

# The REVOLUTION WAS

by GARET GARRETT

## Part 1 (The Revolution Was & Problem One)

Copyright 1944, by The Caxton Printers, Ltd., printed with permission by THE CAXTON PRINTERS, Ltd, Caldwell, Idaho (sgipson@caxton printers.com)

*The Florida Forum Editor's Note: From time to time we hear people say that a revolution is coming. This small booklet says that it has already happened and tells us how. This publication was required reading as this Editor attended college, and while it is over 50 years old, its information is timeless. It explains the details of how America went from a Constitutional Republic to a Socialist state, transferring the real power from the citizen to the government. It is powerful, and deserves careful attention. It will appear in serial form. We thank Caxton Printers, Ltd. for their permission to reprint this. Dr. Shirley Correll, Editor*

### Contents

(Page numbers appearing in the original publication have been omitted so as not to be confusing in this publication. All other printing appear exactly as originally published.)

#### THE REVOLUTION WAS

PROBLEM ONE - To Capture the Seat of Government

PROBLEM TWO - To Seize Economic Power

PROBLEM THREE - To Mobilize by Propaganda the Forces of Hatred

PROBLEM FOUR - To Reconcile and Attach to the Revolution the Two Great Classes, Etc.

PROBLEM FIVE - What to Do with Business—Whether to Liquidate or Shackle It

PROBLEM SIX - The Domestication of the Individual

PROBLEM SEVEN - To Reduce All Rival Forms of Authority

PROBLEM EIGHT - To Sustain Popular Faith in a Spiral Increase of the Public Debt

PROBLEM NINE - To Make Government the Great Capitalist and Enterpriser

CONCLUSION

### The Revolution Was

There are those who still think they are holding the pass against a revolution that may be coming up the road. But they are gazing in the wrong direction. The revolution is behind them. It went by in the Night of Depression, singing songs to freedom.

There are those who have never ceased to say very earnestly, "Something is going to happen to the American form of government if we don't watch out." These were the innocent disarmers. Their trust was in words. They had forgotten their Aristotle. More than 2,000 years ago he wrote of what can happen within the form, when "one thing takes the place of another, so that the ancient laws will remain, while the power will be in the hands of those who have brought about revolution in the state."

Worse outwitted were those who kept trying to make sense of the New Deal from the point of view of all that was implicit in the American scheme, charging it therefore with contradiction, fallacy, economic ignorance, and general incompetence to govern.

But it could not be so embarrassed and all that line was wasted, because, in the first place, it never intended to make that kind of sense, and secondly, it took off from nothing that was implicit in the American scheme.

It took off from a revolutionary base. The design was European. Regarded from the point of view of revolutionary technic it made perfect sense. Its meaning was revolutionary and it had no other. For what it meant to do it was from the beginning consistent in principle, resourceful, intelligent, masterly in workmanship, and -made not one mistake.

The test came in the first one hundred days.

No matter how carefully a revolution may have been planned there is bound to be a crucial time. That comes when the actual seizure of power is taking place. In this case certain steps were necessary. They were difficult and daring steps. But more than that, they had to be taken in a certain sequence, with forethought and precision of timing. One out of place might have been fatal. What happened was that one followed another in exactly the right order, not one out of time or out of place.

**"The test came in the first one hundred days. No matter how carefully a revolution may have been planned there is bound to be a crucial time. That comes when the actual seizure of power is taking place. In this case certain steps were necessary."**

Having passed this crisis, the New Deal went on from one problem to another, taking them in the proper order, according to revolutionary technic; and if the handling of one was inconsistent with the handling of another,

even to the point of nullity, that was blunder in reverse. The effect was to keep people excited about one

thing at a time, and divided, while steadily through all the uproar of outrage and confusion a certain end, held constantly in view, was pursued by main intention.

The end held constantly in view was power.

In a revolutionary situation mistakes and failures are not what they seem. They are scaffolding. Error is not repealed. It is compounded by a longer law, by more decrees and regulations, by further extensions of the administrative hand. As the Lord said in *The Green Pasture*, that when you have passed a miracle you have to pass another one to take care of it, so it was with the New Deal. Every miracle it passed, whether it went right or wrong, had one result. Executive power over the social and economic life of the nation was increased. Draw a curve to represent the rise of executive power and look there for the mistakes. You will not find them. The curve is consistent.

At the end of the first year, in his annual message to the Congress, January 4, 1934, President Roosevelt said: "It is to the eternal credit of the American people that this tremendous readjustment of our national life is being accomplished peacefully."

Peacefully if possible—of course.

But the revolutionary historian will go much further. Writing at some distance in time he will be much less impressed by the fact that it was peacefully accomplished than by the marvelous technic of bringing it to pass not only within the form but within the word, so that people were all the while fixed in the delusion that they were talking about the same things because they were using the same words. Opposite and violently hostile ideas were represented by the same word signs. This was the American people's first experience with dialectic according to Marx and Lenin.

Until it was too late few understood one like Julius C. Smith, of the American Bar Association, saying: "Is there any labor leader, any businessman, any lawyer or any other citizen of America so blind that he cannot see that this country is drifting at an accelerating pace into

administrative absolutism similar to that which prevailed in the governments of antiquity, the governments of the Middle Ages, and in the great totalitarian governments of today? Make no mistake about it. Even as Mussolini and Hitler rose to absolute power under the forms of law,....so may administrative absolutism be fastened upon this country within the Constitution and within the forms of law."

For a significant illustration of what has happened to

words—of the double meaning that inhabits them—put in contrast what the New Deal means when it speaks of preserving the American system of free private enterprise and what American business means when it speaks of defending it. To the New Deal these words—*the American system of free private enterprise*—stand for a conquered province. To the businessman the same words stand for a world that is in danger and may have to be defended.

The New Deal is right.

Business is wrong.

You do not defend a world that is already lost. When was it lost? That you cannot say precisely. It is a point for the revolutionary historian to ponder. We know only that it was surrendered peacefully, without a struggle, almost unawares. There was no day, no hour, no celebration of the event—and yet definitely, the ultimate power of initiative did pass from the hands of private enterprise to government.

There it is and there it will remain until, if ever, it shall be reconquered. Certainly government will never surrender it without a struggle.

To the revolutionary mind the American vista must have been almost as incredible as Genghis Khan's first view of China—so rich, so soft, so unaware.

No politically adult people could ever have been so little conscious of revolution. There was here no revolutionary tradition, as in Europe, but in place of it the strongest tradition of subject government that had ever been evolved—that is, government subject to the will of the people, not *its* people but *the* people. Why should anyone

**"The end held constantly in view was power."**

**"Is there any labor leader, any businessman, any lawyer or any other citizen of America so blind that he cannot see that this country is drifting at an accelerating pace into administrative absolutism similar to that which prevailed in the governments of antiquity, the governments of the Middle Ages, and in the great totalitarian governments of today? Make no mistake about it. Even as Mussolini and Hitler rose to absolute power under the forms of law,....so may administrative absolutism be fastened upon this country within the Constitution and within the forms of law."**

Julius C. Smith, of the American Bar Association

fear government?

In the naïve American mind the word revolution had never grown up. The meaning of it had not changed since horse-and-buggy days, when Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "Revolutions are not made by men in spectacles." It called up scenes from Carlyle and Victor Hugo, or it meant killing the Czar with a bomb, as he may have deserved for oppressing his people.

Definitely, it meant the overthrow of government by force; and nothing like that could happen here. We had passed a law against it.

Well, certainly nothing like that was going to happen here. That it probably could not happen, and that everybody was so sure it couldn't, made everything easier for what did happen.

Revolution in the modern case is no longer an uncouth business. The ancient demagogic art, like every other art, has, as we say, advanced. It has become in fact a science—the science of political dynamics. And your scientific revolutionary in spectacles regards force in a cold, impartial manner. It may or may not be necessary. If not, so much the better; to employ it wantonly, or for the love of it, when it is not necessary, is vulgar, unintelligent and wasteful. Destruction is not the aim. The more you destroy the less there is to take over. Always the single end in view is a transfer of power.

Outside of the Communist Party and its aurora of radical intellectuals few Americans seemed to know that revolution had become a department of knowledge, with a philosophy and a doctorate of its own, a language, a great body of experimental data, schools of method, textbooks, and manuals—and this was revolution regarded not as an act of heroic redress in a particular situation, but revolution as a means to power in the abstract case.

There was a prodigious literature of revolutionary thought concealed only by the respectability of its dress. Americans generally associated dangerous doctrine with bad printing, rude grammar, and stealthy distribution. Here was revolutionary doctrine in well printed and well written books, alongside of best sellers at your bookstore or in competition with detectives on your news-dealer's counter. As such it was all probably harmless, or it was about something that could happen in Europe, not here. A little communism on the newsstand like that might be good for us, in fact, regarded as a twinge of pain in a robust, somewhat reckless social body. One ought to read it, perhaps, just to know. But one had tried, and what dreary stuff it had turned out to be!

To the revolutionary this same dreary stuff was the

most exciting reading in the world. It was knowledge that gave him a sense of power. One who mastered the subject to the point of excellence could be fairly sure of a livelihood by teaching and writing, that is, by imparting it to others, and meanwhile dream of passing at a single leap from this mean obscurity to the prestige of one who assists in the manipulation of great happenings; while one

who mastered it to the point of genius—that one might dream of becoming himself the next Lenin.

A society so largely founded on material success and the rewards of individualism in a sys-

tem of free competitive enterprise would be liable to underestimate both the intellectual content of the revolutionary thesis and the quality of the revolutionary mind that was evolving in a disaffected and envious academic world. At any rate, this society did, and from the revolutionary point of view that was one of the peculiar felicities of the American opportunity. The revolutionary mind that did at length evolve was one of really superior intelligence, clothed with academic dignity, always sure of itself, supercilious and at ease in all circumstances. To entertain it became fashionable. You might encounter it anywhere, and nowhere more amusingly than at a banker's dinner table discussing the banker's trade in a manner sometimes very embarrassing to the banker. Which of these brilliant young men in spectacles was of the cult and which was of the cabal—if there was a cabal—one never knew. Indeed, it was possible that they were not sure of it among themselves, a time having come when some were only playing with the thought of extremes while others were in deadly earnest, all making the same sounds. This was the beginning of mask and guise.

The scientific study of revolution included of course analysis of opportunity. First and always the master of revolutionary technic is an opportunist. He must know opportunity when he sees it in the becoming; he must know how to stalk it, how to let it ripen, how to adapt his means to the realities. The basic ingredients of opportunity are few; nearly always it is how they are mixed that matters. But the one indispensable ingredient is economic distress, and if there is enough of that the mixture will take care of itself.

The Great Depression as it developed here was such an opportunity as might have been made to order. The economic distress was relative, which is to say that at the worst of it living in this country was better than living almost anywhere else in the world. The pain, never-

theless, was very acute; and much worse than any actual hurt was a nameless fear, a kind of active despair, that assumed the proportions of a national psychosis.

Seizures of that kind were not unknown in American history. Indeed, they were characteristic of the American temperament. But never before had there been one so hard and never before had there been the danger that a revolutionary elite would be waiting to take advantage of it.

This revolutionary elite was nothing you could define as a party. It had no name, no habitat, no rigid line. The only party was the Communist Party, and it was included; but its attack was too obvious and its proletarianism too crude, and moreover, it was under the stigma of not belonging. Nobody could say that about the elite above. It did belong, it was eminently respectable, and it knew the American scene. What it represented was a quantity of bitter intellectual radicalism infiltrated from the top downward as a doctorhood of profes-

sors, writers, critics, analysts, advisers, administrators, directors of research, and so on—a prepared revolutionary intelligence in spectacles. There was no plan to begin with. But there was a shibboleth that united them all: "Capitalism is finished." There was one idea in which all differences could be resolved, namely, the idea of a transfer of power. For that a united front; after that, anything. And the wine of communion was a passion to play upon history with a scientific revolutionary technic.

The prestige of the elite was natural for many reasons; but it rested also upon one practical consideration. When the opportunity came a Gracchus would be needed. The elite could produce one. And that was something the Communist Party could not hope to do.

Now given—

- (1) the opportunity,
- (2) a country whose fabulous wealth was in the modern forms—dynamic, functional, non-portable,
- (3) a people so politically naïve as to have passed a law against any attempt to overthrow their government

by force—and,

(4) the intention to bring about what Aristotle called a revolution in the state, within the frame of existing law—

Then from the point of view of scientific revolutionary technic what would the problems be?

They set themselves down in sequence as follows:

The *first*, naturally, would be to capture the seat of government.

The *second* would be to seize economic power.

The *third* would be to mobilize by propaganda the forces of hatred.

The *fourth* would be to reconcile and then attach to the revolution the two great classes whose adherence is indispensable but whose interests are economically antagonistic, namely, the industrial wage earners and the farmers, called in Europe workers and peasants.

The *fifth* would be what to do with business—whether to liquidate or shackle it.

(These five would have a certain imperative

order in time and require immediate decisions because they belong to the program of conquest. That would not be the end. What would then ensue? A program of consolidation. Under that head the problems continue.)

The *sixth* in Burckhardt's devastating phrase, would be "the domestication of individuality"—by any means that would make the individual more dependent upon government.

The *seventh* would be the systematic reduction of all forms of rival authority.

The *eighth* would be to sustain popular faith in an unlimited public debt, for if that faith should break the government would be unable to borrow, if it could not borrow it could not spend, and the revolution must be able to borrow and spend the wealth of the rich or else it will be bankrupt.

The *ninth* would be to make the government itself the great capitalist and enterpriser, so that the ultimate power in initiative would pass from the hands of private enterprise to the all-powerful state.

**"This revolutionary elite was nothing you could define as a party. It had no name, no habitat, no rigid line. The only party was the Communist Party, and it was included; but its attack was too obvious and its proletarianism too crude, and moreover, it was under the stigma of not belonging. Nobody could say that about the elite above. It did belong, it was eminently respectable, and it knew the American scene. What it represented was a quantity of bitter intellectual radicalism infiltrated from the top downward as a doctorhood of professors, writers, critics, analysts, advisers, administrators, directors of research, and so on—a prepared revolutionary intelligence in spectacles."**

Each one of these problems would have two sides, one the obverse and one the reverse, like a coin. One side only would represent the revolutionary intention. The other side in each case would represent Recovery—and that was the side the New Deal constantly held up to view. Nearly everything it did was in the name of Recovery. But in no case was it true that for the ends of economic recovery alone one solution or one course and one only was feasible. In each case there was an alternative and therefore a choice to make.

What we shall see is that in every case the choice was one that could not fail:

(a) To ramify the authority and power of executive government—its power, that is, to rule by decrees and rules and regulations of its own making;

(b) To strengthen its hold upon the economic life of the nation;

(c) To extend its power over the individual;

(d) To degrade the parliamentary principle;

(e) To impair the great American tradition of an independent, Constitutional judicial power;

(f) To weaken all other powers—the power of private enterprise, the power of private finance, the power of state and local government.

(g) To exalt the leader principle.

There was endless controversy as to whether the acts of the New Deal did actually move recovery or retard it, and nothing final could ever come of that bitter debate because it is forever impossible to prove what might have happened in place of what did. But a positive result is obtained if you ask:

Where was the New Deal going?

The answer to that question is too obvious to be debated. Every choice it made, whether it was one that moved recovery or not, was a choice unerringly true to the essential design of totalitarian government, never of

course called by that name either here or anywhere else.

How it worked, how the decisions were made, and how acts that were inconsistent from one point of view were consistent indeed from the other—that now is the matter to be explored, *seriatim*.

## PROBLEM ONE

### To Capture the Seat of Government

There was here no choice of means. The use of force was not to be considered. Therefore, it had to be done by ballot. That being the case, and the factor of political discontent running very high, the single imperative was not to alarm the people.

Senator Taft says that in the presidential campaign of 1932 “the New Deal was hidden behind a program of economy and state rights.”

That is true. Nevertheless, a New Dealer might say: “How could we tell the people what we were going to do when we ourselves did not know?” And that also may be true—that they did

not know what they were going to do.

Lenin, the greatest theorist of them all, did not know what he was going to do after he had got the power. He made up plans as he went along, changed them if they did not work, even reversed them, but always of course in a manner consistent with his basic revolutionary thesis. And so it was with Hitler, who did it by ballot, and with Mussolini, who did it by force.

There was probably no blue print of the New Deal, nor even a clear drawing. Such things as the AAA and the Blue Eagle were expedient inventions. What was concealed from the people was a general revolutionary intention—the intention, that is, to bring about revolution in the state, within the form of law. This becomes clear when you set down what it was the people thought they were voting for in contrast with what they got. They thought they were voting:

**“The *third* would be to mobilize by propaganda the forces of hatred.”**

**“The *fifth* would be what to do with business—whether to liquidate or shackle it.”**

**“The *sixth* in Burckhardt’s devastating phrase, would be ‘the domestication of individuality’—by any means that would make the individual more dependent upon government.”**

**“The *seventh* would be the systematic reduction of all forms of rival authority.”**

**“The *eighth* would be to sustain popular faith in an unlimited public debt, for if that faith should break the government would be unable to borrow, if it could not borrow it could not spend, and the revolution must be able to borrow and spend the wealth of the rich or else it will be bankrupt.”**

For less government, not more;

For an end of deficit spending by government, not deficit spending raised to the plane of a social principle, and,

For sound money, not as the New Deal afterward defined it, but as everybody then understood it, including Senator Glass, formerly Secretary of the Treasury, who wrote the money plank in the Democratic Party platform and during the campaign earnestly denounced as akin to treason any suggestion that the New Deal was going to do what it did forthwith proceed to do, over his dramatic protest.

The first three planks of the Democratic Party platform read as follows:

"We advocate:

"1. An immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 per cent in the cost of Federal government.....

"2. Maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced.....

"3. A sound currency to be maintained at all hazards."

Mr. Roosevelt pledged himself to be bound by this platform as no President had ever before been bound by a party document. All during the campaign he supported it with words that could not possibly be misunderstood. He said:

"I accuse the present Administration (Hoover's) of being the greatest spending Administration in peace time in all American history one which piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs or reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer..... We are spending altogether too much money for government services which are neither practical nor necessary. In addition to this, we are attempting too many functions and we need a simplification of what the Federal government is giving to the people."

This he said many times.

Few of the great majority that voted in November, 1932, for less Federal government and fewer Federal func-

tions could have imagined that by the middle of the next year the extensions of government and the multiplication of its functions would have been such as to create serious administrative confusion in Washington, which the President, according to his own words, dealt with in the following manner:

**"This becomes clear when you set down what it was the people thought they were voting for in contrast with what they got. They thought they were voting:**

**For less government, not more;**

**For an end of deficit spending by government, not deficit spending raised to the plane of a social principle, and,**

**For sound money, not as the New Deal afterward defined it, but as everybody then understood it,..."**

"On July eleventh I constituted the Executive Council for the simple reason that so many new agencies having been created, a weekly meeting with the members of the Cabinet in joint session was imperative. Mr. Frank C. Walker was appointed as Executive Secretary of the Council."

Fewer still could have believed that if such a thing did happen it would be more than temporary, for the duration of the emergency only; and yet within a year after Mr. Roosevelt had pledged himself, if elected, to make a 25 per cent cut in Federal government by "eliminating functions" and by

"abolishing many boards and commissions," he was writing, in a book entitled *On Our Way*, the following:

"In spite of the necessary complexity of the group of organizations whose abbreviated titles have caused some amusement, and through what has seemed to some a mere reaching out for centralized power by the Federal government, there has run a very definite, deep and permanent objective."

Few of the majority that voted in November, 1932, for an end of deficit spending and a balanced Federal budget could have believed that the President's second budget message to Congress would shock the financial reason of the country, or that in that same book, *On Our Way*, he would be writing about it in a blithesome manner, saying:

"The next day, I transmitted the Annual Budget Message to the Congress. It is, of course, filled with figures and accompanied by a huge volume containing in detail all of the proposed appropriations for running the government during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, and ending June 30, 1935. Although the facts of previous appropriations had all been made public, the country, and I think most of the Congress, did not fully realize the huge sums which would be expended by the government this year and next year; nor did they realize the great amount the Treasury would have to borrow."

See **REVOLUTION** page 25.



## What Terrorists did for the United States.

THEOPHILUS

The Heavens Declare It!



### REVOLUTION from page 8

And certainly almost no one who voted in November, 1932, for a sound gold standard money according to the Glass money plank in the platform could have believed that less than a year later, in a radio address reviewing the extraordinary monetary acts of the New Deal, the President would be saying: "We are thus continuing to move toward a managed currency."

The broken party platform, as an object, had a curious end. Instead of floating away and out of sight as a proper party platform should, it kept coming back with the tide. Once it came so close that the President had to notice it. Then all he did was to turn it over, campaign side down, with the words: "I was able, conscientiously, to give full assent to this platform and to develop its purposes in campaign speeches. A campaign, however, is apt to partake so much of the character of a debate and the discussion of indi-

## Did You Know.....

"Kenneth Mead, inspector general of the Department of Transportation, testified in Congress last week that 80% or more of the security screeners at Dulles International Airport in nearby northern Virginia are not U.S. Citizens.... The hijacked American Airlines flight that smashed into the Pentagon September 11 originated at Dulles.... At a September 20 hearing, when asked the citizenship status of the screeners at Dulles, Mead said that 'a substantial percentage of them are not U.S. citizens'.... 'What percent?' asked Rep. Harold Rogers (R-Ky).... 'I think it is about 80%. It may be somewhat more,' said Mead...." (*Human Events*, October 1, 2001) This is especially disturbing to Americans who face loss of jobs and lower pay to see that not only are there jobs going to foreigners, but now our airline safety is in the hands of those with no loyalty to our country.

There is little doubt now that America needs a vast overhaul of our immigration policies. One terrorist expert has stated that it appears easier for a terrorist to enter our country than a refugee. Of special interest is a law sponsored by Ted Kennedy which mandates affirmative action for Libya, Iraq, Sudan and Syria. According to *Human Events* (10/01/01) "The U.S. State Department runs a quota system designed to encourage immigration from all seven countries on the department's own terrorist list." Perhaps while we are overhauling our immigration laws, we might overhaul our Congress.

vidual points that the deeper and more permanent philosophy of the whole plan (where one exists) is often lost."

At that the platform sank.

And so the first problem was solved. The seat of government was captured by ballot, according to law.

(To be continued.)

**"And certainly almost no one who voted in November, 1932, for a sound gold standard money according to the Glass money plank in the platform could have believed that less than a year later, in a radio address reviewing the extraordinary monetary acts of the New Deal, the President would be saying: 'We are thus continuing to move toward a managed currency.'"**

**Florida Forum**  
Editor's Note: My parents---who believed in limited federal government---were so swayed by Roosevelt's charisma and media propaganda, named my younger brother Franklin Delano. This act shows the power of persuasive propaganda when people can respect those

who rob them of self government, and whose actions are exactly the opposite of those desired by the populace.

Dr. Shirley Correll, Editor