns and Vandals" of New Deal, 11; referred to by Lord Macaulay, 47, 51; footnote, 77; 155
- Hutchins, Robert M., quoted and discussed, 74-76
- Hutton, Barbara, 63
- Huxley, Thomas H., quoted, 54
- "I-am-the-law," discussed, 65
- I Like America*, 76-79
- Ickes, Harold, 36-37, 79, 139; discussed, 143, 187, 205, 240
- Imperialism*, and Lenin, 9-15
- Indiana University, and McNutt, Paul V., 174
- Indianapolis, 19, 83
- Inflation, Jones Family in waiting, 127
- Ingalls, John J., quoted, 171
- Initiative and referendum, 62
- Insull, Samuel, 135
- Investment bankers, swindles promoted, 50
- Irish Free State, Jewish population, 122
- Israel, part in revolution, 113-114
- Italy, proposed alliance against, 108
- Ivan the Terrible, 215
- Jackson, Robert H., 206
- Jacobin Clubs, and Two Per Cent Club, 23-24
- Jacobson, Morris L., 96
- James, Jesse, 187
- Japan, proposed alliance against, 108; 138, 142, 151, 165, 168
- Japanese loan, 103
- Jefferson, Thomas, quoted, 88; note to George III, of July 4, 1776, 129; 139-140, 205
- Jeffersonville, Indiana, 82-83
- Jerusalem, destruction of, 121
- Jesus of Nazareth, 54, 92, 102, 239
- "Jew baiter" and "Red baiter," 123
- Jewish economists, 91
- Jewish Encyclopedia*, quoted, 101
- Jewish Year Book, American, Communism and Nazism*, 107
- Jews, and the New Deal, 93-124; and Communism, 99; and revolution, 104-124; and French Revolution, 108; and Reign of Terror, 108; and Bolshevik Revolution, 107; and fear of persecution, 108; and distinction between Sephardic and Eastern, 108; and in smaller cities distinguished, 108-109; and C.I.O., 109; and influence on Occidental peoples, 109; and failure of assimilation, 109-110; and Marxian philosophy, 110; and de-

- Jews, and the New Deal (*Continued*)**
struction of Hellenic civilization, 111; and "Renaissance" in Spain, 111; and "manipulations," 112; and radicalism, analyzed by *Fortune*, 112-113
- Jews, number in Russia, 1914, 107;**
and antithetical roles of, 116; and attitude towards Germany and Russia, 117; and social equality, 119-120; and refusal of home in East Africa, 121; and settlement in cities, 121; and as men of business, 122; and ideals of versus American ideals, 123-124; and Black appointment, 188
- Jews, and social equality, 119-120, 183-185, 233, 235**
- Joffe, 106
- Johnson, Andrew, 197
- Johnson, Hugh, 80
- Johnson, Samuel, 78; quoted, 211
- "Jones" family, and Roosevelts, 125-133
- Jones, J. Edward, and Kennedy, J. P., 204-205
- Jones, Jesse, 89
- Jordan, Dr. Virgil, footnote, 90
- Josephson, Matthew, 79
- Judaism, and Communism, 107; Communism, and "Democracy" on common front, 109; entrenchment in seats of power, 233-234; concept of Roosevelt, 239
- Judaism, identical with Communism, "Democracy," "Liberalism" and Socialism, 2-3, 16, 101, 110, 112-113, 117, 148, 232
- Juvenal, quoted, 134
- Kaganovitch, Lazarus, 118; Lazarus, Machail, Julius, Andrie, Baruch M., Sergie M., and Marie, footnote, 118
- Kameneff, footnote, 102
- Kamkoff, 106
- Kansas City, election frauds, 50
- Karelin, 106
- Karpf, Maurice, quoted, 115
- Kastein, Joseph, quoted, 98-100, 110-111, 116, 121
- Katz, Hymie, as race-track tipster, 111
- Kautskyites, 9
- Kelly-Nash machine, 240
- Kennedy, Joseph P., 204
- Kent, Frank R., 198
- Kerensky, 103-104
- Kharasch, Morris S., footnote, 74
- xxx, applied to Judge Hugo Black, 7, 129
- Kleitman, Nathaniel, footnote, 74
- Knickerbocker Broadcasting Company, 86
- Knox, Frank, 219
- Knudsen, W. P., footnote, 77, 239
- Koch, Lucien, footnote, 94
- Kohn, Hans, quoted, 211 (also see footnote, 211); 238
- Korzybski, Alfred, footnote, 176
- Krueger, Ivar, 87
- Ku Klux Klan, compared to Jacobin Clubs, 23-24; referred to, 41; effect on politics, 48; 134, 137; in Indiana, 171-172; 192, 214-215
- Kuhn, Fritz, 220
- Kun, Bela, alias Aron Cohn, 105
- Labor Racket, in high gear, 54-63
- Labor racketeers, and Harvard accent, 57
- Laderman, Isidor, footnote, 94
- LaFollette family, 87, 176, 210, 212-213, 215, 234, 240
- LaFollette, Robert M., Sr., 87
- LaGuardia, Fiorello H., blood tradition, 19; municipal commissar, 22; 114, 117, 132, 220
- Lamont, Corliss, 205
- Landon, Alfred M., 170
- Lasser, David, 59, 93-94
- Lawrence, David, 198-199
- Lawrence, T. E., quoted, 123-124
- League of Nations, 150
- Lehman, Herbert H., pays off Roosevelt deficit, 41; and candidate for fourth term, 117
- Leiserson, William M., 96
- Lenin, Nikolai, 4, 9-16, 30-31, 33, 72-73, 99; and Bela Kun, 105; 106-107, 117; quoted, 156, 161, 178; "more democracy," 190-191, 227; 244
- Levi, Edward H., footnote, 74
- Levin, Abraham, and resolution against Communism, 104
- Levin, Jack, 97
- Lewis, James Hamilton, 203
- Lewis, John L., 23, 36, 49, 54, 58-62, 82; and alien and Jewish Communists, 93; in Pennsylvania politics, 111; 131, 142, 162, 177, 206, 226, 230, 239-240, 246
- "Liberalism," identical with "Democracy," Communism, Socialism, Judaism as taught by Marx, 2-3, 16, 101, 110, 112-113, 117, 148, 232
- "Liberals," 208-215, 227
- Lilienthal, David E., 95; manipulations of, 111; 181, 182, 206, 212
- Lincoln, Abraham, and Gettysburg address, 140

- Lippmann, Walter, 52, 140-141, 157-158, 198-199, 239
 Lipshitz, "Lippy," 111
Little Blue Books, 117
 Little Red Riding Hood, 2
 Litvinoff, 118, 158, 233
 Lockhart, R. H. Bruce, 102, 104; quoted, 106
 Loeb, Harold, 96, 244
 Long, Huey, 48, 145, 146
 Louis xv, referred to, 24-25
 Louis xvi, of France, 7, 177, 244
 Louisville, Kentucky, 83
 Lubin, Isador, 243
 Ludwig, Emil, quoted, 114
 Lundberg, Ferdinand, 79
 Lutsky, 106
 Lynch, Bernard W., footnote, 182-183
 Lyons, Eugene, and *The American Mercury*, footnote, 112
 Lysander, 226
 McCarthy, Charlie, 187, 215
 McKesson & Robbins, 241
 McKinley, William, assassination of, 113; and "manifest destiny," 128; referred to, 129
 McNinch, Frank R., 105
 McNutt, Paul V., and Two Per Cent Club, 23-24, 240; palace in Manila, 142; regimentation of Hoosier state, 171-174; and disasters of 1938 election, 189; 204, 206
 Macaulay, Lord, quoted, 11; referred to, 33; forecasts New Deal, 46-53; 155
 Machiavelli, 135
 Madagascar, proposed homeland for Jews, footnote, 122
 Madison, James, 140
 Manufacturers, National Association of, 51-52
 Manville, Tommy, 63
 Marat, 4, 7, 139, 244
 Markle, Chester, 239
 Markleville, Indiana, 12, 14
 Marshall, John, 8
 Martin, Everett Dean, quoted, 19-20, 60, 159
 "Martyrdom" of schoolmasters, 67
 Marx, Karl, 4, 9-10, 16, 30-31, 33, 49, 62, 70; footnote, 77, 94, 100-101; and Roosevelt, Franklin D., 101-102; and Jewish philosophy, 110; and American politics, 110; and Jewish background of Talmudic dialectics, 112-113; 116, 119, 124, 156, 178, 227-230, 239
 Matanuska Valley, 222
 Matthews, J. B., 93, 228-229
 Maurois, André, quoted, 15
 Mayflower Descendants, inspired with patriotism by Walter Winchell, 111-112
 Medici, Lorenzino, 168
 Memphis, Tennessee, 49
 Mencken, H. L., 106; footnote, 112; quoted from introduction to *Anti-christ*, 120; quoted from *Treatise on the Gods*, 121; footnote, 176; autopsy on Roosevelt 1, 247-248
 Merchant marine, and New Deal, 175-176
 Mercy, Count, Austrian ambassador to France, quoted, 24
 Merejkowski, quoted, 216
 Merriam, Charles E., 74
 Mexico, and Communism of Indians, 15; Communism and Fascism, 107; Jewish population, 122; and the New Deal, 163-170
 Mezhrayantsi, and Bolsheviks, footnote, 102
 Michelson, Charles, footnote, 42
 Michelson, Clarina, footnote, 94
 Michelson, Max, footnote, 94
 "Middletown" (Muncie, Indiana) and Jewish vote, 99
 Millay, Edna St. Vincent, 205
 Miller, Abraham, footnote, 95
 Minton, Sherman, 172, 187, 194-195, 203-204
 Molotoff, Viacheslav, quoted, 119
 "Monopolistic capitalism," 13
 "Monopoly," and New Deal, 9-15, 30-34, 71-73, 228
 Monterey, Mexico, footnote, 165
 Moon Mullins, 215
 Mooney-Billings Committee, 67
 Mooney case, and Frankfurter, Prof. Felix, 102
 Morals, of New Deal, and War, 6; generally, 50; discussed, 134-148
 More abundant life, 26-27, 57, 192
 Morgan, Dr. Arthur E., 4, 95, 111
 Morgan, J. P., 179, 214
 Morgenthau, Henry, Jr., 95, 135, 158, 206, 233
 Morgenthau, Henry, Sr., quoted, 25; referred to, 74
 Morones, 166-167
 Morris, Robert, 108
 Moscow, seat of Bolshevik government, 106; referred to, 119; and Governor Murphy, 181
 Moseley, General George Van Horn, 238
 Moses, 120
 Mosewitsky, Mose, footnote, 94
 Mother Means, quoted, 142

- Mundelein, George William, Cardinal, 106, 188
 Munich accord, 137, 180
 Munitions, and New Deal, 47, 151-152
 Murphy, Frank, 88, 142, 180, 181, 206, 239
 Musica, Philip (alias F. Donald Coster), 87, 241
 Mussolini, Benito, 2, 5, 22, 71, 92, 95, 97, 126; and Fascism, 146-147; 151, 155, 161, 206
 Myers, A. H., 96
 Myers, Gustavus, 79
- NA, 129
 Napoleon, referred to by Lord Macaulay, 47; 155; discussed, 161-162
Nation, The, 4; quoted, 10; footnote, 95; 180, 213-214; quoted, 243
 National Bituminous Coal Commission, *The*, 81-83, 206
 National Housing Conference, 97
 National Labor Relations Board, 8, 85, 96, 129, 206
 National Mediation Board, 96
 Nazis, 107, 119, 120, 180
 NEC, 129
 Negroes, 3; and New Deal housing, 12-13; balance of power, 19; population, 25-26; 28, 45, 47; and Communism, 110; 139, 144, 177
 Nerlove, Samuel H., footnote, 74
 Nero, 186-187
 New Albany, Indiana, 82-83
 New Deal, and Social Progress, 1-17; and background, 18-34, 35-44; forecast by Lord Macaulay, 46-53; and Labor racket, 54-63; and "universal" education, 64-79; and chaos in business and industry, 80-92; and the Jew, 93-124; and the "Jones" family, 125-133; and morals of period, 134-148; and Mrs. Roosevelt, 149-158; and dictatorship, 159-162; and Mexican corridor, 163-170; and present phases, 171-184; and its future, 186-201; and hints at liquidation, 202-215; and final liquidation, 216-226; and its epilogue, 227-235; and its pamphleteers, 236-241, 242-246; and Roosevelt, the First, 247-248; and housing, 12; and the Courts, 136-137; and tax laws, 138, 141-142; and Uriah Heep, 144; and cash for elections, 175-176; and merchant marine, 176; career analogous to that of Richard Whitney, 192-195; compared to Square Deal, 207-208
 "New Life," promised by Lenin, 13
- "New Life" and "more abundant life" compared, 15, 192, 228
New Masses, The, 4
New Republic, The, 4, 49, 70, 180, 213-214, 242
 New York Stock Exchange, 127
New York Times, The, 2, 10, 15-16, 20; quoted, 74; 104, 132, 168, 192
 New York University, 97
 Newman, Rabbi Louis I., quoted, 98
 Nicholas II, abdication as Czar, footnote, 102; 103
 Nietzsche, Frederick W., and Superman, 61; quoted, 99; quoted and discussed, 100; 120; quoted, 202
 Nock, Albert Jay, footnote, 112
 Norris, George W., 212, 234
 North Carolina, University of, 1
 Northwestern University, 97
 NRA, 12, 80, 86, 96, 129
 NRB, 74
 NRC, 129
 NYA, 129
- O'Brien, John Lord, footnote, 182
 Ochs, Adolph S., 113
 O'Connor, John J., 199
 Odum, Floyd B., 103, 182
 Ogburn, William F., 74
 "Old Kentucky," 83
 "Onward Christian Soldiers," 1
Opinion, "a Journal of Jewish Life and Letters," quoted, 99
 Oregon, University of, 97
 Orozco, 166
 Oxford Movement, and Otomi Indian, 136
 Oyster Bay, 1
- Palestine, Jewish population, 121
 Parsees, compared with Jews, Greeks and Armenians, 112; want of friction in Bombay, 122; also, see footnote, 122
 Passamaquoddy, 61, 114, 139, 241
 Patterson, Eleanor, 203
 PCCA, 129
 Pendergast, Tom, 240
 Pennsylvania, and Boss Guffey, 82
 Penrose, Boies, 41-42, 179
 Pericles, 175, 191
 Perkins, George W., 248
 Perkins, Madame, 22, 59, 96, 206
 Perlman, Jacob, 96
 Petrograd, Jewish bankers in, 104
 Petroleum Labor Policy Board, 97
 Phaedrus, quoted, 7
 Pinchot, Amos, and "reorganization" of government, 173-174
 "Planned economy," 12

- Platforms, of political parties, described, 40
- Plato, referred to, 70
- Plutarch, quoted, 175, 191, 225-226
- Polakov, Walter, 96, 244
- Poland, Jewish influences on, footnote, 121
- Political bosses, 48-49
- Politicians, described, 39-45
- Pollock, Channing, footnote, 112; discussed, 116
- Pompey, 175
- Pontius Pilate, 97
- Pope, Alexander, quoted, 148
- Populists, 27, 87
- Post Office Department, and deficits, 44-45; and rural free mail delivery, 45
- Potash, Irving, 94
- Potofsky, J. S., footnote, 95
- Powys, John Cowper, quoted, 184; 205
- Pressman, Lee, footnote, 94
- Princeton University, and Communism, 71, 96, 184, 246
- Prohibition, 48, 140, 144, 155, 156, 173, 192
- Proportional representation, 62
- Ptolemy, 175
- Pump priming, and New Deal, 25, 175, 198
- PWA, 95, 175, 238-239
- RA, footnote, 94, 129
- Rabelais, quoted, 139
- Racial prejudice, discussed, 105, 123-124
- Racial vigor, of Jews, 109
- Radek, Karl, footnote, 102; pamphleteer of Bolshevism, 106
- Radin, Paul, quoted, 233-234
- Radio, and propaganda, 44
- Railroads, and "monopoly" investigation, 10; government-dictated consolidation, 57; plight from regulation, 87-88
- Rakovsky, footnote, 102
- REA, 97, 129
- "Reconstruction of Society," 14-15
- "Red baiter," and "Jew baiter," 123, 148
- Redfield, Robert, quoted, 19
- Reed College, 97
- Reed, John, 209
- Regimentation, and New Deal, 30; and mendicancy, 74; and coal business, 81-83; and labor, 84; and farmers, 84; and unemployed, 85; and railroads, 85; and industry, 85; and FCC, 85-86; and investment
- Regimentation (*Continued*)
- bankers, 86-87; in Rome, Berlin and Washington, 84
- Rehoboam, and New Deal, 115
- Reign of Terror, 5, 7, 22-23, 108
- Religious prejudice, discussed, 105, 123-124
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 76-77
- "Reorganization," and U. S. Constitution, 6; and lawyers, 37; and Congress, 130
- Republicans, and southern apportionment, 26
- Revolution, and Jews, 106-124; resisted by some, 108; discussed by *Fortune*, 112-113
- RFC, 129
- RFGMC, 129
- Richmond, Virginia, 49
- Rivera, Diego, 163-164, 166
- Robber Barons, The*, 79, 148
- Roberts, Kenneth, footnote, 112
- Robespierre, 4, 7, 18, 22, 139, 152, 156-157, 167; and his "New Deal," 177; 244
- Robins, Raymond, quoted, 102, 205
- Roca, Blas (Francisco Caldero), 16
- Rockefeller, John D., 63, 76
- Roman Empire, 47, 54, 99
- Roosevelt, Eleanor, "Diary," 36-37; referred to, 41, 43, 88; in insurance business, 126; adds the feminine touch, 149-158, 167, 169, 187, 207
- Roosevelt, Elliott, 41, 169, 207
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., address of Sept. 17, 1937, 2-8, 207; and Constitution, 2-8; and war, 6; and lawyers, 4; and TVA, 4; and "Democracy," 4; and "reorganization" of Federal Government, 6; compared to French adventurers of 1789, 25; as new Messiah of masses, 27; Socialistic sweep of administration; and regimentation, 30; and Roosevelt I, 33; popularity with masses, 41; dynastic ambitions, 43; and "contumacy," 34; high cost of, 47; and John L. Lewis, 58-62; "quarantine" speech, 56; and Cicero, 62; as "believer in capitalist system," 2, 101-102; compared to Solomon, 114-115; fondness for "Jones family," 125-133; ethics and morals, 134-148; compared to Roosevelt I, 208; discussed, 231; articles of proposed impeachment, 222-225
- Roosevelt, James, as "Son Jimmie," 12, 22; and nepotism, 38; 41, 43; salary as member of Secretariat, 47;

- Roosevelt, James (*Continued*)
 88; and Hollywood, 111; 126, 127,
 130; and insurance, 182, 187, 207
 Roosevelt, John, 41, 207
 Roosevelt, Junior, 41, 207
 Roosevelt, Nicholas, quoted, foot-
 note, 207
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 1; and Franklin
 D., 33; 1904 victory, 48; quoted,
 102; and "third cup of coffee," 143;
 207; compared to Franklin D., 208;
 career discussed, 247-248
 Rose, Alex, footnote, 95
 Rosengoltz, A., 118
 Rousseau, 99-100
 Ruhle, Otto, quoted, 98, 101, 107-108
 Russia, and unhappiness of masses,
 15; proposed alliance with U.S.A.,
 108; official positions held by Jews,
 117-118; poetical musing of Waldo
 Frank, 183-185; Lenin charts the
 way, 190-191; fantastic opinions of
 George Soule, 243-244
 Russian Revolution, 103-110
 Saalkind, 106
 Sacco-Vanzetti National League, 67
 Sage, Russell, 63
 Saint-Etienne, Rabaud, quoted, 21-
 22, 152, 156-157
 Saint-Simon, quoted, 11-12
 Salomon, Haym, 108
 Santa Claus, 135
 Saposs, David J., 96
 Sasuly, Max, 96
 Satan, 135
Saturday Evening Post, The, foot-
 note, 72
 Scheer, Marcel, footnote, 94
 Schiff, Jacob H., 103
 Schneiderman, Rose, footnote, 95
 Schultz, Henry, footnote, 74
 Schwab, Charles M., 214
 Schwimmer, Rosika, 209
 Seagle, William, 97
 Securities and Exchange Commission,
 86-87; authorship, 95; 126, 129;
 footnote, 182-183
 Seltzer, L. H., 96
 Semantics, 176
 Semites, 109, 123, 124
 Senators, U. S., popular election, 48,
 62
Seven Pillars of Wisdom, quoted,
 123-124
 Shakespeare, William, quoted, 139,
 141, 153
 Siberia, 107
 Simpson, "Sockless Jerry," 27, 87
 Sims, Ernest M., brochure discussed,
 footnote, 29
 Sinclair, Upton, 195-196
 Siqueros, 166
 Sisson documents, 103
 "Sistie" and "Bustie," 41, 207
 Sit-Down-Strikes, 54, 71; and Jewish
 Communists, 109; 114, 161, 239,
 246
Sixty Families, referred to, 31, 79,
 148
 Slogans, in politics, 48, 231-232
 Smith College, 76
 Social Equality, and the Jew, 119-
 120, 183-185, 233, 235
 Social Justice, referred to, footnote,
 119
 "Social Progress," New Deal Model,
 1-17
 "Social Security," 36, 85; American
 Association for, 97; as a hoax, 135,
 139
 Socialism, and Socialists, 3-4, 15-16,
 30-34, 61, 180-181, 192; class strug-
 gle, 30-34; and catastrophe, 15
 Socialism, identical with "Democ-
 racy," "Liberalism," Communism,
 Judaism, 2-3, 16, 101, 110, 112-113,
 117, 148, 232
 Sokolnikov, 106
 Sokolsky, George, 198
 Solomon, and New Deal, 114-115
 Soule, George, 242-246
 South, character of politics, 49
 Soviet army, liquidation of, 119
 Spain, decline of and Jewish "Renaiss-
 sance," 111
 Spearmint, 215
 Spending to save, 25, 51, 170, 174,
 177-178, 192-194, 200
 Spengler, Oswald, 14, 15; quoted, 18;
 discussed, 61; footnote, 94; quoted,
 98-99; opinion discussed, 109;
 effect of Jews on Western civiliza-
 tion, III; quoted, 122, 150, 152, 178-
 179, 186, 196, 202-203
 Spinoza, 120
 ss2, 129
 St. Louis, 62, 104
 Stalin, Joseph, 2, 4-5, 22, 60, 71, 95;
 footnote, 112; 116-118, 120, 126,
 154-155, 191, 209, 239, 244
 Standard Gas and Electric Company,
 182-183
 State Department, American, 103-104
State and Revolution, The, by Niko-
 lai Lenin, reviewed, 9-15
 Stavisky, Serge, 87
 Steffens, Lincoln, 205
 Steinhardt, Laurence A., 233
 Stevens, Thaddeus, 26
Still Hell Bent, 116
 Stimson, Henry L., 157

- Stoddard, Lothrop, quoted, footnote, 121
- Stokowski, 205-206
- Strachey, John, quoted, 2; 16
- Suffrage, enfranchisement of women, 25-26; and relief contingent, 28; women's, 48; universal, 62; cause of national distress, footnote, 90; operates to destroy the state, 191
- Supreme Court, United States, 5-6; as a rubber stamp, 8; 85; appointment of Frankfurter, Prof. Felix, 102; 131; control of, 136, 160-162, 187, 240
- Sverdloff, 106
- s.w.o.c., footnote, 94
- Swift, Harold, 205
- Tacitus, quoted, 98-100
- Taft, Lorado, 205
- Taft, William H., 1908 victory, 48; 197, 215
- Talmud, background for Marxism, 112-113
- Tammany, 155, 189, 240
- Technology, and Capitalism, 32-34
- Tepoztlan, 166
- Tepoztlan, a Mexican Village*, quoted, 19
- Textbooks, changes of, 78
- Thaw, Harry, 63
- This Troubled World*, and Mrs. Roosevelt, 149 et seq.
- Thomas, Norman, 246
- Thompson, Dorothy, quoted, 52; and Coughlin, Charles E., 85-86; 105, 198, 239
- Thucydides, 175
- Tiberius, Emperor, referred to, 19
- Tiffany, Raymond, quoted, 192
- Titus, destroyer of Jerusalem, 121
- Toledano, 166
- Tolstoy, Count Leo, quoted, 48, 186
- Trade unions, and French Revolution, 23
- "Transition" and Communism, 13, 16, 228, 243, 245
- Treatise on the Gods*, 121
- Trotsky, Leon, 16; sketch of (footnote) and discussed, 102-104
- Tucker, Ray, 198
- Tugwell, Rexford G., quoted, 16; referred to, 22; 36, 49, 167, 214
- TVA, 3-4, 12, 36, 61, 95, 111, 129, 139; discussed, 143; 178; footnote, 182; 200, 212-213, 229
- Uliznow, Vladimir Ilyitch (Nikolai Lenin), 13
- United Mine Workers, 60
- United Press*, footnote, 112
- United States, proposed alliance with Russia, 108; Jewish population, 122
- Universal Education, 29, 62, 64-79; and citizenship, 64, 69; and Marxism in schools, 70-71; and pedagogues in New Deal, 73-74, 195; footnote, 90; 220
- Uritzky, 106
- USIS, 129
- USMC, 129
- Van Nuys, Frederick, 171-172
- Viner, Jacob, 74
- Vocational education, 61-62
- Volodarsky, 106
- Wages and hours, 54-55; policy of Samuel Gompers, 59-61; 230
- Wagner Act, and Hutchins, Robert M., 75
- Walker, DeLoss, 84
- Wallace, Henry A., 84, 95, 205
- War, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, 6, 43, 56, 137, 168-169, 199, 231
- Warburg, James P., and New Deal, 111, 116, 234
- Watson, James E., quoted, 145; candidate, 171, 172
- Weiner, Norbet, 200
- Weinstone, William, instigator of sit-down strikes, 109
- Western Culture, 18, 33; and Jewish Culture, 109-110; end of, 248
- Whitney, Richard, 20, 87, 141, 175; career compared to New Deal, 192-195
- Williams College, and Communism, 184
- Willkie, Wendell, 181-182
- Wilson, Woodrow, first "Internationalist," 42; 1912 victory, 48; 151, 197
- Winchell, Walter, 12-14; fervor for "Democracy" and refugees, 111-112; footnote, 112
- Windfall, Indiana, 14
- Wirt, William A., 230
- Wirth, Louis, footnote, 74
- Wise, Rabbi Stephen S., 104
- Wolf, Benedict, 96
- Wolfe, Bertram, quoted, 167
- Women's Rebellion, footnote, 28
- Workers' Alliance, 93, 132, 226
- World War, footnote, 90-92; influence of Marxism since, 100-101; emancipation of Jews, 107; 113
- Wortis, R. D., footnote, 95
- WPA, 4; footnote, 28; 33; footnote, 94; and Communism, 110; 129, 132, 139, 174, 187, 200, 228, 238-239
- Wulfson, Theresa, footnote, 95
- Wyzanski, Charles E., 96

Yagoda, Heinrich, 118	Zane, John M., quoted, 166
Yale University, and Communism,	"Zeke," quoted, 237-238
71, 184	Zinovieff, footnote, 102
Yarmolinsky, Avrahm, quoted, 113	Zionism, 113
Yaroslavsky, Emilian, alias Gobel-	Zionists, 107, 121
man, 118	