

THE MARVIN LECTURES



Issued by
The Educational Committee
of the
American Coalition

INTRODUCTION

* * * * *

This series of lectures was prepared by Mr. Fred R. Marvin and originally delivered to a group of New York City women under the auspices of Mrs. Finley J. Shepard, at the Army and Navy Club during the winter of 1929-30; later to a group of men under the auspices of a local Chapter of the National Sojourners at the McAlpin Hotel. As each lecture was printed in mimeograph form, the series was supplied to a number of citizens residing in different parts of the United States.

As members of both groups urged a system be devised to extend the information therein contained, The American Coalition established an Educational Committee with Mrs. Finley J. Shepard, of New York City, Chairman, and Judge Josiah A. Van Orsdel, Associate Justice District Court of Appeals, Washington, D. C., Vice-Chairman. To the original number of twelve lectures, three have been added. All have been revised and brought up to date by Mr. Marvin and then submitted, for correction and approval, to the members of the Editorial Board of this Committee.

These lectures—or lessons, since they are now being put out in a correspondence form through Study Clubs—are designed to expose the economic, social and political fallacies of Socialism which are commonly designated under a variety of names such as “Communism,” “Liberalism,” “Internationalism,” “Pacifism,” “Atheism,” etc. These lectures do not pretend to exhaustively cover the subject but instead are designed to furnish a basis for additional study and reading, or for quick reference for writers and speakers.

In presenting these lectures to Study Clubs, the Educational Committee of The American Coalition believes it is doing a service to every loyal American citizen, and it asks the hearty and whole-souled co-operation of all who join such clubs. The American people are sound and still intensely loyal. That they have been, and are being, deceived by alien agencies and forces there is no doubt. By knowledge only can we, as a people, destroy these agencies and forces. These lectures, we believe, will materially aid in making clear certain essential facts.

This Committee operates on the assumption that every person joining a Study Club and subscribing to these lectures, is animated by a spirit of national loyalty and patriotism as we understand and interpret those terms. The lectures are for the individual use of members in their efforts to develop in others the same spirit of national loyalty and patriotism which is the sole foundation of national safety. When so used citations may be made with or without credit but any persons obtaining possession of these lectures for any other purpose, and using them in pursuance of a different end than that for which they have been written, will be subject to all the penalties of the laws governing copyright.

Educational Committee:

Chairman, Mrs. Finley J. Shepard, New York City;

Vice Chairman, Hon. Josiah A. Van Orsdel, Associate Justice
District Court of Appeals, Washington, D. C.

Members Editorial Board:

Mrs. Frank D. Callan, State President (New York) United
States Daughters of 1812;

Major General Amos A. Fries, Past National President, National Sojourners; President R. O. T. C. Association;

Mrs. Charles Haas, National Legislative Chairman, American War Mothers;

Mrs. Ada E. Harrison, Vice President, Ladies Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars of U. S.;

Kenaz Huffman, Past State Commander (Colorado), The American Legion;

Herman A. Miller, National Secretary, Patriotic Order Sons of America;

Judge John H. Noyes, Legislative Representative, Junior Order United American Mechanics;

Lt. Col. LeRoy F. Smith, Editor, Bulletin, Better America Federation of California;

Mrs. William Sherman Walker, Chairman National Defense Committee, Daughters of the American Revolution.

The following organizations affiliated with The American Coalition have representatives on the Educational Committee:

ALLIED PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES, INC.
AMERICAN DEFENSE SOCIETY, INC., THE
AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY
AMERICAN VIGILANT INTELLIGENCE FEDERATION
AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS
AMERICAN WOMEN'S LEGION
BERGEN COUNTY (N. J.) WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB
BETTER AMERICA FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA
DAMES OF THE LOYAL LEGION OF THE U. S.
DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA, NATIONAL COUNCIL
DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, NATIONAL SOCIETY
DAUGHTERS OF THE DEFENDERS OF THE REPUBLIC
DAUGHTERS OF THE REVOLUTION, NATIONAL SOCIETY
DAUGHTERS OF THE REVOLUTION, NEW JERSEY STATE SOCIETY
DAUGHTERS OF THE UNION, 1861-1865, NATIONAL SOCIETY
DAUGHTERS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR, 1861-1865
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR, THE
ENGLEWOOD (N. J.) WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB
GOVERNMENT CLUB, INC., THE
IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION ASSOCIATION (CHICAGO)
IMMIGRATION STUDY COMMISSION
JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS, NEW JERSEY

LADIES AUXILIARY, ORDER OF INDEPENDENT AMERICANS
LADIES AUXILIARY, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE U. S.
LADIES OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC
LEONIA (N. J.) WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB

MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WAR
MILITARY SOCIETY WAR OF 1812

NATIONAL IMMIGRATION LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
NATIONAL PATRIOTIC ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL PATRIOTIC COUNCIL
NATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN
NATIONAL SOJOURNERS
NATIONAL WOMAN'S RELIEF CORPS, THE
NAVAL AND MILITARY ORDER OF THE SPANISH AMERICAN WAR, THE NATIONAL COMMANDERY
NEW YORK CHAPTER NO. 86, NATIONAL SOJOURNERS
NEW YORK CITY COLONY, SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN

ORDER OF INDEPENDENT AMERICANS, INC., STATE COUNCIL OF PENNSYLVANIA

PATRIOTIC BUILDERS OF AMERICA, INC., NATIONAL SOCIETY
PATRIOTIC ORDER OF AMERICANS, NATIONAL CAMP
PATRIOTIC ORDER SONS OF AMERICA, NATIONAL CAMP
PATRIOTIC WOMEN OF AMERICA, NATIONAL SOCIETY

R. O. T. C. ASSOCIATION OF THE U. S.

SERVICE STAR LEGION, INC.
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, NATIONAL SOCIETY
SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF LIBERTY, NATIONAL COUNCIL
SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF THE PILGRIMS, NATIONAL SOCIETY

UNION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN, SANGAMON COUNTY, ILL.
UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY, NEW YORK CHAPTER
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION, INC.
UNITED STATES DAUGHTERS OF 1812, NATIONAL SOCIETY

VETERAN CORPS OF ARTILLERY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE U. S. (AMERICANIZATION COMMITTEE)

WESTCHESTER SECURITY LEAGUE
WOMEN DESCENDANTS OF THE ANCIENT AND HONORABLE ARTILLERY COMPANY, NATIONAL SOCIETY

THE EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE
OF
THE AMERICAN COALITION

Room 1203, 120 West 42nd Street

New York, N. Y.

Copyright 1930

LECTURE No. 1

SOCIALISM THE GERM—WHY NOT UNDERSTOOD

One naturally approaches a series of lectures or lessons such as that in which we are about to engage with considerable hesitation. Strangely enough in the preparation of such a course there is no precedent to guide. You, as listeners, and I assuming, whether rightfully or not, the position of instructor, are pioneers in a field which nearly every one thinks has been thoroughly developed.

We hear and we talk a great deal about radicalism, Socialism, Communism, bolshevism, un-Americanism, liberalism, pacifism, internationalism, alienism and other isms. But when, for the purpose of study, we come to analyze them, no matter what may be the name applied, we find we are dealing, in the final analysis, solely with the questions of government and economics, questions so closely related that as a matter of fact we treat them as one.

To say we are to study government seems simple enough. Since government is a study in high schools, colleges and universities, and since many of you took that course when in school, to go into it now may seem a bit absurd. However, it is not as absurd as it appears on the face of things. So far as I know, save in a rather casual manner, no educational institution undertakes to present a course which fully analyzes two antagonistic forms of government. Most students upon their graduation have a rather vague idea of our form of government and an equally dim concept of a form that is exactly its opposite. That is all.

In our study, we will deal primarily with two forms of government and we are talking about *forms* only, mind you, not management or methods of management. We are dealing with these two *forms* because, unless we appreciate their position in the picture in which radicalism, Socialism, Communism and all allied isms play so prominent a part, we can not understand the aims of those following these isms, or the reason why we suffer because of them.

One of the forms to be considered is called a Capitalist government. That is the form concerning which we know considerable, the one under which we live and enjoy security; the form so generally accepted that it seems fixed and permanent. The other is the Socialist form, technically called a cooperative commonwealth, the form that gives rise to all our isms, and which is now being tried in Russia. The fundamental difference between these two forms and the occasion for all the trouble, is the *private property right*. The Capitalism form sustains and defends that right as it is given to the individual. The Socialist form denies the private property right and the establishment of a Socialist form of government is urged in order to destroy that right. All other differences are merely superstructures on this one foundation.

The world has been cursed by many physical plagues. The "black death", smallpox, diphtheria, etc., have swept millions of persons into untimely graves. But as soon as men and women, after extensive study, located and ascertained the nature of the germs that caused these afflictions, means were found to destroy them and the diseases that existed because of them. Today, plagues of this type which once devastated great areas, are mere memories.

For every effect there is a cause and every effect partakes of the qualities of the cause. We are experiencing certain effects manifested in unrest, distrust, class hatred and a pronounced revolutionary spirit; in organized movements to advance atheism, to destroy the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism, to instill a spirit of contempt in the minds of the rising generation for our institutions and our ideals, to destroy all forms of national defense and to prevent the enactment of any laws that will curb the influx of undesirable foreigners, or secure the deportation of such persons should they succeed in entering.

There are those who insist, and with great zeal, that these manifestations are the aftermath of the World War. No doubt some who so urge are sincere in their belief but their conclusion is not sustained by facts. The manifestations or effects I have mentioned are not the direct result of the World War. The World War merely produced a fertile mental soil in which the true germ could breed. These effects are caused by a germ of quite another kind, one which the world must understand before the effects, the diseases of the body politic can be cured.

This germ is found in certain theories concerning government and economics. The name we commonly give to it is Socialism, but remember all the time that Socialism means far more than a theory held by certain individuals who call themselves Socialists. The word Socialism, as we shall use it, covers also Communism, bolshevism, radicalism, often "liberalism" and "internationalism". Sometimes it includes pacifism and all other isms which predicate the overthrow of our form of government with its institutions, including the private property right, in order that a wholly different form of government, one which sets up different institutions and denies the private property right, may be established.

Although we go more fully into this phase of the subject later, a brief statement here as to just what Socialism and Communism are may be in order. The fundamentals of the theory advanced by those termed Socialists and of that espoused by those termed Communists, are the same. In other words, *Socialism and Communism are identical insofar as theory is concerned*. The difference comes in methods to attain the ends sought, which at all times, remember, is the overthrow of our form of government with its institutions including the private property right. Those called Socialists adopt what is technically termed "legislative (or parliamentary) action." Those called Communists adopt what is technically called "mass (or direct) action".

It is the purpose of these lectures to present the evidence, leaving each of you to draw your own conclusions. At times, naturally, we will indulge in comment and you should accept this as a jury accepts the summing up of an attorney. Our statements are not evidence. They will be made only for the purpose of introducing or clarifying the evidence. We have no thought of dealing exhaustively with the questions involved in this course. All we are seeking to do is to present certain fundamental facts and lay a ground-work that will enable each of you to pursue the study with understanding. We are here to gather and analyze evidence.

It may be somewhat difficult for me to make clear to you just what the Capitalist *form* of government, now operating in the United States, and the Socialist *form* of government, now operating in Russia, mean to us as individuals. We have so long enjoyed the one, and know so little about the other, that the gravity of the situation, possibly, is not appreciated. We are dealing with a mental germ.

One can not see it, hear it, taste it, smell it or touch it. It can not be isolated, as our medical friends say. Therefore, it does not appear to exist.

Again, in going into the nature and extent of this germ we call Socialism, we find so much misunderstanding as to just what Socialism means, what it is and what it proposes to do, that when one presents it stripped of the gaudy clothes in which it is usually dressed, each of its exponents exclaims, "Oh, that is not the kind of Socialism I stand for."

Now, there is just one kind of Socialism, notwithstanding the fact that its followers have interpreted the theory in a hundred different ways. Primarily and fundamentally the object of Socialism—which is also the object of Communism—is to destroy the private property right. Marx, in his "Communist Manifesto," the bible of all who accept Socialism or Communism, was particularly emphatic upon this point. He says ("Communist Manifesto," Rand School edition, page 30), " * * * The theory of Communism may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of the private property right." And again (page 32-3), "You are horrified at our intending to do away with the private property right. * * * Precisely so; that is just what we intend."

Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw of London ("A Survey of Socialism," page 425) writes, "Socialism, in short, in all its protean forms, seems to me to be either a delusive snare or a devastating terror." The writer says that if he had been called a Socialist twenty years ago, he would not have felt "insulted." He adds: (page vi) "I have reluctantly but decidedly been compelled to come to the conclusion that its (Socialism's) diagnosis of the diseases of the body politic is so entirely wrong, and the remedies which it proposes so dangerously pernicious, that it is necessary to denounce it as a public peril."

This terse statement from one who has made an extensive study of the question and from whom we will quote many times, will strike you with force when you begin to discuss the subject with some one who is following the Socialist theory with utter lack of comprehension. The chances are nine out of ten that the person nursing this dangerous germ is not a Socialist at all but a plain idealist. The chances are ninety-nine in one hundred that this person, who probably wears the label of "liberalism," hasn't the slightest conception of the true purposes of Socialism.

Y. Guyot, a French writer, ("Socialist Fallacies" English Translation, 1910, page x) says that "as soon as you attempt a discussion with socialists, they tell you that the socialism which you are criticising is not the true one."

Dr. A. Schaffle, a German student of the subject for many years ("Quintessence of Socialism" English Translation 1908, page 1 and 2), insists that "not only those who oppose and scorn the gospel, but also even many of those who are believers in it, have themselves no true idea, often not even the most distant conception, of what it really is they fear or detest, that they despise or extol."

Now, if we are to get a fair understanding of this germ called Socialism—this germ that breeds all that is contained in that which we commonly brand radicalism—it becomes necessary for us to make it the object of a rather complete study.

In this series of lectures I shall quote extensively from authoritative Socialist writers, that you may have these citations in front of you and give them the interpretation you consider proper. At the same time I shall quote from writers who do not favor Socialism, that you may have the benefit of the conclusions drawn by able students of this and other lands. I shall try not to quote that which is merely hearsay or circumstantial. What we want for our own edification are facts, not fancies or fiction.

Let us turn to Griffith's book "What Is Socialism?" Prof. Arthur Shadwell of London, who has given many years to a study of this germ more as an analyst than as an opponent, sums up the 260 definitions found in the book in this language: ("The Socialist Movement," Vol. I, Page xi.)

"Socialism is described by different writers as a religion, a faith, a philosophy of life, a theory of evolution, a step in evolution, an historical necessity, an economic necessity, a new conception of society, an attitude toward life, practical Christianity, the Kingdom of God on earth, an opportunity for self-expression, an economic system, an ethical code, a class struggle, a spirit, a theory of political action, a theory of society, the opposite of Individualism, a tendency, democracy applied to industry, the science of minding our own business, a body of economic, political and social doctrine and philosophy, a scientific theory, man's mind developed, a criticism, a feeling, an ethical-religious mass movement, a system of political organi-

zation, science wedded to art, common sense, a theory of national and municipal housekeeping, mankind functioning in the spiritual plane, a collective consciousness in humanity, the antithesis of Capitalism, the political and social faith of all sensible men—besides many other things.”

“Socialism,” writes Prof. Shadwell just before making the above summary of its many definitions, “springs from and expresses the most contrary primitive motives—love and hate, greed and sacrifice, envy and pity, pugnacity and peaceability. It wears the badge of the gentle emotions, but makes most appeal to the destructive ones.”

“What Is Socialism?”, edited by Dan Griffiths, printed by Grant Richards, Ltd., (London, 1924) is interesting because, it would appear, outside of a few well known leaders, the majority of those who furnished definitions, have little or no conception of the aims and purposes of the theory they advance. In this connection, attention is called to the fact that none of the standard dictionaries and encyclopedias gives a clear definition of the meaning of Socialism. Here are three definitions cited by Griffiths (Pages 96 and 97).

The Standard Dictionary: “Socialism: A theory of civil polity that aims to secure the reconstruction of society, increase of wealth, and a more equal distribution of the products of labour, through the public collective ownership of land and capital (as distinguished from property), and the public collective management of all industries.”*

Webster’s New International Dictionary: “Socialism: A political and economic theory of social reorganization, the essential feature of which is governmental control of economic activities, to the end that competition shall give way to co-operation, and that the opportunities of life and the rewards of labour shall be equitably apportioned.”

Worcester’s Dictionary: “Socialism: The science of reconstructing society on an entirely new basis, by substituting the principles of association for that of competition in every branch of human industry.”

The average American citizen in reading these three definitions is not unduly alarmed. Nothing therein contained, forcibly reminds him that ere the “reconstructed society” can be established *existing*

*The spelling of the original is followed in these citations.

society must be destroyed. You can not erect two buildings of wholly different construction on the same piece of land. If there is now a building standing the old one must be destroyed before the new one can be erected. Existing society sustains and maintains certain institutions among them being the private property right, the church and the home. Existing society also sustains and maintains certain fixed beliefs, such as national loyalty, patriotism, the moral code, etc. All these *must be destroyed* if we are to have a "reconstructed society" as proposed by the Socialists.

Regardless of their assurances that this proposed "reconstructed society" is going to remove human ills and bring about a "brotherhood of man" on earth, how do we know that will be the result? What evidence has been produced, or can be produced, to lead one even to infer that when existing society has been destroyed, and we have in its place a Socialist "reconstructed society," that "the opportunities of life and the reward of labour shall be equitably apportioned"? The theory of a Socialist "reconstructed society" has been applied now for more than thirteen years in Russia. Where are the splendid results?

The Labour Party of England, at the head of which is Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, defines Socialism as follows: (Griffiths, page 97) "Object: To secure for the producers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service."

To secure for all the people "the full fruits of their industry" is a laudable desire. But where is the evidence that by taking away from the individual the private property right the people are going to enjoy "the full fruits of their industry"?

The interesting definitions of Socialism found in Griffiths' compilation, however, are not those of well known leaders who have the knack of confusing the issue through the use of words, but the definitions of the idealists and altruists who buzz around the thorn of Socialism as the bee buzzes around the fragrant rose. Let me quote some of them:

"Socialism is a science and a religion." (Page 12.)

"To me, Socialism is the practical expression of Christ's teaching." (Page 13.) (Anyone knowing what Socialism is and conversant with the teachings of Jesus the Christ will have to hold that the person furnishing this definition was not acquainted with both.)

"Socialism: Light in the darkness of a depressed world; hope and opportunity for all peoples; economic wisdom, political salvation, religious practice." (Page 19.)

"Jesus of Nazareth defined its *ideal* * * * Karl Marx formulated its *economics* * * * Lenin was endeavouring to apply its politics. * * *" (Page 25.) The person who wrote this definition has "Rev." before his name.

"Socialism is the economic expression of the spiritual fact of fellowship." (Page 35.)

"Socialism will replace 'I am' with 'we are'." (Page 39.)

"Socialism is the practical expression of one of the essentials of Christianity, namely, the Brotherhood of Man." (Page 45.)

"Socialism substitutes order for chaos; liberty for despotism; tolerance for bigotry; cooperation for competition; administration of things for the government of men; peace for war." (Page 67.)

Vida D. Scudder ("Socialism and Character," page 104), "Socialism apparently desires to establish civilization on a basis never before approved by any religion, Occidental or Oriental—for it proposes to supplant love by justice." Earlier in the above book (page 5) she describes herself as a "class-conscious revolutionary Socialist" and says: "The word Socialism moreover glows to the writer not with the delicate rose-pink so pleasantly popular, but with a deep uncompromising red."

Having presented the definitions of Socialism by those who follow its creed, it may be well here to inject, for your edification, a few citations by students of the subject who oppose it.

A. Schaffle ("Quintessence of Socialism," English translation, page 20): "Let us repeat once again that the alpha and omega of Socialism is the transformation of private and competing capitals into a united collective capital." In other words, place all capital into one great trust and place the management of that trust in the hands of men who have not, by their energy, skill, ability, intelligence, etc., created that capital.

Prof. Ramsay Muir, ("The Socialist Case Examined," page 3) "Socialism is a chameleon-like creed. It changes its colour according to its environments. For the street-corner and the club-room it wears the flaming scarlet of class war; for the intellectuals its red is shot with tawny; for the sentimentalists it becomes a delicate rose-pink; and in clerical circles it assumes a virgin-white, just touched with a faint flush of generous aspiration."

J. S. Nicholson ("Revival of Marxism," page 139), "It is the immediate redistribution of the property of others that gives the driving force to revolutions of the Bolshevist type."

Prof. Richard T. Ely ("Outlines of Economics," page 608), "Socialism, at its best, is an abstract and vaguely defined ideal."

Prof. O. D. Skelton ("Socialism, a Critical Analysis," page 1), says that it is "impossible to label Socialism with the cheerful finality with which the scientist treats a palcolithic fossil," and that the term is further clouded by the tendency "of sundry well-meaning sentimentalists to adopt the label to denote their half-baked yearnings."

Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 59), "Socialist principle, then, demands the complete expropriation, without compensation, of all owners of land, whether large or small; and the total abolition of rent."

It is because of the contrary and antagonistic features of this germ of world unrest, distrust, class-hatred and a revolutionary spirit, that it is so little understood by those whose very lives depend upon a better understanding. While preaching love to win the support of the emotional, it practices hate to gain the support of those of an opposite nature. While urging sacrifices to attain its ends it intensifies greed. While expressing pity for those in misery or suffering from some economic or similar ill, it incites envy of all who are better situated. While holding aloft the banner of peace, it has declared war on every capitalist government and is urging a bloody revolution to attain its ends.

Another thing that causes a lack of understanding of this germ is that those who advocate the adoption of the theories expressed by Socialism, make it a practice to confuse issues by using words and terms which have little meaning to us, by giving a false inter-

pretation to words and terms, and by dealing in half truths or perverted truths. In reading Socialist literature words and expressions are encountered which convey little or no meaning to the average American. For that reason this literature fails to gain the attention of such persons. Not catching the true sense concealed in certain words and terms, the casual reader might go through several Socialist books and not understand just what the writer was advocating.

We hear much about the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The terms mean little to us. They are not in common use in this country. As a matter of fact we have no such classes as are indicated by these words. We possibly think of the proletariat as those who draw wages and the bourgeoisie as those who are in the employing group. The truth is, as the words are used, the proletariat comprises those who would do away with the private property right and destroy all that goes with it, while the bourgeoisie are those who believe in sustaining that right.

The literature of Socialism is filled with the word "revolution." Now most of us know what that word means, but the average person who calls himself a Socialist will say that it does not mean "revolution" as we interpret the word at all, but rather "evolution." Although insisting he wants to change society in an evolutionary, or orderly manner, he often talks in the language of the blood-thirsty highwayman. The constituents of the Communist wing of the Socialist movement frankly admit that they mean just what they say—that they are blood-thirsty. No wonder Prof. Shadwell is forced to the conclusion that while "it wears the badge of the gentle emotions, Socialism makes most appeal to the destructive ones."

When one touches on the destructive side of Socialism, its sponsors at once proceed to confuse the issue in order to cause the belief that they do not approve of violence. Bertrand Russell, the well known English Socialist who appears quite popular as a lecturer before American college groups, ("Proposed Roads to Freedom," page 32-3), writes:

"For every bomb manufactured by an anarchist, many millions are manufactured by governments, and for every man killed by anarchist violence, many millions are killed by the violence of states. We may, therefore, dismiss from our minds the whole question of violence, which plays so large a part in the popular imagination, since it is neither essential nor peculiar to those who adopt the anarchist position."

Rather strange reasoning! Certain acts of the government are necessary for the maintenance of order and the security of the people. The acts of the anarchist are designed to destroy the government and take from the people their protection. Mr. Russell's logic is

that a criminal for selfish individual reasons should be permitted to do that which organized society does for the common protection of the people.

The Socialist Party in 1912 amended its constitution to prohibit members from advocating sabotage. This section of the constitution was repealed by the 1917 convention, the convention that openly defied the government of the United States, and refused to give aid and support to this government in its conflict with the Central Powers. Various excuses for this action have been given by those who insist that the Socialist movement proposes to use only peaceful means to destroy our form of government. While this action may not be construed as openly approving sabotage, it is certain that members who believed in sabotage did not violate the constitution of their organization when they engaged in destructive methods. Again, the evidence is conclusive that sabotage in connection with the manufacture of war materials was materially increased.

When certain elements broke away from the united Socialist movement in 1919 and formed the Left Wing, now known as Communists, Morris Hillquit in the "New York Call" for May 21st, 1919 (cited Mereto's "The Red Conspiracy," page 40-1) among other things wrote:

"I am one of the last men in the party to ignore or misunderstand the sound revolutionary impulse which animates the rank and file of the new movement, * * * I am opposed to it, not because it is too radical but because it is essentially reactionary and non-Socialistic; not because it would lead us too far, but because it would lead us nowhere. * * * Let them separate, honestly, freely and without rancor. Let each side organize and work in its own way, and make such contribution to the Socialist movement in America as it can. Better a hundred times to have two numerically small Socialist organizations, each homogeneous and harmonious within itself, than to have one big party torn by dissensions and squabbles, * * *"

It would appear that Mr. Hillquit, who is for "peaceful" methods, does not seriously object to certain elements engaging in all the force and violence they want, even though he holds such actions will not attain the ends sought. Further, it should be noted from this quotation that Mr. Hillquit, a well known Socialist authority, admits that those who withdrew to become known as Communists are a part of "the Socialist movement in America."

There is something peculiar about the minds of those who have been inoculated with the germ of Socialism, something that makes it difficult indeed for one to meet their unique line of reasoning. They hold that whatever they do is perfectly proper; that whatever those who oppose them do is obviously improper.

For instance, it is an open declaration of the Communist wing of the Socialist movement that they propose to bring about the downfall of all capitalist governments by inciting civil wars and revolutions. They hold it is not only right but justifiable for them to adopt this means of attaining their ends. But when a capitalistic government arrests any of them for disturbing the peace, such action becomes a despicable thing and demonstrations are staged to denounce those who are responsible for it. According to their doctrine it is all right for Communists to beat into insensibility a man who opposes them, but it is all wrong for the police, when quelling a riot, to gently tap one of them on the head with a nightstick.

We see evidence of this "what I do is all right; what you do is all wrong" position on the part of those seeking the destruction of our government, every day. It is all right, for instance, for them to go upon the lecture platform or rush into print to denounce in as vigorous language as they dare those who oppose them, but it is all wrong for these opponents even to protest. It is all right for them to induce a strike and bring about rioting, but it is all wrong for the civil authorities to use the police to preserve order. It is all right for them to confuse issues, but it is all wrong should someone opposing them make the slightest error in a citation.

It is all right for them to establish their organized groups in the schools and colleges but it is all wrong for those opposing their theories to do the same thing. It is all right for them to bombard members of the Congress with their propaganda but it is all wrong for the followers of our present form of government to do so. It is all right for them to place men and women on the stand in connection with some hearing before a committee of the Congress but it is all wrong for their opponents so to do.

The Communist wing of the Socialist movement denounces in the most bitter terms every form of protection given the American people—the army, the navy, the air force, the militia, the constabulary, the police, the sheriffs, etc. At the same time they urge their followers to arm themselves, to engage in rioting and bloodshed in order to attain their ends.

While parading their abhorrence to war and engaging much time in demanding world peace and the disarmament of all capitalist nations, the Socialists frankly admit that it is their purpose to plunge the whole world into a bloody conflict if need be, in order that they may emerge in control of all countries just as they are now in control of Russia. The late humanitarian (?) Lenin held it dangerous to human rights for the capitalist class to defend itself and its property, but frankly admitted that "no Socialist unless he had lost his senses would dare to get up in an assembly and maintain that Socialism could be introduced by any other means than civil

war." Again, and in another place, ("The Proletarian Revolution," pages 93-4) this same agent of Socialism said, "Socialism is altogether opposed to violence against man; * * * no one has yet drawn the conclusion from this proposition that Socialism is opposed to revolutionary violence. * * * The same holds good about violence against nations. Every war implies violence against nations but that does not prevent the Socialists from being in favor of a revolutionary war."

All Socialists, whether called Socialists or whether called Communists, stand squarely on these utterances of Karl Marx, (quoted by Hearnshaw in "A Survey of Socialism," page 274) :

"We are ruthless and want no consideration from you. When our turn comes, revolutionary terrorism will not be sugar-coated. * * * There is but one way of simplifying; shortening, concentrating the hideous death agony of the old society, as well as the bloody labour of the new world's birth—viz., revolutionary terrorism."

The idealists, the so-called "respectable fronts," who make up the noisy element of the Socialist movement, will say that Marx did not mean what he said. The Communist elements hold he did mean it and cite their latter day saint, Lenin, to prove it. Lenin was a rather prolific writer of revolutionary documents and to attempt to quote anything like a fair percentage of his utterances along this line would require a good-sized book.

The questions of force and violence, acts of terrorism, civil wars and revolutionary activities will be taken up in their proper place and dealt with more fully.

Today we have a working illustration of this contradictory tendency of those who have been inoculated with the germ of Socialism. They are foremost in opposition to war. They are yelling with all their might for "peace pacts." They are demanding the disarmament of every nation except that of Russia. And yet they hold that an agreement with a capitalist government made by the Socialist government of Russia is not binding, and frankly confess that it is their purpose to disarm the capitalist governments and to arm the "workers" of the world in order to plunge every capitalist nation into a civil war.

Menjinsky, the head of Ogpu (the secret police of the Soviet government), the ruling power in Russia, according to M. J. Larsons in his book, "An Expert in the Service of the Soviet," quoted in a bulletin issued by the Economic League, London, October, 1929, said:

"As long as there are idiots to take our signatures seriously, and to put their trust in it, we must promise everything that is being asked, and as much as one likes, if we can get something tangible in exchange."

Another characteristic of those who have already become inoculated with the Socialist germ is that when it is pointed out that their theory is quite at variance with the facts, they will deny the facts. They hold, to illustrate a feature we will later take up in more detail, that all ills and evils are due to the existence of the private property right. When it is shown that they can present no evidence to sustain this position, they deny the obvious truth and shed crocodile tears because of the evils of capitalism.

They pretend to be the advance agents for the abolition of unemployment, misery, suffering, etc., but when their attention is called to the fact that the great majority of the people of all civilized nations are anxious to eradicate these evils, they insist that those ends can not be attained until their whole program is put into effect—that is, until capitalist governments have been abolished, the individual deprived of the property right, patriotism killed, inheritance prevented, religion throttled, and the moral code abrogated. Consistency is not one of the characteristics of those inoculated with the virus of Socialism.

While making great pretensions, so far as the public is concerned, that the whole purpose of Socialism is to elevate mankind and destroy existing ills, the fact remains that should we, under our present system of government and economics, attain all the Socialists profess they desire, still they would not be satisfied. As a matter of fact, it would seem, it is not so much the attainment of their expressed desires as the destruction of present society, in order that they may do a bit of experimenting, that interests them.

Harry W. Laidler, Ph.D., a well known Socialist writer and exponent, is the author of a book, "Socialism in Thought and Action." On page 37 he writes:

"Indeed most socialists contend that, even though poverty were entirely eliminated, under capitalism, even though each man and woman willing to work were assured of safe employment, of reasonable hours, of healthful surroundings, and of a wage which would permit him to supply his family with decent food, decent clothing and decent shelter; even though all employers were enlightened and adequate labor legislation passed and enforced; in fact, even though the workers no longer suffered any of the physical ills which capitalism now brings in its wake, *nevertheless the present system would be condemned* because of its disastrous reactions on the intellectual, the aesthetic and the ethical life of the masses." (Emphasis supplied.)

We interpret that this way: "Give us everything we ask in our platforms which the majority of those who follow our leadership believe are our true aims, and still we will not be satisfied. What we want, what we demand, is the complete destruction of the pres-

ent form of government, the present institutions and the existing economic system, in order that we may put into operation a theory of our own." Can good come from a movement that takes such a position?

The leaders of the Socialist movement insist in their campaign for control of the world that their desire is to save the poor "working" man from being exploited by the "master class." Yet when some one calls their attention to the fact that the poor "working" man does not appear to be anxious to accept their brand of salvation, and that the majority of those in command of the pious army of Socialists are not themselves of the so-called "working" class, but on the contrary pride themselves on being members of the "intelligentsia," they grow indignant and deny the obvious facts.

One of the strange characteristics of Socialism is that its idealistic leaders are those who, from practical experience, know nothing whatever about the problems of those whom they wish to save from "exploitation." Not only are the majority of the writers and lecturers on Socialism impractical persons, but few of them have been compelled to work a day at manual labor to attain the wherewithal to live. In what the Communist wing of the Socialist movement designated a "lesson in revolution," when they brought about strikes in Passaic, N. J., textile mills a few years ago, the leaders were largely college students, not workers in the mills.

The New York papers of November 11, 1929, carried stories of the arrest of a number for distributing literature on the streets without a permit, and obstructing traffic. Two calls for police reserves had to be put in, according to the printed reports, before enough officers arrived to break up the crowd and restore normal traffic.

The *Herald-Tribune* in its report begins its story thus:

"Seven divinity students, an economist, another academician, two girl law students, a woman lawyer and a union organizer were arrested at 6 o'clock last night," etc.

The "workers" whom these students were seeking to induce to leave their employment appeared not at all interested in the effort on the part of a group of "divinity" students to save them from "exploitation" under the capitalist system.

At the outset I stated that we are studying two *forms* of government—the Capitalist, which supports and defends the individual property right, and the Socialist, which refuses to support and defend such a right and which would take it from the individual. It is, as I have stated, the theory advanced by the Socialists and the Communists that is responsible for world unrest, distrust, class hatred and a pronounced revolutionary spirit; responsible for orga-

nized movements to advance atheism, to destroy the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism, to instill a spirit of contempt in the minds of the growing generation for our institutions and our ideals, to destroy all forms of national defense and to break down all immigration barriers and prevent deportation of undesirable aliens. Then, clearly, it becomes necessary for us to know more, not only about the germ which is attacking the body politic, but more about the strength and weakness of that body politic. Through understanding only can we take a firm and unassailable position for the support of our *form* of government.

As I previously stated, since no one in the past has undertaken a course of lectures, or lessons, quite along the line we propose we have no precedent to guide us and, therefore, will have to chart our own course as to order and method of taking up each feature of this study. Being neither a lecturer nor a teacher, I may not proceed in a proper sequential manner. However, in each lecture, I will undertake to bring out certain facts, all parts of the intricate mesh of what we call the radical web. I will repeat myself often. Impressions come from reiteration of facts. That which we may not grasp when presented in one way, or by one illustration, we may appreciate if it is offered in another way and through another illustration.

Keep in mind at all times that we are dealing with theories. We are not dealing with individuals who are presenting the theories even though, at times, we become exceedingly angry because of their activities, and grow indignant because of their utterances and acts. Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw in "A Survey of Socialism" (page 45) says these individuals are motivated by "the lure of loot." Most of us are forced to agree with him. He writes:

"No one can read the literature of socialism, or listen to the speeches which make the strongest popular appeal, without realizing that the effective forces behind the demand for the equalization of human conditions are the predatory passions of primitive barbarism—envy of those who are more prosperous, jealousy of those who are superior in character or ability, hatred of those who are in authority, fathomless malice and limitless uncharitableness."

That is what many of us would all like to say although, possibly, not able to command such perfect language for the expression of our feelings. At the same time, that is not going to change the situation. Battling manifestations is not productive of results. We must know the germ and then destroy it, for when that is done the manifestations automatically disappear and do not reappear in some other form. We are not interested in individuals nor in manifestations, but we *are* interested in the *theories* lying back of the manifestations. For theories that are accepted by individuals as correct will direct these individuals in their actions.

LECTURE No. 2

SOCIALISM AND THE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHT

In the first lecture we located the germ responsible for world unrest, distrust, class-hatred and the revolutionary spirit. To that germ we apply the name Socialism. Socialism, however, it must be remembered, appears under many names—Communism, bolshevism, "labour," in England, and often "liberalism" "pacifism," and "internationalism" in the United States. This is in keeping with the common system of those who are guiding Socialist propaganda to confuse the people and create false impressions. No matter whether the germ is called Socialism, Communism or something less offensive to the average citizen. The objectives are the same. These objectives are:

1. The abolition of governments (that is, capitalist governments that sustain personal liberty and equality of political rights);
2. The abolition of patriotism;
3. The abolition of the private property right;
4. The abolition of inheritance;
5. The abolition of religion; and,
6. The abolition of the family relation (that is, morality).

True, as we will later point out, those who call themselves Socialists go rather lightly on the last two of these objectives. Not so, however, those who call themselves Communists. Bernard Shaw says, "Communism is the same as Socialism, but better English." Well, Shaw ought to know. He is one of the leading Socialists writers of the day.

This matter of relationship between those who term themselves Socialists and those who term themselves Communists is of the utmost importance in studying the subject of all movements seeking to change our *form* of government and our institutions. In later lectures we will go into this relationship fully, but the connection is here stated to remind you that when we use the term Socialism we are including that which is called Communism.

To give an understanding of the reason why so few people know what Socialism really seeks to attain, in the initial lecture we called attention to some of the methods used to confuse issues in order to distract attention from the real points and center it upon something wholly apart from the main question, something which, because of its emotional appeal, would gain instant attention. In this connection one of the common practices of those guiding and directing the Socialist movement is to lay great stress on the claim that its sole purpose is to benefit mankind, remove ills and evils, advance the teachings of Jesus the Christ, establish a great "brotherhood of man," etc.

Since the germ we have located creates a mental disease that destroys the body politic, and since we all depend on the body politic—that is, our government—for all we possess or enjoy, it becomes the duty of every loyal citizen to know something of the nature and extent of this germ.

That the germ has found fertile mental soil in this country is not at all surprising when one stops to analyze the force and effect of the emotional appeals just mentioned. Writers and lecturers who, apparently, have never studied the subject and who seem to be obsessed with their own importance, are active propagandists for Socialism. No doubt many such persons are sincere and honest in their convictions. They probably believe that what they say is true. The question of their sincerity or their honesty, however, is not here involved. The issue is the correctness of their contentions. What evidence, one naturally asks, have they to support their claim that if we destroy our present form of government, destroy our institutions, including the church and the home, and do away with the private property right, the ills and evils to which they point with apparent glee will disappear? It is evidence we want, not unsustained claims.

Those who hold to the belief that the abolition of our form of government, our institutions and the private property right would result in returning man to barbarism, are certainly honest and sincere in their contentions. Any unprejudiced person will be forced to admit that those who take this position have plenty of evidence to sustain them.

Let us turn to the reports of two official bodies which gave much time and study to this question. In 1919, after taking testimony for several months and examining several hundred documents, to ascertain the nature and extent of forces and agen-

cies alleged to be presenting propaganda dangerous to our form of government, our institutions and our economic system, a subcommittee of the Judiciary of the Senate filed a report. It is commonly known as the Overman Report because Senator Lee S. Overman of North Carolina was chairman of the subcommittee. The full title of this report is "Brewing and Liquor Interests and German and Bolshevik Propaganda—Report and Hearing of the Subcommittee of the Judiciary, United States Senate, submitted pursuant to S. Res. 307 and 439, Sixty-Fifth Congress."

The testimony, documents and findings were printed in three large volumes of about 1,200 pages each. These volumes contain a vast amount of interesting and convincing material. One paragraph of the conclusions, however, is particularly striking in view of present day events. It follows (Page XLIX) :

"That the American people have been victimized and deceived by the activities of special interests and the subtle practices of designing individuals, some of them the agents and representatives of foreign governments through the use of organizations having dignified and respectable names, which completely disarm all suspicion of the ulterior purposes of those who inspired their organization. By the use of euphonest names given to supposedly patriotic, idealistic, and charitable organizations, patriotic and philanthropic citizens have been innocent victims of conniving representatives of foreign interests and governments and have been exploited by corrupt and dishonest elements. * * * "

About the same time the Legislature of the State of New York named a committee to engage in a similar inquiry. This is commonly known as the Lusk Committee and its findings as the Lusk Report because Senator Clayton R. Lusk was chairman. The complete official title of this report is "Revolutionary Radicalism. Its History, Purpose and Tactics, with an exposition and discussion of the steps being taken and required to curb it, being the Report of the Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities, Filed April 24, 1920, in the Senate of the State of New York."

The documents reviewed, the abstract of the testimony taken, and the conclusions of the committee, were printed in four large volumes of better than one thousand pages each. In the conclusions of the committee appears the following language:

"The same forces which promote civil strife in many of the countries of Europe are at work on this side of the ocean seeking to create a division in our population, stimulating class hatred and

a contempt for government, which, if continued, must necessarily result in serious consequences to the peace and prosperity of this country." (Page 7.) Evidence, certainly, is not lacking that it has been continued.

After giving the names of some of the organizations studied, which the Committee found were engaged in spreading foreign doctrines and theories, the report continues:

"A study of their platforms and official pronouncements shows that they do not differ fundamentally in their objectives. These objectives are: the establishment of the co-operative commonwealth in place of the present form of government in the United States; the overthrow of what they are pleased to call the capitalist system, namely, the present system under which we live, and the substitution in its place of collective ownership. * * * These organizations differ but slightly in the means advocated to bring about the social revolution." (Page 8.)

"The Socialist, Communist, and Anarchist movements in this country, as well as the industrial organizations which are the outgrowth of their propaganda, are not spontaneous expressions of unrest brought about by critical economic conditions in this country, but are the result of systematic and energetic propaganda, spread by representatives of European revolutionary bodies." (Page 502.)

It is noticeable that in practically every instance in this country when some official or unofficial body has sought to present the true nature of the forces back of the Socialist School of Thought, a well organized propaganda to discredit that body has appeared. The purpose of this propaganda is to create the false belief in the minds of the public that those who made the study and issued their conclusions were unreliable and untrustworthy, were moved by "hysteria," were "seeing red," or were guided wholly by some ulterior motive.

As a part of the general propaganda campaign of the radical movement to discredit everything which gives some insight as to the aims and purposes of those following that movement, the Lusk Report was attacked even before it was printed. Today when one gives a citation from this document the reply is "Oh, the Lusk Report has been discredited." No attempt is made, however, to show that the citation itself is incorrect. It is said that only four errors are found in the entire four volumes, and these of minor importance, in nowise affecting the general conclusions of the Committee.

So far as we are able to learn, no one has even suggested that a single document reprinted in the Lusk Report lacks in authority or is incorrectly cited. James O Neal, a recognized Socialist writer and the editor of "The New Appeal," the official organ of the Socialist Party, in his book "American Communism," cites some of the documents appearing in the Lusk Report and admits they are reliable. He denounces—and naturally so since the Report is certainly a complete exposé of the theories and doctrines for which he stands—the conclusions of the Committee. In a foot note, page 51, of "American Communism," referring to the Lusk Report, Mr. O Neal says:

"The first two volumes of this report contain many documents of various organizations which would be difficult to find elsewhere. Most of this material is reliable * * * The committee itself was later discredited when its insufferable arrogance provoked resentment * * *"

Its "insufferable arrogance," it would appear from the facts in the case, consisted in urging laws which would effectively expose both the theories and the system of the Socialist School of Thought; and the "resentment" was that evidenced by the sponsors of this school—and by no one else.

More than ten years have elapsed since the publication of these documents. Those who have closely followed events assert that the very forces and agencies mentioned in both reports, have been intensifying their activities in the United States under many names. Socialism wears cloaks of various patterns, some of brightest red and some of palest pink, in order to attract the attention of different individuals.

Now there are those—and all of them have given great care and study to the question—who hold to the belief that there is a well organized movement operating in the United States, seeking,

First, to destroy our form of government and its institutions which include the home and the church, and wreck our economic system which grants to the individual the private property right, in order that,

Second, they may establish here a wholly different form of government, wholly different institutions which, in effect, would abolish the home and the church, and a wholly different economic system wherein the individual property right is not granted. In brief, a government modelled after that now existing in Russia.

What interests us is this: Are those who contend that there is an organized movement to destroy this government correct? Are they swayed by "hysteria;" are they "seeing red;" are they

guided by some ulterior motive? Or, are their conclusions the result of careful and painstaking study of indisputable and irrefutable documents and evidence?

If they are correct in their conclusions, we want to know it that we may join in a common attack on these dangerous agencies and forces. If they are not correct, if the adoption of these alien theories and doctrines will bring us good instead of harm, we want to know it so that we may join in hastening the day when these theories and doctrines may become operative in the United States.

Now, there is only one way to ascertain whether these contentions are correct or not. And that is by a complete, careful and conscientious study of the records, of passing events, of the theories and doctrines held to be dangerous, and of the system employed to put their theories into operation. At the same time it is necessary to have a clearer and better understanding of the theories and doctrines underlying our form of government and the institutions which it maintains and supports, including the home and the church. Also, a better understanding of the economic system which prevails under our form of government and in harmony with our institutions.

What we are to study, then, as a matter of fact, are the doctrines presented by the Schools of Thought. One is the Capitalist School of Thought and the other is the Socialist School of Thought. These two schools present antagonistic views. They are as far apart as the poles. We in the United States are enjoying a marked degree of prosperity and security through the operation of one—the Capitalist School of Thought. The other, the Socialist School of Thought, seeks to impose its theories and doctrines upon us, insisting that if these theories and doctrines are placed in operation they will bring more prosperity and more security. Are we right or are they?

We are not going to get at the facts and so gain a clear understanding of the truth to establish in our minds who is right and who is wrong, unless we get down to fundamentals and essentials. For that reason, I will not deal with individuals and organizations save as they come into the picture because of theories advanced. We are not interested in individuals and organizations. The things in which we are interested, however, the things we are to study and understand are the theories and the doctrines which certain individuals and organizations approve, advance, expound and agitate in order to gain converts.

We who are advocating a continuation of the theories and doctrines of the Capitalist School of Thought—and that means the great majority of the people—and those who are advocating the theories and doctrines of the Socialist School of Thought, the school this majority opposes, are mere actors on the stage for the time being. Those of yesterday have gone and others have taken their places. Those of today will pass and others will take their places. The span of human life is short. Theories, however, if correct, endure and bring general advancement in their way; but theories that are incorrect since they can not be demonstrated, arise again and again to plague mankind, bringing much misery in their train.

If the American people would take the time to carefully survey the situation, locate the *germ* of what is now a world disease, manifest in nearly every land through some form of unrest, distrust or class-hatred and revolutionary spirit, it would not take long to locate and destroy that germ.

The germ we are after is a BELIEF. That germ in this instance, is a FALSE BELIEF, a belief in theories which are clearly fallacious, theories which, when put into practice, have invariably failed, theories advanced through irrational and illogical reasoning.

It would be a foolish general who would go into an armed conflict not knowing what it was he was fighting; not knowing whether a defensive or an offensive movement was the most desirable; not knowing whether the enemy was north, south, east or west of him; not knowing whether the enemy was equipped with powerful modern guns or with peashooters; not knowing whether the army was well disciplined and under able commanders, or a mere band of hoboes with no commanders at all. Such a general, I fear, would not fare very well in a battle.

We first must understand fully just what it is for which the enemy is fighting; just where that enemy is located, the kind of ammunition it is using, and the kind it expects to use in the future; the size, character and training of soldiers in the ranks and of the commanding officers.

And so we naturally ask ourselves this question: What is it for which the supporters of the Capitalist School of Thought are fighting, and what is it for which the supporters of the Socialist School of Thought are fighting?

The followers of the Capitalist School of Thought—and we will go more deeply into this School in the next lecture—are fighting to preserve and maintain our present *form* of government

and theory of economics, together with the institutions sustained by that *form* of government. Among these institutions are the private property right, the home and the church.

The followers of the Socialist School of Thought are fighting to do away with our *form* of government, our established institutions and our theory of economics in order to experiment with a wholly different form of government, wholly different institutions, and a wholly different theory of economics.

And that brings us down to the first important feature of the question we are studying—our *form* of government advanced and upheld by what we call Capitalism. But remember at all times that the essence of Capitalism is the private property right.

We who live in the United States have a prize, a very dear and valuable prize. That prize is our form of government with its institutions. To destroy these is the purpose of certain agencies and forces we call Socialism. Why is our form of government with its institutions so valuable? Because it is the foundation upon which rests everything we, as people and each of us as individuals, have or enjoy, materially; the foundation upon which rests the peace and security of the nation, and the happiness, contentment, success and prosperity of each individual citizen of this nation.

Few of you, possibly, have given any serious consideration to your government and when you have discussed it you have thought in terms of the administration of affairs rather than in terms of the *form* of government. It is the *form* in which we are interested. It is the *form* we insist must be preserved for our children and our children's children. There is a whole lot of difference between those who *administer* our government and the *form* of that government. We can change those who administer, and do change them from time to time if we think they are not handling affairs as they should, but the question is, do we want to change *the form*?

If you will but take the time to make a careful survey, you will find that all you have, the one thing upon which depends your life, your liberty and the pursuit of your happiness—even though all may not catch up with that happiness—is your government. A safe, sound, stable government such as ours, administered for the common welfare of all the people; a government which gives to the individual the personal property right and that means the individual enjoyment of the fruit of one's initiative, energy, agility, skill, genius or labor, is the basis of all that we possess. It is because of our *form* of government that the people—aliens within our borders as well as citizens—enjoy certain rights and privileges.

For instance, every person has the right to engage in business or any character of legal employment and to enjoy the emoluments arising therefrom. Every person has the right to acquire property and use that property for his individual enjoyment or profit; and he has the right to sell, transfer, devise or bequeath that property to whomsoever he may see fit. Every person has the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience so long as he does not adopt a form of worship subversive to the government which grants that right. Every person has the right to maintain a home of his own and that home, no matter how humble, is his castle and not subject to search or seizure save by due process of law. Every person has the right to enjoy the fruits of his own initiative, energy, skill, ability, genius, labor, etc. Every person has the right to express himself freely on public matters, so long as his opinions do not advocate the destruction of this government by force and violence, and even in this we, as a government, are exceedingly liberal. Every person has the right to petition the Congress for the redress of any grievance he feels he suffers.

Every person charged with a crime has the right to a trial by a jury of his peers, and every person has a right to call upon his government and all the machinery of that government for the protection of his individual rights, his property and his person.

Now these and other individual rights, expressly given to the citizens by the Constitution of the United States, have been long enjoyed. They have brought to the people of this country so much improvement, success, contentment, prosperity, etc., that it is difficult for any one to believe there is, or could be, an organized movement to destroy them.

In the first place, those who enjoy them, without stopping to give the matter any consideration or thought at all, assume that these rights are indestructible; that they are enjoyed because they are natural rights, just as is the right to breathe the air. But these rights are destructible. They are granted by an instrument called the Constitution of the United States. They can be taken away by the annulment of that instrument. They are ours, wholly and solely, because of our *form* of government. Change that form and apply the theories of the Socialist School of Thought and these rights disappear.

Let us turn to just one of these for it is primary and because of it most of the others exist and add to human happiness. That is the private property right. How much thought have you given to this? Whether you have been able to exercise it or not you possess

it. For instance, you say you own a piece of real estate. How do you know you own it? You say, "Oh, I have a deed for it from the former owner." True, but how do you know the person who transferred it to you had the right to so transfer? You say, "Why I have an abstract of title which shows that he owned the property." True again. So let us turn to that abstract of title. How did the first person who exercised the right to own that property and transfer it as he wished and whomsoever he pleased, gain the title?

You go back through many pages of the abstract to the first guarantor, and what do you find? The government of the United States. Or, if the first title of an individual were secured before we became a nation, then you find that the government having dominion over the section where the land was located, had transferred it to some person through a grant or a patent. When the United States came into existence it recognized as legal all such grants and patents and ever since has affirmed and defended them.

Now, therefore, upon what does the right to own, hold, transfer, sell, devise or bequeath property depend—and depend absolutely? Upon the government of the United States with its present Constitution. Supposing the *form* of government of the United States is changed to one that does not sustain the property right, what becomes of your property? It is taken from you. You no longer own it.

"The essence of Socialism and Communism lies in the abolition of private property," writes Theodore D. Woolsey ("Communism and Socialism," page 14.)

In "The A B C of Communism," by N. Buharin and E. Preobrazhensky, an authoritative text-book for the Communist wing of the Socialist School of Thought (page 70), appears this language:

"The basis of communist society must be the social ownership of the means of production and exchange. Machinery, locomotives, steamships, factory buildings, warehouses, grain elevators, mines, telegraphs and telephones, the land, sheep, horses and cattle, must all be at the disposal of society. All these means of production must be under the control of society as a whole, and not as at present under the control of individual capitalists or capitalist combines."

The right wing followers of the Socialist School of Thought, those who call themselves Socialists, have a little different way of saying exactly the same thing. In "Socialism Summed Up" by

Morris Hillquit—and Mr. Hillquit is a recognized Socialist authority—appears this (page 24):

“Socialism would substitute the prevailing method of private enterprise for individual profit by a system of social production for collective use. * * * the Socialist program requires the public or collective ownership and operation of the principal instruments and agencies for the production and distribution of wealth—the land, mines, railroads, steamboats, telegraph and telephone lines, mills, factories and modern machinery.”

If the state is to own and control all of the property mentioned in these citations, then, certainly, those who now own and hold that character of property, are deprived of their right under the Constitution, are they not?

All Socialists, no matter under what name they appear, go to Marx for a decision in every controversial question. In the “Communist Manifesto” (Rand School Edition, page 30), he writes:

“The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.” (And on pages 32 and 33), “You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. Precisely so: that is just what we intend.”

Now then, if the government that is formed to take the place of the present one, a government fashioned to conform with the theories of Socialism, does not compensate you for the property taken, it has been confiscated, has it not?

While some of the modern Socialist writers, especially in the United States, avoid the word “confiscate,” when explaining what is to become of private property after they have secured command and have established the Socialist state, others, especially those in Great Britain and on the Continent, are not so fearful lest, by the use of this harsh word, they drive out of the movement a certain “liberal” element. Fred Henderson, whose book “The Case for Socialism” was issued by the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain, is frank enough. He writes (pages 20, 21, 28) as follows:

“ * * * Let there be no mistake about it. Socialism, I repeat, is an attack upon the institution of private property in * * * capital. We socialists advocate the expropriation of the * * * capitalist class. * * * In its final consummation, socialism means the complete expropriation of the proprietary class. * * * Do not let us deceive ourselves into thinking that we can get round this accusation about confiscation and robbery by talking about some form of compensation to the persons whom we propose to expropriate. If the nation gave them

compensation, in the sense of giving them an equivalent for what it is proposed to take from them, we should fail in our purpose. Compensation, if it is to be a real equivalent, would only continue in another form the very thing which it is our purpose to end altogether. Definitely and clearly, our purpose is to deprive these people of their present way of living. * * * Socialism means the complete expropriation of the proprietary class."

Expropriate may not be quite as harsh a word as confiscate, but it is the same thing.

L. Grolund ("Co-Operative Commonwealth," page 122) writes: "That matter of compensation will not worry us very much. Socialists claim that it is society to whom our plutocrats owe all their wealth, and that, therefore, society has the right at any moment to take it back." Society in the United States is based wholly on our form of government. Change that government, and society will be changed, and the private property right destroyed.

E. B. Bax ("Ethics of Socialism," page 76) says: "The moment you talk of compensation you surrender the socialist principle of justice; for compensation can only be real if it is adequate; and it can only be adequate if it counterbalances and thereby annuls the confiscation."

Citing these and other similar quotations of well known Socialist-Liberal teachers, for there are plenty of them, Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 56), sums the matter up in these words: "This attitude of the thoroughgoing socialist is the only one consistent with fundamental socialistic principle. According to this principle, capital in private hands is robbery; its possessors, therefore, have no moral right to it; hence, to take it from them is just, and to compensate them for it would be unjust; it would, further, be absurd, for it would perpetuate their economic ascendancy."

Sponsors of the Socialist School of Thought in the United States are not quite as frank as their European brethren. In this country, the movement, if it goes forward at all, must depend largely on its "liberal" following, those who are attracted to it by certain emotional appeals, by their altruism and idealism, many of whom, as a matter of fact, have attained considerable wealth. To drive them from the movement would deprive it of much of its financial support.

Dr. Jessie Wallace Hughan, in her recent book (1928), "What is Socialism?", in dealing with this phase of the subject, carefully avoids the use of the term "confiscate" and yet frankly admits, in substance, that is just what would happen. After stating that probably those from whom property would be taken when the socialist government is in control, would be compensated by having interest bearing bonds delivered them, she refers to steps that would be taken to make these interest bearing bonds worthless—in other words "confiscate" them. She writes (page 113):

* * * we may expect that the Socialist government, as soon as public opinion should render it practicable, would proceed to the deliberate, though gradual, extinction of the bond-holding class."

A few sentences farther on, and in the same paragraph, appears this language: "Granted a favorable public sentiment, even the principal might be repudiated after due notice and an interest-bearing interval sufficiently great." Taking a man's property and handing him a "gold brick" in return, certainly can amount to nothing other than confiscation.

You are a member of some club. That club erects and furnishes a nice home for its members. How did it erect and furnish that home? By money received from contributions of its members, or through a loan secured by a mortgage on the property. If by contributions of members, then it was because these members, through the possession of the private property right, had the means to give. If by a loan, then it was because some person, through the exercise of the private property right, had the money to loan and was willing to advance the funds because he knew the property would become his in case the loan was not repaid.

Now, supposing you lived under a government where the private property right did not exist. Do you think there would have been any such club building? How could the members have secured means to contribute, or where would have been found a person to loan with no security, providing there was any one who had the means so to do!

Did we not live under a form of government which recognizes and sustains the individual property right, not one of us would be here to-day. The building in which we meet would not have been erected. Indeed, it is a question whether this city would be more than a mere hamlet, or whether the United States would be even known beyond the Mississippi River, if that far. The thing that inspired the pioneers to push through the forests and across the plains to the Pacific was the hope that, through the exercise of their individual property rights, they might attain more for themselves and their families.

The thing that motivated the men who suffered untold hardships in prospecting the mountains of the West, discovering the veins of minerals which have added so much to the welfare of the whole world, was the hope of personal reward. Had the government under which they lived not granted the individual the private property right, do you think that any of these rich veins would have been discovered?

Your community has erected a fine school building for the use and benefit of those who live in that community. Right here our Socialist friends will say this is a form of Socialism since it is community ownership. It is not a form of socialism as that school building is there wholly because the people of the community live under a government which grants the individual property right.

Collectivism, under the government of the United States, such as owning and directing certain phases of public activities, as in the case of schools, the post offices, etc., is NOT Socialism, since the main feature of Socialism, that is, the abolition of the private property right, is absent.

Going a step farther, however, and placing the ownership and management of such lines as transportation, communication, light and power, banking, insurance, etc., in the hands of the government is a decided advance toward complete socialization. Under our system of government the private property right in one form of capital can not be destroyed without destroying that right in all forms. To socialize any one of the above named lines would, in time, result in the socialization of all. Indeed, that is the objective of the Socialist movement—that, and the abolition of the form of government which will not permit of confiscation.

“The extension of public enterprise is NOT in itself socialism; what IS essentially socialistic is the extinction of private enterprise,” writes Prof. Hearnshaw (“A Survey of Socialism,” page 78). Again (page 437), the same writer says:

“Collectivism is merely the POSITIVE doing of things by the community—e.g., the provision of streets, parks, public clocks, free libraries, and so on; and many of these things are best done by the community in its corporate capacity. They tend to enlarge the sphere of private enterprise, and to leave individual initiative ampler scope for its activities. Socialism, on the other hand, is a NEGATIVE thing: it is not the doing of any number of things by the community, but the prohibition of their being done by private enterprise. That is the curse of socialism; that is why it is so deadly a blight; that is how its presence puts a stop to productive activity.”

Keep always in mind the distinction between collectivism, such as the control of the schools, and socialism which is the abolition of the private property right.

The school building we cited as an illustration was erected through taxes on the real estate. Had there been no private ownership of real estate there would have been nothing to tax, and had there been no taxes there would have been no school building. Take any case you wish along this line and analyze it carefully and you will find that what you are, what you have, what you enjoy, what you hope to have and enjoy, goes back to the *form* of government—the *form* which grants you, and each of you, the private property right. I think all of you can visualize what would happen if this right were taken from you.

Stripped of all idealism and altruism with which the Socialist theory is trimmed and made presentable and palatable to the American people, the whole question involved is the *private property right*. We have a government which grants that right to the individual. The form of government which the Socialist School of Thought proposes is one which denies the individual that right. If more of the people, who accept without investigation the emotional appeal with which the Socialist speakers or writers clothe their statements, would give the matter careful consideration, they would readily see that to change our *form* of government to that which is commonly called a co-operative commonwealth—Russia has a co-operative commonwealth—would mean their complete destruction.

I have not presented a thing in this lecture that every one of you does not know. But knowing, how much consideration have you given to it? The fact of the matter is that not one out of ten thousand persons you meet in the ordinary walks of life, and I include in this some of our ablest business men, have given this matter any thought. They seem to believe that because the private property right has been exercised ever since we became a nation, indeed long before, nothing can destroy it. The Constitution grants the right—it is not a natural one. The Constitution can be changed and that right taken away. All that is needed to make the change is a sufficient number of citizens demanding it.

In the course of my years of investigation I have discussed this matter with a great many persons practically all of whom are zealously devoted to the private property right since, through the exercise of that right, they have accumulated fortunes. And yet, when their attention has been called to some socialistic legislative proposal, they have replied in the most disinterested manner, "I don't care if it is adopted. It can't hurt me."

Then they would assail something that they held was wrong because of the government. In no instance was the wrong to which they referred due to the government. The wrong was with themselves since they paid so little attention to the type of persons *administering* the government, or to agencies seeking to destroy it.

Because you have a very bad cook, you don't stop eating, do you? Because your automobile balks on a crowded thoroughfare you don't commence demolishing all automobiles, do you? Because, when you tune in on a radio, you get a program that is anything but pleasing, you don't throw the radio out of the window, do you? The thing you do is correct the wrong, whatever it may be.

Those who say, "Oh, I don't care if they change the form of government," haven't given the slightest thought to what our present *form* of government means to them. Most of them, you will find, are the owners of property, engaged in some character of business, the possessors of income from investments, etc., or the wives, sisters, sons or dependents of those who own property, are engaged in business, the possessors of income from investments, etc. In other words, they are persons who depend on the private property right for everything they have to enjoy.

What would become of every one of these persons if the *form* of government were changed from one that *grants* the individual property right to one which *denies* this right?

(Copyright 1930)

LECTURE No. 3

THE CLASS STRUGGLE—TWO SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

While a great many people are crying "peace, peace," the fact is that we are in the midst of war—a war on our *form* of government, our institutions and all that we hold dear. It is a conflict between two diametrically opposite theories. This cry of "peace, peace," I fear, in many instances is more to distract our attention from the war which is now actually going on than to prevent us from ever again being plunged into an armed conflict with some other nation. In truth no such conflict is in the offing. The only nation on the face of the globe with which we might become so engaged is the one that is giving aid, comfort, and in some manner, financial support to those who have declared and are now waging the war against us. I refer to Russia, where the Socialist theory dominates in government and where the private property right does not exist.

The war against the government of the United States, and the institutions which that government sustains, has been declared by the international Socialist movement. "The war is one between Socialism and Americanism," writes George B. Lockwood ("Thoughts on Americanism," page 49). "In that battle it is the duty of every citizen to take a part. The institutions our fathers established at such a sacrifice of blood and treasure, are worthy of defense by every American worthy of the name. These institutions, in the face of attack by propagandists of socialism, open and camouflaged, will not maintain themselves. They can only be upheld by eternal vigilance."

Socialism as it is manifest today is the common name given to a certain movement. Socialism, Communism, certain phases of "liberalism," "internationalism" and "pacifism" and "Labour" in Great Britain, have the same aims and purposes.

Military strategy necessitates knowing both the strength and the weakness of the enemy. So knowing, strategy demands a weakening process aimed at the strong positions and a direct offensive

centered on the weak ones. And that is the strategy employed by the present Socialist commanders in waging their war against the government of the United States, and the institutions which we now enjoy and cherish.

The destruction of the government of the United States and its institutions, including the home and the church—for the destruction of these institutions is sought—means the elimination of the present position of this country in world affairs; means the elimination of our prosperity; *means the elimination of you and all you possess, or hope to possess.* It means the confiscation of all property and the abolition of that which creates all wealth—the individual property right.

It doesn't make much difference whether this government is destroyed by the landing of superior military forces that dominate the people through military activities or whether it is destroyed by a movement which causes the people to grow lax, apathetic and unmindful of the value of the government to them. And it is through this laxness, this apathy, that those who seek to impose their will upon us, who crave the wealth created through the operation of the private property right, hope to secure control of the government by "peaceful" means, through what the Socialists call "legislative action" and the Communists call "mass or direct action," both of which methods we will deal with more fully in a later lecture.

There are many ways of killing a man. A stab in the heart is almost instantaneous and practically painless. Slow poison wracks the whole system and while not producing instant death, accomplishes its end just the same. In either case the victim is no more. The ultimate result is the same.

A man's business may be destroyed and his wealth wiped out in many ways. Forces of nature—fires, cyclones, floods—may do the job. On the other hand, the owner may grow neglectful of his affairs, leaving management details to others who, being incompetent and untrustworthy, force the business into the hands of a receiver. But in either case the man is financially ruined. It is not necessarily his fault in the first instance, although he should have protected himself by insurance, but who can say that it is not always his fault in the second instance? Apathy at all times is a lurking, dangerous enemy.

Piccolo Tigre, connected with the revolutionary society, Haute Vente Romaine, which operated in certain sections of Europe about 1848, wrote: "Everywhere there is enthusiasm in our ranks and apathy or indifference amongst the enemy. This is a certain and infallible sign of success." (Quoted in "The World Revolution," Nesta A. Webster, page 132.)

"No civilized modern government can be overthrown by violence if it realizes the danger that threatens it and firmly resolves to defend itself," writes Mrs. Webster. "It is not resistance but weakness that produces revolution, for weakness invites audacity and the revolutionary spirit." She adds (page 326), "Every outbreak of the World Revolution that has so far occurred has been rendered possible by the apathy of the nation in general."

When a nation declares war it serves open notice that it hopes and expects to conquer its opponent. That places us on our mettle. We know who the enemy is, and what we may expect if we lose in the conflict. The purpose of that enemy is to gain control of our government and establish some other government to rule us; or to annex us and make us subject to some other government; or to place us in such a position that we must pay tribute to some other government.

Now, the Socialist movement has declared war against us as a people, and against all of our institutions. In open manifestoes, platforms, speeches and writings of the leaders, those directing the enemy frankly and without equivocation, say it is their purpose to destroy this government, confiscate all property and wealth, and upon the ruins build a wholly different form of government, with wholly different institutions, and they specifically declare that the first thing they will do, if they win this war, is to destroy the private property right.

Our government is what is known as a non-class form. Every citizen of legal age has a voice in saying who shall manage the affairs of government. And this government maintains and sustains the private property right. Clearly, any organization, force or movement that sets forth frankly and emphatically, and in language which no one can mistake, that its purpose is to change our *form* of government, now non-class, to a strictly *class* government wherein only certain individuals called "workers" are permitted to exercise the right to vote or hold office, and change our *form* of

government which recognizes the private property right to one wherein this right is not recognized, has openly declared war against our government and its institutions, has it not?

The theory of the "class struggle" is held fundamental by those who accept the teachings of Marx, no matter under what name his doctrine is presented, including those who mellow his harsh cry, "the abolition of the private property right," by using the term "production for use and not for profit," or "industrial democracy."

Marx and all of his followers divided the people of all so-called capitalist countries into two distinct classes. One is termed the bourgeoisie, the ruling, the exploiting or the oppressing class, commonly known as "capitalists." The other is termed the proletariat, the oppressed, or the exploited class, commonly known today as the "workers." The assumption is that the former comprises all who enjoy an income from invested capital, no matter how small that income, or who are the recipients of large salaries, while in the latter class are all who work for wages or small salaries, and who do not enjoy any income from invested savings. It is the contention of those directing the Socialist movement that by the very nature of things there is, and can be, nothing in common between the people in these two classes, and that the latter must organize and by the application of force, violence and acts of terrorism bring about a bloody civil war or revolution to destroy all in the so-called capitalist class and confiscate their wealth.

If, in fact, these two classes exist and there is a bitter war between them, then we would expect to see all having any part of their income from invested savings or enjoying large salaries, solidly lined up on one side, and all who gain their entire livelihood from wages or small salaries, solidly lined up on the other. This, however, we do not find actually, or even theoretically. Millions of men and women who work for wages or small salaries, refuse to accept the Socialist theory, and so, by all its advocates, are placed in the capitalist class, while there are a very considerable number of persons who enjoy rather large incomes from invested wealth who, having accepted the Socialist theory, are placed in the workers class. And so it becomes clear to anyone giving the question a minute's consideration that the "war," while being waged all right enough, is not between those of different *classes* as we understand the word, but rather between those holding opposite *beliefs* or *opinions* concerning government and economics.

In the United States the great majority of the people believe in our form of government, the institutions built thereon, and the economic system which provides the private property right. Because of that belief they are designated as capitalists by the followers of Marx. There is a small minority in this country, a few of them wage-earners—most of them not American citizens—and some very wealthy persons, who believe in the form of government controlling Russia and the economic system sustained by that government. They in turn are all called workers.

Prof. Arthur Shadwell of London (*The Socialist Movement*, Vol. II, page 24) writes: "Any convert who subscribes to the faith is welcomed, regardless of class, and everyone who does not is an object of contempt, scorn and abuse, no matter what class he belongs to. He is either a knave or a fool, a 'lackey' of capitalism or a Henry Dubb. The same man, who today is a knave or a fool, becomes a grand fellow tomorrow if so be he embraces the faith."

The so-called capitalist follower who rejects the principles of the private property right and accepts the Socialist theory, by that act discards all that hitherto has made him a "knave," or "fool," or a "lackey of capitalism" and instantly becomes a "good fellow." He may be the possessor of wealth which he did not earn because of any individual effort, but enjoys through inheritance. He may never have worked a day in his life, or through his own efforts earned a dollar, or created a dollar's worth of wealth. He may live in a mansion, employ many servants to whom he pays wages, have his money invested in industrial enterprises which employ a large number of wage-earners, drive an expensive car and disport himself in society. He may many times have been denounced as a "parasite" or a "lackey of capitalism," but the moment he renounces his old faith and accepts the new, he becomes a welcomed worker. He has not changed his *class* at all. He has merely changed his *opinions* or *beliefs*. He still earns nothing because of his own efforts. He still enjoys all he enjoyed before he recanted, but while yesterday a hated capitalist because of his beliefs, today he is a lowly worker, likewise because of his beliefs.

And, conversely, if the fellow who for many years has zealously followed the Socialist theory and has taken part in organization work, has his eyes opened and renounces that theory, that minute he transfers himself from the workers' into the capitalist

class, and becomes subject to bitter denunciation. He has not changed his class, his employment, his manner of living, his friends or his associates. He has merely changed his opinion on the subjects of government and economics. The Marxian theory that there is a "war" between those of different classes, is not a reality but merely a slogan, a rallying cry that joins together into a militant army to destroy the thing called capitalism—and of necessity the form of government that supports the private property right—the unemployed, the shiftless, the lazy, the indigent, and all who are seeking some easy way to gain a livelihood.

Holding, however, that there are these two antagonistic classes, the Socialist Platform for 1904 (Proceedings of the National Socialist Party, 1904, page 307), expresses it in this language: "Between these two classes"—that is, those they term workers and those they term capitalists—"there can be no identity of interests, any more than there can be peace in the midst of war, or light in the midst of darkness."

The Communist wing of the movement labeled its campaign text book for 1928 "The Platform of the Class Struggle." It presents the declaration of war on our form of government, and its institutions (page 4) in this language:

"The keynote of our platform is struggle—relentless, uncompromising, determined struggle against the capitalist world." And again (page 11):

"The issue is Capitalism or Communism. The Workers (Communist) Party of America declares itself the deadly enemy of capitalism. It has as its aim the overthrow of capitalism. * * *"

Can clearer or more explicit language be used? Moreover the organization thus frankly stating its aims is not American for it is "a Section of the Third (Communist) International." Therefore, this declaration of war against our government and our institutions is not a move on the part of any of our people to change conditions, but a move on the part of those who are alien to everything American, *not* to benefit the people of the United States, but instead to better a so-called special class in all countries.

Those in the Socialist wing of the movement—we will come to these two wings or factions in a later lecture—present their declaration of purposes in words which do not seem vicious and which have confused a great many people. The language of the Socialists

may not suggest the roar of cannons and the whirr of bombing planes in the air, but the destructive features are there just the same. The language found in the Declaration of Principles of the Socialist Party of the United States, the platform followed by many who call themselves "liberals," "internationalists" or "pacifists," is as follows (The American Labor Year Book for 1921-22, Rand School of Social Science, page 395):

"Its purpose is to secure a majority in Congress and in every state legislature, to win the principal executive and judicial offices, to become the dominant and controlling party, and when in power to transfer to the ownership by the people of industries, beginning with those of a public character, such as banking, insurance, mining, transportation and communication, as well as the trustified industries, and extending the process to all other industries susceptible of collective ownership, as rapidly as their technical conditions will permit.

"It also proposes to socialize the system of public education and health and all activities and institutions vitally affecting the public needs and welfare, including dwelling houses."

That statement—which we interpret as a declaration of war against our form of government and the institutions sustained and maintained by that form—has been many times publicly made. But how many of those who are depending on the private property right—and all in this country do depend upon it—have given it the slightest attention?

What is it the Socialists say they propose to do? Get control of the government. And why control of the government? In order to transfer to the government directed by them, all industries and property "susceptible of collective ownership"—and even a peanut stand is "susceptible of collective ownership." Then what do they say they propose to do after they have control of the government? They propose to "socialize," that is, place in the hands of the government which they control and direct, "the system of public health and education." But that is not all. They say still further that they propose to "socialize," that is, place in the hands of the government which they control and direct, "the dwelling houses." That means your home and my home and the home of every individual citizen. If your home is to be thus invaded by a government in the direction of which you have no voice, what becomes of the family?

Now, this organization so clearly expressing its aims and purposes is not American. It does not pretend to be American. It does not pretend to be working for the advancement of the American people as a whole. The first paragraph in its constitution, adopted in 1917, reads as follows (The American Labor Year Book, 1921-22, page 396): "The Socialist Party of the United States is the political expression of the interests of the workers in this country, and is part of the international working class movement." In the same document appears this language: "The Socialist movement is a world struggle * * *" (Page 396). In the platform of the Socialist Party for 1904 appears this language: "As an American Socialist Party we pledge our fidelity to the principles of international socialism. * * * The Socialist movement is a world movement."

As a plain process of sound reasoning, how can a movement have any program for the improvement or betterment of *all* the people of the United States when it frankly admits that it is a part of an *international class movement*, not working for the benefit of the people of the United States, but confining its interests to the scattered few who hold un-American views?

Clearly, that which is international in its scope and aims is not national. An organization that frankly admits its purpose is to aid only a certain group of different lands, even though other groups in the United States are injured, certainly is not American in spirit or intent. Any organization existing in the United States that boastingly proclaims it first pledges "fidelity to the principles of international socialism"—and *first* means pledging that fidelity ahead of fidelity to the government of the United States—must, by that very proclamation, be considered an organization diametrically opposed to the aims and purposes of the people of the United States.

Nor do those who are leaders in the Socialist movement in the United States deny that their organization is waging a war against our form of government and our institutions. Morris Hillquit is one such leader. He writes ("Socialism Summed Up," page 14), "And there is war between and among the classes. War, sometimes overt and violent, sometimes concealed and even unconscious, but war nevertheless."

The war that is "overt and violent" is that carried on by the Communist wing of the Socialist movement. That which is "con-

cealed" is the war conducted by the Socialist wing of the same movement. And of this war, the American people appear to be "unconscious."

We have been taught to think of war in military terms, that is, a combat waged through the employment of military machinery—armies, navies, air forces, guns, ammunition, gas, soldiers at the front, in the trenches, etc. That kind of war is sensationally terrible. And those who are waging the conflict along wholly different lines are exceptionally clever in keeping our minds centered on that character of warfare with its many horrors. That kind, however, at least has one merit—the whole nation understands that war has been declared against us, and steps are taken by loyal citizens to protect and defend the government and its institutions.

To understand this Socialist form of waging a war, and today a most effective one, let us go back to this matter of strategy for a minute. What are the strong positions and what are the weak positions, of the government of the United States? We have been in the habit of dealing with effect rather than cause. We battle manifestations with much vigor and yet make no attempt to locate the cause of these manifestations, and so eradicate the origin and—it naturally follows—destroy the manifestations. We deal almost exclusively with the disease and overlook the germ.

Let us do a bit of sound logical reasoning. What makes a nation strong? It is not the size of its army, the strength of its navy, the impregnable fortresses that guard its main ports. While all these are necessary, they are effects, not causes. The strength of every nation lies in the loyalty of its citizenry, lies in that sentiment which we call patriotism. So long as the majority of the people of the United States are loyal to our form of government and our institutions, so long as patriotism dominates the vast majority and is expressed in the acts of the people, this nation will endure and nothing can destroy it.

But now start the weakening process. Commence to implant in the minds of the people the belief that our form of government is not one that meets their needs and requirements; that misfortunes, unemployment, suffering, misery, are the portion of the people wholly because of the form of government and its institutions; that our form operates to defeat the aims and ambitions of the great mass; that to be "liberal," "progressive" or "advanced," one must

find fault with society as it exists and belittle American institutions; that our schools are the breeding places for the ideas of the narrow and bigoted; that the church is a machine to subjugate the people to a form of slavery that exists under a government which permits and sustains the private property right; that the home founded on adherence to the moral code is not in keeping with proper progress; that the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism are to be shunned.

I say, let this weakening process continue long enough, and no matter how great the army, no matter how big the navy, no matter how impregnable, from a material standpoint, may be the fortresses guarding our principal ports, with a majority of the people so believing—yes, even a vociferous and militant minority so believing—nothing can save the United States!

Certainly every thoughtful person in the land, who has given the matter any consideration, must be impressed with the extent of propaganda to create false beliefs concerning our form of government, our institutions, including the home and the church, our economic system, our moral code and the well known sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism. Not only do we read much along this line in the press, including the magazines, but we see moving pictures which appear to be designed to create false beliefs. Even ministers of the gospel deliver sermons along this line. Keeping in mind the reason for this—the weakening process in order to destroy the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism upon which sentiments the safety of the nation depends—in your general reading and when you attend theatres or hear lectures, you will be able to note the seriousness of the situation.

Now, when you want to change a person's views upon any subject, what do you do? You do not deal with his body, with his business, with his home or with anything that is visible, or anything that can be cognized by one, or all, of the five physical senses. *You deal with his thoughts* because the only things to change are his *thoughts*. You are not seeking to change his body, his business or his home, or anything of a material nature. *You deal with thoughts and thoughts only*, because thoughts formulate beliefs; and we all act according to our beliefs.

The United States came into existence because of certain thoughts held by the majority of those who then lived in the Colonies. This majority was united on certain beliefs. This nation has grown rich,

has developed to a wonderful degree its vast landed areas. The people have builded homes and reared children in peace and security. We have become the richest nation on the face of the globe with that wealth more evenly divided than elsewhere, wholly because the great majority of the people have *held to certain common beliefs—certain common thoughts*. We call them sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism.

The only way this nation can be destroyed is through the destruction of the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism, sentiments which cause men and women freely to give their lives, if need be, for the protection of the government and its institutions. So long as these sentiments prevail, as I believe they do prevail today although more or less dormant, the nation will endure. Destroy them and the nation will be destroyed. That means this government will cease to exist and its institutions, such as the private property right, the home and the church, will disappear.

Thought, then, is the primary power, the thing we must analyze, because the enemy in waging a warfare against the government of the United States and its institutions, by seeking first to undermine the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism, is seeking to change, pervert or destroy the common thought of the people. Edwin S. Kimball in his printed lectures (page 52) said:

“All the strife and war among nations is primarily thought. All the business affairs of the world are thus originated. Continents are discovered, explored and colonized; nations are founded, cities are built; the earth is made to give forth its produce; goods are designed and manufactured, and all of the vast and ponderous transactions of the world are procured and continued by the action of thought.

“Thought establishes social relationships and on the other hand it murders and commits suicide. It brings forth the manifestations of music, art and invention and again it demolishes and destroys. Without thought all human activity would cease; the earth would become depopulated; the wheels of industry would abruptly stop, crumble and decay and the work of man’s hand be obliterated. Gaze where you will on the scene of humanity and you may know that its visible presence on earth and all of its possessions; all that it does or has accomplished; all the minutia and immensity of its doings; indeed all things of whatsoever phase or nature that are included in the entire compass of its career, are but the phenomena of thought; and you may also know that mortal man and his affairs which exist because of thought would be a nonentity without it.”

Now, one man seeking to change the thought of another does not amount to much. It is when a large number of persons organize into what is termed a movement for the purpose of destroying cer-

tain existing ideas, thoughts or beliefs, and establishing wholly different ideas, thoughts or beliefs, that the matter becomes serious. When the situation reaches such a stage, we term each group a School of Thought.

There are in the world today two Schools of Thought dealing specifically with government and economics, and we are dealing wholly with these two subjects in order to gain a full knowledge of the facts that we may determine whether or not we should make a change. Government and economics are the foundation stones upon which rest existing society and all of the institutions it includes, such as the home, the church, the private property right, patriotism, national loyalty, morality, etc. If the present form of government and the operating formula of economics are radically changed, or if either one of them is radically changed, then society as it exists will be radically changed. The careful thinkers and students say the change will be for the worse; the loose thinkers and the idealists say for the better. The former base their conclusions on proven and well sustained evidence; the latter base theirs on desires and emotions, plus the "lure of loot," the lure of the limelight, and the desire to break away from certain restraints now imposed upon them by existing society.

Insofar as government is concerned, one of these Schools of Thought dominates in the United States, and insofar as economics are concerned, this same School of Thought dominates not only in the United States but in practically all other civilized countries. There is only one so-called civilized country, in fact, in which it does not dominate and that is Russia—a Socialist country.

Many Socialists, or at least many followers of the Socialist School of Thought will not take kindly to using Russia as an example of the failure of Socialism. And yet Russia is a Socialist government. The very name is "The United Socialist Soviet Republics." Those who are now running the country insist they are placing the theories of Marx in operation. When the present regime took control, the Socialists of the United States were loud in their praise of the action. The Socialist party in its appeal for party unity (*New York Call*, July 19, 1919) used this language:

"Promptly, and notwithstanding all obstacles and persecution, the Socialist Party hurried to the front in defense of the cause of our Russian Comrades. Mass meetings were held, demonstrations in behalf of Soviet Russia were arranged, our Socialist press gave all possible support to counteract the sinister work of the American capitalist press."

Debs, then the local patron saint of Socialism, in the March, 1919, "Party News," the official organ of the Socialist Party of Philadelphia, wrote:

"In Russia and Germany our valiant Comrades are leading the proletarian revolution, which knows no race, no color, no sex and no boundary lines. They are setting the heroic example for world-wide emulation. Let us, like them, scorn and repudiate the cowardly compromises within our ranks, challenge and defy the robber-class power, and fight it out on that line to victory or death! From the crown of my head to the soles of my feet I am Bolshevik, and am proud of it." (The above two quotations are from pages 59 and 60, "The Red Conspiracy," by Joseph Mereto, New York, 1920.)

In seeking evidence to sustain our contention as to just what the Socialist Party stands for, we naturally turn to the writings of Morris Hillquit, who is an outstanding figure in international Socialism. He is the author of a book entitled "From Marx to Lenin." In that book he brands the government in Russia as a Socialist government in the following language:

"In Russia the revolution has been accomplished. In other countries it is yet to come. * * * In Russia the *Socialists* are in possession of the powers of government and their immediate political task is to maintain themselves in power. In the western countries the bourgeoisie is in political control, and the immediate political task of the workers is to wrest the power from the hands of their opponents." (Page 129.) "The Russian Revolution is beyond doubt the greatest event in the history of *Socialism* * * *" (Page 139). "The Russian Revolution has suddenly ushered in a new era in the *Socialist* movement of the world—the era of direct efforts for the practical realization of the Socialist program * * *" (Page 140). "To the mass of the workers and non-workers Soviet Russia is and always will be a *practical demonstration of Socialism at work*, and the prototype of all *Socialist* governments. The success of the Russian struggle will inspire and stimulate the *Socialist* movement of all countries" (Page 141). (Emphasis supplied.)

One of these Schools of Thought to which we referred, is called "Capitalism"; the other "Socialism," known in the United States sometimes as "liberalism" and "internationalism" and in Great Britain as "labour."

The advocates of the latter school have, with marked cleverness, used the words capitalist, capitalism and the term capitalist government in such a manner as to create a wholly false concept in the minds of many. In order to better understand the situation, permit us here to set forth briefly, proper definitions of these words and this term:

Capital is the excess of production over consumption which excess, because he possesses the private property right, remains that of the individual who produced it.

Capitalism is that system of economics which supports the private property right principle and enables one exercising it to use for his own benefit whatever surplus he may obtain because of his initiative, energy, ability, skill, genius, labor, etc.

A *capitalist government* is any form of government—republic, democracy, monarchy, dictatorship, etc.—that sustains the individual in the exercise of that right.

These words and this term, however, are so used in Socialist literature and by Socialist agitators that, in the mind of the reader or listener, *capital* has come to mean great wealth in the hands of one person or a few persons; *capitalism*, the economic principle that enables one person or a small group of persons to acquire great wealth; and a *capitalist government*, one operated for, by, and wholly in the interest of, those who have attained great wealth. Even certain educated persons have accepted the Socialist definitions and are doing all they can to implant the theory in the minds of the rising generation.

Now it is the Socialist School of Thought that has declared war on the Capitalist School of Thought. The Socialist School is engaged in an active and persistent campaign to destroy the strong position of the government of the United States, the strength of which, as we have seen, is the existence in the minds of the people of the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism, the spirit of individualism. And what a shocking defense we are making! With all that has proven desirable, with all that has been demonstrated as just and elevating, we sit supinely by and permit the inoculation of unsound theories into the minds of the rising generation—those who in a few years will be in voting command in this nation! Through a system of slow poison we are wrecking a great people. Far better open warfare with military machinery in place and at play!

The capitalist School of Thought in the United States, in the realm of government, holds to the theory that a form of government such as outlined in and established under the Constitution, is best fitted to the advancement, the happiness and the prosperity of all the people. This form is representative and sets up a Republic. "We were instituted as a Republic and down to today have remained a Republic," writes Charles Stewart Davison ("The Alien in Our Midst," page 55). "* * * Few if any know or appreciate the fundamental difference between a republic and a democracy. They use the names but know nothing of the meaning. There is only one differentiation of principle involved. The theory of republic is that no man shall speak for himself, that every man shall be heard in governmental affairs through his representative. The theory of a democracy is that every man shall constantly have his own way, shall speak for himself, shall judge for himself, shall act for himself.

There can be in this world but one pure democracy—a single individual living alone in the desert. Here observe that this would be pure autocracy.”

Do not confuse the words Republican and Democratic as applied to certain political parties in the United States with the correct meaning of the words republic and democracy.

Our form of government places the management of affairs in the hands of persons selected and elected by the people. The right to vote is not determined by birth, breeding, standing, wealth, race or ability. All citizens of legal age can express their preference at the polls—at least they have the right to do so and if they do not exercise that right, they have no excuse to offer if things fail to go as they desire. In this respect our form of government differs greatly from that advanced by the Socialist School of Thought, which recognizes the right of but one class, those called “workers,” to vote, or to hold an office under their form of government.

The Capitalist School of Thought in the realm of economics holds to the theory that the greatest good comes to the greatest number, and that individual success, prosperity, contentment and happiness are advanced, and so national success, prosperity, contentment and happiness are advanced more rapidly, through the operation of what we call the “profit” system, or, more often, the “private property right” system. Capitalism, in other words, in the realm of economics is the “private property right” system, as distinguished from the ownership of all property in common. This system has been tried for ages and not found wanting. Every advancement in science, art, literature, music, industry, etc., traces its source to the economic system styled Capitalism—to the right of the individual to acquire, own, hold, sell, transfer, devise and bequeath property.

Now, this School of Thought, after establishing its formula by combining the old and proven theory of economics with the new theory of government as expressed in the Constitution (and that was only a theory when adopted), put the combined formula into effect in the newly formed nation called the United States of America. The trial has lasted over one hundred and fifty years. The formula has been sustained and proven by accomplishments. In other words, it has been demonstrated as a true and correct formula, or theory.

The opposing School, known as the Socialist School of Thought, offers a wholly different and antagonistic formula. It presents the theory that the government best fitted to our people, the one that will bring to the individual and so to the nation as a whole the greatest good, prosperity, happiness and contentment, is one wherein only those enjoy the voting franchise who belong to a self-constituted class called “workers,” and wherein only those who are mem-

bers of this so-called special class can become agents of the people in the management of the affairs of the government. In other words, that only those called "workers" are allowed to vote or to hold office. While having much to say about democracy, the Socialist form approaches autocracy. Where, indeed, can be found a more autocratic government on the face of the globe today than that of Russia, officially called "The United Socialist Soviet Republics"?

In the realm of economics the Socialist School of Thought advances a formula that is equally as unique. This theory is that no individual shall be entitled to the fruits of his own efforts; that whatever may be the fruits of one's individual initiative, energy, skill, genius, ability and labor shall be for the use and the benefit of society as a whole rather than for the use of the individual who thus creates.

And so—it naturally follows—the right to acquire, own, hold, sell, transfer, devise and bequeath property shall not be possessed by the individual, but all property shall be owned by the people in common. Further, the Socialist School of Thought advances the formula that all the power of the government which it establishes shall be used to prevent the individual from undertaking to exercise the right to own property or in any way personally to enjoy the fruits of his individual efforts.

And so we find that two Schools of Thought teaching diametrically opposed theories of government and economics divide the people into two camps. The issue is clear and well defined. As a matter of fact even the issue which brought on the civil conflict in 1862 was not as menacing to the future peace and welfare of the people as the present one.

We all follow the capitalist School of Thought. That is, we believe in our form of government and its institutions. We hold that this form of government grants more liberties and privileges to the individual citizen than any other. We believe that the institutions of church and home both are well protected by our form of government. We believe in the economic system which grants the private property right to the individual, which system is styled capitalism.

The question then for all of us is simply and frankly this: *Shall we retain what we have attained or shall we permit those who hold wholly contrary views concerning government and economics, to gain control in the United States?*

(Copyright 1930)

LECTURE No. 4

THE VALUE OF OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

We have noted that the power which maintains this government and its institutions was found in the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism as these have existed, and still do exist, in the minds of the people. Moreover, we have learned that those who would abolish our present form of government with its institutions and who would establish a wholly different form, with wholly different institutions, recognize that ere they can accomplish their ends they must destroy the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism—this power, if you please.

In consequence, we divided those who hold to the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism and so believe in and desire to sustain our form of government with its institutions, and those who hold wholly opposite beliefs, into two schools of thought—one called the Capitalist and the other the Socialist. And this we have done because our form of government is sustained wholly because of a line of *thought*, or a *belief*, and because those who would destroy this form of government must eradicate existing thought or belief before they can establish their own thought or belief.

The whole theory of the Socialist School of Thought is predicated on the assumption that a form of government which sustains the private property right does not operate for the common good of the majority of people; that such a government divides the people into two classes, one usually called the exploiters or capitalists, and the other usually called the exploited, or workers; that these two classes can have nothing in common and that a bitter war must be waged by the latter, alleged to be in the minority, in order to destroy the system which we recognize as the private property right.

In the preceding lecture we dealt at some length with this question of the so-called "class struggle." It was pointed out, and I hope clearly, that there is no such "struggle"; that the term is used wholly as a slogan to win as converts those who lay all their troubles

to our government or to our economic system. By adopting what they term the "class struggle," those directing the Socialist School of Thought start with a false premise and, it necessarily follows, they arrive at a false conclusion. Because of the importance of this phase of all Socialist literature, no matter under what name presented, a few additional citations of authority seem desirable.

The Socialist platform adopted in 1908 (Proceedings of the National Convention of The Socialist Party, page 324) reads: "Sec. 5: All persons joining the Socialist Party shall sign the following pledge: '*I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class,*' etc. * * *" (Emphasis supplied.)

This declaration, in some form or manner, has appeared in all Socialist platforms since that date. The platform for 1928 expresses the same idea in this language ("The Intelligent Voter's Guide, Official 1928 Campaign Handbook of the Socialist Party," page 11): "It (the Socialist Party) is our political weapon in the *class struggle*. * * *"

David P. Berenberg, who is a recognized Socialist writer, in his little pamphlet, "Socialism," issued by the Rand School, page 32, says: "The Socialist Party is frankly a class party. It makes no pretense of representing the interests of the whole people."

If the Socialist Party does not pretend to represent the interests of the whole people, by what process of reasoning do the followers of the Socialist School of Thought arrive at the conclusion that its success will mean more happiness, contentment, prosperity for the whole people? In truth, Socialist leaders do not so contend. Their position, on the contrary, is that, if in power, the Socialists will advance only those of one class, that is, those who accept as gospel the Socialist theory, to the injury of those of another class, that is, those who refuse to accept the Socialist theory; will confiscate the property of the latter in order that those of the former may enjoy the same.

Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 244) referring to the Marxian theory of the "class struggle" says two things can be said of it: "First, that it is false; secondly, that it is pernicious." And again (page 247), "It is more than a mistaken theory; it is a causeless and abominable battle cry." Prof. Arthur Shadwell ("The Socialist Movement," Vol. I, page 180) says the "class struggle" slogan "is only a euphemism for strife."

There is nothing wrong with our form of government; nothing wrong with the institutions existing because of that form of government; nothing wrong with the economic system. Certain persons may believe there is a great deal wrong in that they do not, from their point of view, enjoy the prosperity, contentment, etc., which they hold they should. Where and when such conditions exist—and they always will exist so long as there are human weaknesses and frailties—they are due not to the form of government or the economic system, or the institutions which go to make up existing society. They are due either to the weaknesses or frailties of those who suffer or think they suffer, or they are due to the *administration* of government or economics—never to form. It is the *form* that those who follow the Socialist School of Thought would change.

You have not failed to note, although possibly giving it little thought, that when some group of individuals becomes discontented because of a condition which is not pleasing to them, they at once assume that the government, our institutions, or our economic system, is at fault. They demand some form of legislation to correct the evil. This idea did not find fertile soil in the minds of the people of a quarter of a century ago. It has become more or less prominent today because of the teachings of the Socialist School of Thought, and this School has gained a dangerous position in the United States largely because of our lax immigration policy of the past.

“The average citizen looks upon the law as a natural remedy for all evils,” writes Charles E. Carpenter (“Dollars and Sense,” page 126). “Actually law is, or should be, the last resort for the correction of evil. It is intended to be the lesser of two evils.” And in another connection (page 123): “Government is primarily for the protection of its citizens and whenever a government attempts to function beyond the protection of its citizens it is a failure.” Still again (page 94): “Fanatics have tried to build a smooth concrete legislative road to Heaven ever since the existence of Heaven has been admitted, but the rough old road to Hell is as busy as ever.”

Those who are denouncing our form of government with its institutions, which include the home and the church, assume that a few fault-finders are the majority of the people. As a matter of fact they constitute a very small, although an exceedingly noisy, minority. In most cases of actual distress or suffering, an investigation will

show that the condition is due to some human trait—laziness, shiftlessness, drink, lack of ambition. Misfortunes, of course, are responsible for some such cases. But search as you will, you cannot locate even one instance in the United States where the government or our economic system is directly responsible. The remedy then lies with the individual. Legislation does not correct human faults.

“You can’t make human beings perfect, and so long as this is a fact you are not going to make anything perfect over which human beings have control,” writes Mr. Carpenter (above citation, page 94). “The degree of perfection which is attained will be in direct proportion to the perfection of the human beings in control.” He adds (page 109). “There seems to be an unexplainable trait in human character to get something for nothing. This trait is natural, deep-seated, and shows itself in many ways.”

We take it from the general character of its activities that the New School of Social Research, New York City, is devoted to the advancement of Socialism. Therefore what one of its lecturers said should be considered good authority from the Socialist point of view. One such lecturer is Everitt Dean Martin. He evidently does not hold that the ills we suffer are the direct result of our form of government or our institutions. He says, (“Psychology and Its Use,” page 19) that “much of the evil which humanity suffers flows from the inability or unwillingness of men to face the facts of their natures. * * * There are still in the nature of all of us anti-social wishes, savage traits, childish egoistic tendencies.”

Ere we go more fully into the origin and system of operation of the Socialist School of Thought, let us devote a bit more time to our own government. Do not think I am unnecessarily stressing this feature of the study. No one fights for a thing unless he appreciates its merit and the harm or displeasure that will come to him through its loss. Pardon my fear that we do not all fully appreciate the merits of our form of government and its institutions. And so let us better understand just what this government is, just what it was established to do. Let us see whether the objectives, as stated by the founders, have been attained, and whether or not something far better, or far greater, would be attained if our present form of government were set aside and an entirely new one established—the form proposed by the Socialist School of Thought.

The United States of America is a great corporation. Indeed, the greatest corporation of its kind in the world. The residents of the

United States, aliens as well as citizens, are the stockholders in this great corporation. The stock is divided into two classes, "A" and "B". The owners of the "A" stock, being citizens, have a voice in the selection of the management. The owners of the "B" stock, not being citizens, have no voice in this selection. But even these "B" stockholders, indirectly, are represented in the Congress. We apportion membership in the House of Representatives on the basis of population, not citizenship. The aliens, or "B" stockholders, in consequence, have at least 33 members in the House because if these "B" stockholders, or aliens, were withdrawn from the count there would be about 33 less members in the House, or if the same number of members, then the 33 would be directly representing the "A" stockholders or citizens. Outside of having no vote, and so no voice, in selecting management, the "B" stockholders enjoy all the privileges of the "A" stockholders.

All of these stockholders, citizens as well as aliens, are drawing larger dividends in happiness, security, contentment, prosperity, success and individual freedom than are the stockholders of any similar corporation in the world. It is true there are fault-finders and kickers. There always have been fault-finders and kickers. It is a trait of human nature. Philosophers, scientists, religious leaders, inventors and learned individuals in every walk of life, and in nearly every country, since the beginning of written history and probably long before, have sought to find a method whereby this and other undesirable human traits might be eliminated. All have failed.

The Socialist School of Thought overlooks wholly the question of human traits. It goes on the assumption that, take the private property right from the individual, and there will be none who exhibits traits of envy, jealousy, greed, avarice, lust, etc. There is no evidence to show that these frailties are so easily removed. Wrongs and ills that may affect the people of the United States are due to these traits, not to the form of government or to our economic system. Certainly it requires no evidence to support this contention.

Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," pages 347-8) writes: "*Socialism misreads and misrepresents human nature.* Not only is it objectively wrong; it is subjectively false. * * * Its assertion of equality as a primary fact is an illusion, and its elevation of equality as an ideal is a challenge to every healthy person's instinct of emulation and desire to distinguish himself from

his fellows by some excellence. * * * The efforts of socialism to extinguish private enterprise and to eradicate competition are mortal blows to those creative, combative, and acquisitive instincts which—however much they may have been abused when unrestrained by conscience—are the very mainsprings of man's most effective economic activities. * * * The socialist mentality is the mentality of the underman, to whom equality means levelling down of superiors; for whom competition connotes defeat and humiliation; and in whose hands private enterprise is but another name for rapid descent into the bankruptcy court."

Harold Cox ("Economic Liberty," pages 199-200), referring to the disposition of the Socialists to brush aside human traits, writes: "This is an aspect of the matter which socialists never seem capable of understanding. Their creed is essentially inhuman; by which I mean it is entirely removed from the real facts of human life. There are certain fundamental instincts which have been with us since the world began, and will be with us till the world ends. Prominent among these are the love of possession, the love of offspring and the love of liberty."

"The assumption that people will behave quite differently and shed their former bad habits under the new order is implicit in all Socialist schemes. It is the oil that is counted on to secure smooth working", writes Prof. Arthur Shadwell in "The Breakdown of Socialism" (page 28).

"Until you make human beings perfect and see that none but perfect human beings are vested with the power of government there can be no such thing as a perfect government," writes Charles E. Carpenter ("Dollars and Sense", page 127).

Fault-finders and kickers often are those who, because of their own deficiencies, want to place all blame on someone else, or upon something else. They delight in finding alibis for themselves. Since they do not wish to admit—in fact cannot be induced to admit—that their lack of success, happiness, etc. is due to their individual acts, they readily accept the suggestion that the fault lies with the government, or the institutions maintained and sustained by the government, or with our economic system.

Probably there is no corporation, small or large, doing business in any part of the world that does not number among its stockholders at least one fault-finder—one persistent and ever present

kicker who has no foundation for his position. In all corporations stockholders will be found who are certain they could run the business far better, could make it pay larger dividends, could cut out much waste and increase efficiency, if only given a chance.

Here, again, the doctrines expounded in the Socialist School of Thought assume that if the private property right is removed and all production is for common use and benefit there will be far greater efficiency and less waste in production and distribution. The very assumption is absurd on its face. To reason that a man who can not enjoy the fruits of his own energy will work harder or produce more in a given time than one who is permitted to enjoy what he earns is to controvert human nature.

Prof. Harry W. Laidler is a recognized Socialist writer and advocate. In his book "Socialism in Thought and Action," the very first chapter is devoted to waste under the capitalist system. On page 11 he says: "There are many counts in the socialist indictment. One of the chief of these is that capitalism involves enormous wastes in material and in men, both in the realm of production and in that of distribution."

Prof. Laidler touches on wastes in manufacturing, agriculture, natural resources, advertising, traveling salesmen, distribution, etc. "Even when labor is expended in producing actual necessities of life, many wastes are in evidence that could be eliminated under a cooperative system," he writes (page 13). Nowhere in the book, however, is cited any evidence that the cooperative system—that is, a Socialist government—could prevent any of these alleged wastes. The writer is a professor. It is hard to visualize him, or others who express the same point of view, exhibiting managerial capacities in manufacturing or transportation that are not exhibited by men who have devoted years in seeking to eliminate every possible waste in these lines. To claim that money spent in advertising, or for salesmen, is a form of waste is not in keeping with the facts.

In a few instances these fault-finding corporation stockholders have induced a majority of the Board to believe that they could accomplish all they claim and have been given positions of authority. We know of no case where this has happened in which the corporation did not prove far less efficient, and its dividends disappear. Then, after a majority of the stockholders ousted these wise persons and returned skilled and trained managers to com-

mand, the fault-finders, the kickers, have always presented their excuses—they were not given the necessary time to show what they could do or they were not given the opportunity to make their methods effective. That's an old, old alibi. Certain it is that you will find it presented as the excuse for fault-finders and kickers for many centuries back.

One might be induced to give some support to the theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought if those who follow it could point to just one instance where its theories have been tried and proven successful. Since no such illustration has been cited, but after each failure only an alibi that will not hold water, reasoning people will continue to doubt the value of the theories. For more than ten years now, Socialism has been on trial in Russia. The world has come to understand its marked failures. Bitterly opposed to Capitalism, its leaders have been in every Capitalist country on the face of the globe seeking to borrow money accumulated because of the Capitalist system in order through Socialism to demonstrate that Capitalism is a failure.

Why did not the leaders of Socialist Russia, when they came into possession of all the wealth of that country and had repudiated all financial obligations of that government, employ that wealth to demonstrate the merits of the theories they follow? Had they shown that the system was superior to the capitalist system, certainly all other nations would have been willing to give it more consideration. This, however, they did not do. On the contrary, they devoted the wealth that came into their hands to carrying on propaganda in other countries in a vicious attempt to force Socialism upon these other countries and this Socialism, mind you, always to be under the dictatorship of Moscow. The leaders of Soviet Russia have, in the past five years or more, presented innumerable alibis for their failures. The trouble with them and others who follow their doctrines is that they can not point to performance and therefore indulge in excuses.

And so, when we hear fault-finders and kickers among the stockholders of the great corporation known as the United States of America, we need not be surprised. It would be impossible, considering the variety of human traits, not to find a small army of them in a corporation with around a hundred and twenty million stockholders. The important thing is not that we have them, but to determine whether they have legitimate reasons for fault-finding.

A corporation, when formed, states in its articles of incorporation specifically the purpose for which it is formed, and usually does this in a few terse sentences. The balance of the document goes into detail as to machinery to be set up to carry out the purposes, how the organization shall be managed, the duties of different officials, the location of the main office, the method of handling funds, etc.

So it is with the Constitution of the United States which, in effect, constitutes our articles of incorporation. The purposes for which this government—this great corporation—was founded are set forth in just fifty-five words, and these words constitute the preamble to the Constitution. How many persons in the United States, stockholders in this great corporation, have ever read that preamble with care and understanding?

The men who formulated the Constitution had in mind certain well defined purposes. They knew what they wanted the corporation to do, what it was they proposed it should do. Numbered and paragraphed, our objectives under the Constitution are as follows:

1. To form a more perfect union (that is, union of the states);
2. To establish justice;
3. To insure domestic tranquility;
4. To provide for the common defense;
5. To promote the general welfare; and
6. To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

The question, then, for every stockholder in this great corporation—the government of the United States of America—to consider before he sponsors reformistic remedies emanating from certain organizations alien in their control, is *whether or not these six objectives have been attained*, and has the attainment benefitted him as an individual? If a stockholder believes they have been attained, then certainly he does not want any change in the corporation that will destroy the good result. If he believes they have not been attained, then, before he adopts the remedies proposed by the fault-finders and kickers who follow the Socialist School of Thought, he should give some attention to the nature of the remedies and be assured these remedies, if put into operation, will secure the desired ends. A careful investigation makes certain facts clear.

We *have* formed a more perfect union. We have 48 great commonwealths known as states, each with its separate government determined by its own citizens, each handling its internal affairs,

yet all proceeding in harmonious accord. We hear no threats of rebellion on the part of any state. We find, so interwoven are the affairs of the people of all these states, that the prosperity and welfare of those of one state have marked effects upon the prosperity and welfare of all the others. And so we must all agree that the first objective of the corporation has been attained. Could more have been secured, could better results have been obtained through the adoption of the program of the Socialist School of Thought?

We *have* established justice. Now right here the great army of fault-finders and kickers, who gain great personal gratification by keeping themselves in the limelight, will deny that we have secured justice. They will point to certain cases which they have used to further their emotional appeal, cases wherein men or women have been found guilty of a crime while employing force and violence to put into operation the theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought. Those thus found guilty they call "political prisoners."

Because two well known advocates of force and violence to overthrow the government of the United States—Sacco and Vanzetti—were convicted of a murder in Massachusetts and paid the penalty with their lives, the world Socialist movement inaugurated a general campaign to show that there was no justice in the United States for the "working man." Remember when the term "working man" is used in cases like this the reference is not to those who earn a daily wage but to those who accept and follow the Socialist theory. The trouble with these two men was that most of their work consisted, not in producing that they and their families might benefit from their efforts, but in promoting acts of violence in the belief that through this system they could overthrow the government. Much has been said in the press about this case. It has been used not only to extend propoganda but to secure money from emotional and non-thinking persons for additional propoganda. Able jurists who have gone over the records of the case carefully hold the men were rightfully convicted.

The recent conviction of a number of Communists in North Carolina for the killing of the chief of police of Gastonia, is another illustration of the charge that the "working man" can get no justice under the laws of the United States. These North Carolina Cases, that of Sacco and Vanzetti in Massachusetts, that of certain I. W. W. leaders, convicted of killing Legion men during an Armis-

tice Day parade at Centralia, Washington, and many others, have been used to raise money and extend propaganda designed to injure the government of the United States, its institutions and its economic system. This is a part of the general breaking-down system.

Others of the fault-finding, kicking group will point out a single case of justice gone amiss. They lay great stress on this one exception and overlook the thousands that have followed the rule. An individual misapplication of a principle does not affect the correctness of that principle. A mistake in addition certainly does not reflect on the proven and known principle of mathematics. Because some untrained musician in an orchestra strikes a discord, it does not follow that the principle of harmony is wrong, or that the composition is at fault. Wherever there has been a miscarriage of justice, it has not been due to our *form* of government but to the frailty of human nature.

The fellow who is always looking for the exception rather than the rule is not only in mighty poor business but he is doing himself harm as well. He is like the person who visits a fine art gallery. On the wall is a magnificent painting. It is the work of a great master, an inspiration, if you please. While all others view this masterpiece with awe and admiration, the fault-finding person rushes up and pushes his way to the front. Seeing a mere speck of dirt in the corner, he turns to the others and pointing to the dust, with the air of a great critic, exclaims, "Great? I should say not! It is a daub! Why, look at that terrible blemish in the corner!"

His eyes can not appreciate the good, the beauty, the charm of that picture. He can only see blemishes, faults and errors. And so he goes through the world, from cradle to coffin-bed, making much of the bad, finally passing to a place where he can eternally enjoy himself since in that realm there is reputed to be nothing good.

We *have* established justice in the United States, established it upon a firm and sound jurisprudence. Miscarriages there may be but these miscarriages are never the fault of the system, the principle. Rather they are the fault of individuals who misapply the principle. Who is there to say that by abrogating a principle and experimenting with an unproven theory, better results can be attained? The people of the nation can rest secure, at all times and in all places, in the possession of their individual rights because we have established justice, justice alike to the rich and the poor, to the citizen and the alien, to the humble and the aristocrat.

Noting what we have done in this corporation for the benefit of all the stockholders in the matter of individual justice, do these stockholders wish now to abolish the proven and experiment with the unproven?

We *have* insured domestic tranquility. That is to say, we have established the most harmonious relations between the people of all states and all sections of this great nation. True it is that the fault-finder and kicker is not pleased. He wants to stir up trouble if he can—and he does his best to that end. Domestic tranquility to him appears to have no value. He would set East against West, North against South, the farmers against the bankers, the workers against the employers, the whites against the colored, the aliens against the citizens, etc. He is the busiest little trouble-maker in the world when it comes to preventing domestic tranquility, and yet with all his efforts he has not disturbed that tranquility to any great extent. Here and there, now and then, he has created something of a ripple upon the otherwise placid surface, but his motives became known and he disappeared from the scene only to be followed by some other fault-finder, some other kicker, with a wholly different basis for his trouble-making.

The theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought were brought to the United States by aliens. James O Neal, a Socialist writer (“American Communism,” page 54), calls attention to the fact that as late as 1919, 53 per cent of the total membership of the Socialist Party were in foreign language federations. And again (page 70) he says that “the foreign federations constituted the overwhelming bulk of the membership of the Communist Party convention and easily controlled its deliberations.”

The fact that the theories of the Socialist School of Thought were imported and that these theories are held by such a large number of foreign-born furnishes fertile soil to create a bitter feeling in the minds of such persons against old line Americans who oppose their doctrines and their tactics. This is probably far more marked among the followers of the Communist wing of the movement than elsewhere. This wing formed an organization known as the Council for the Protection of Foreign Born Workers. The lack of understanding of our ways, our language, our laws, enables the skilled agitator to implant into the minds of those who join this organization the belief that the sole purpose of our immigration restriction

laws is to injure the foreign born. At this time the Communist wing of the Socialist movement is devoting a great deal of time and effort in an attempt to arouse the colored people against the whites.

No one can question the fact that under our Constitution we have attained domestic tranquility. Having attained it, why consider a quack remedy to weaken the patient?

We *have*, in the past, provided for the common defense. In the body of the Constitution we find detailed plans for the machinery by which we shall maintain a common defense. Eighteen separate paragraphs are given over to this one subject because, without a proper and efficient common defense, the other objectives could not be attained, or if attained, could not be maintained. In recent years we have experienced a growing disposition on the part of certain groups to destroy this all-important objective. Defense being the keystone of the whole program of purposes expressed in the preamble to the Constitution, its destruction would mean failure of all other aims.

It does not take a student to locate the source of this character of fault-finding. Every movement yet presented to destroy, or weaken, the common defenses of the people of the United States originated in other lands. The present pacifist movement, into which so many well-meaning and sincere persons have been drawn, did not originate in the United States. It is an alien movement although it has many noisy American sponsors, all of whom, one is forced to assume, little understand the nature or seriousness of their activities.

The plan to weaken and finally destroy our "common defenses" originated in an international Socialist convention many years ago. The program then outlined has been reiterated at practically all similar conventions since then. The Socialists contend, in substance, that the only way to put into practice their theory—often presented in the United States as "liberalism" and "internationalism"—is to establish a government wherein the private property right is denied the individual; is to deprive those who believe in the private property right of the necessary machinery to protect themselves against revolutionary movements designed to destroy them. The objective, mind you, is always the same—the abolition of the private property right. In a later lecture evidence will be cited to show the origin and purpose of what is now commonly called the "pacifist movement."

But, notwithstanding the efforts of groups who cleverly aim their thunderbolts at the keystone of our whole system, we have so far, maintained a common defense and the question before us now is—*Shall that defense be maintained with equal efficiency in the future!*

We *have* promoted the general welfare of the people. Here, again, we hear the discordant, rasping voices of the fault-finders and kickers. Because they have not attained all they believe they, personally, should have attained, they find fault with others. They insist there is no prosperity while others, through honest effort, are demonstrating and enjoying that prosperity. They deny there is any happiness, and yet they see about them millions of happy people. They insist there is no opportunity for them to gain the mere necessities of life and yet, at the same time, they ride around in their automobiles or sit in comfortable chairs in steam-heated, electric-lighted, elevator-equipped apartments, and hear over the radio the highest paid artists the world knows. They bemoan the terrible conditions that affect them and yet take their families to the theatres, out on long drives on Sundays, or enjoy any of the thousands of well written books and novels at free public libraries.

But did you ever know a fault-finder or a kicker who did not take special delight in turning the limelight that brought into bold relief his own faults, on some other person or some other thing? These poor devils are more to be pitied than censured, even though they cause a great deal of harm in this world. Selfishness, the "lure of loot," is, as a matter of fact, their inspiration, their hope. They worship only that which they think others have attained. "You shall be as gods knowing all without the trouble of learning anything. You shall be as Kings possessing everything without the trouble of acquiring anything," writes Eliphaz Levi ("The History of Magic," page 395). Then he adds: "Such is a fair summary of the promises of the revolutionary spirit of the envious multitude." Little do the fault-finders understand that if they have failed, it is because of their own deficiencies. Not one of them can advance any sound logic or present any reliable evidence to show that our form of government with its institutions or our economic system is responsible. Neither is responsible. The fault lies with themselves.

That we *have* promoted the general welfare of the people is self-evident. The United States of America today is the wealthiest nation on the face of the globe and is using that wealth unselfishly for the common good of mankind, regardless of origin or creed. In our country the people enjoy more real luxuries than elsewhere. Here more people own their own homes; more ride in their own automobiles; more listen-in on their own radios; more have bank accounts and more people are regularly employed at good wages or salaries than in any other land. And here the individual property

right, that thing called Capitalism, has advanced a people more rapidly than at any other time in history.

Those who are the most vehement in their fault-finding and denunciation of American institutions, are likewise the most vehement in their denunciation of all who insist on rigid immigration laws. If this country is as bad as they paint it, why, pray tell, are they so anxious that their relatives and friends should come from some other land and partake of our misery? If this country is in the grip of Capitalism, then certainly Russia is in the grip of Socialism. Instead of the hundreds of thousands of many lands, figuratively standing in line for a chance to come to the "poverty stricken" United States, why do not these persons go to "prosperous" Russia, the emancipated; go there and demonstrate that a nation in which the private property right is not recognized, where religion is banned, where morality is at its lowest ebb, is the home of the free and contented? We have heard nothing about Russia finding it necessary to restrict immigration.

And so we *have* attained general welfare to a degree of which even the founders did not dream. We have promoted the general welfare of all the people and when we say all, we mean all those who have or have had brains enough, energy enough, willingness enough to partake of that which is spread before them. A form of government and a system of economics such as ours is responsible for this general welfare, notwithstanding all the cries of the professional fault-finders and kickers. The question, then, that should be uppermost in the mind of every American citizen is: "*Shall I discard the proven for the untried?*"

We *have* secured the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Moreover, we have welcomed the people of other nations who have come here to partake of those blessings. Many of those from other lands have become good American citizens; others, figuratively, have taken our welcome as an invitation to help themselves to everything that is not nailed down. These simple and wrongly guided minds confuse liberty with license; confuse the right to work with the right to rob; confuse the common defense with individual force for individual advantage. Many of them assume that their rights transcend ours. They have misapplied the "blessings of liberty" and we have found it necessary in literally thousands of cases to jail some and deport others. This has incensed them and their friends. As a result those of these groups remaining, those fortunate enough to escape both jail and deportation, join hands with the professional kickers and fault-finders, attach themselves to the Socialist School of Thought, think only in terms of "the lure of loot," and proclaim in loud voices, and in many languages, that they are going to unite and destroy this government with its institutions in order that they, selfishly, may enjoy that which many generations of pioneers struggled hard to attain for their posterity.

John E. Edgerton, president of the National Association of Manufacturers ("The Alien in Our Midst," pages 5-6), touching the tendency of certain immigrants to demand that we change our manners and customs to accord with theirs, writes:

"In the name of tolerance and liberalism we have permitted, until within very recent years, the practically unrestricted invasion of our national household by foreign hordes, many of whom have brought and kept inferior moral and political conceptions, ideals and habits. By the millions they have come to our shores through the last half century, and while the sturdier elements have made contributions to our progress, an infinitely larger number have been a continuous national liability.

"Drunk upon the wine of freedom which they have never before tasted, they have attempted with menacing success, to teach us new and strange lessons in tolerance, liberalism and alleged personal liberty. As fast as they have complained at any of our moral or political conceptions and practices, we have, in the pride of our good sportsmanship, compromised with them. They have not liked the way that we once observed the Sabbath Day of our fathers, and in our larger cities it has been abandoned to the uncultured and uncontrolled uses of irreverence. They did not like to see the Holy Bible in our public schools, and as good liberals we gave it up to placate their dissatisfaction. They did not admire our Constitution and laws, and we have been doing our best for many years to adjust them to their liking. The courts of our land have been irksome to them, and have interfered too much with their conception of personal liberty, and there are many Americans who would compromise now in this vital matter."

In dealing with the question as to whether or not we have attained the six objectives expressly stated in the Constitution of the United States, I have been talking about *form*, not *management*. I have been discussing principles not individuals. Be careful to note the distinction. That there are many wrongs, evils, and ills in a nation of over one hundred and twenty-two million people, is not at all surprising, especially when we consider the racial make-up of this vast number. Now while these wrongs, evils and ills exist *under* our form of government and our economic system they do not exist *because of* our form of government and economic system.

It is the *form* of government and the *formula* of economics that are at issue between two Schools of Thought. Until convincing evidence is presented to show that by changing the form of government and the economic system we will change the characteristics of the people, we will correct human frailties and weaknesses, we will abolish greed, jealousy, laziness, selfishness, shiftlessness, etc., do you not think it wise to stand firmly with the proven and not get our fingers burned with the untried?

(Copyright 1930)

LECTURE No. 5

THE ORDER OF THE ILLUMINATI, THE GRANDPARENT OF SOCIALISM

Our study involves an understanding of theories dealing with government and economics as these theories are advanced by two Schools of Thought. One we call the Capitalist, the other the Socialist, School. The cornerstone of the former is the individual private property right, the right of each individual to own property, the right of each individual to possess and enjoy the fruits of his own initiative, energy, skill, ability, genius, and labor. The cornerstone of the latter is the absence of that right. That is to say, those following the Socialist School of Thought would set up a form of government wherein the individual is not permitted to own property, is denied the fruits of his own initiative, energy, skill, ability, genius and labor, the fruits whatever they may be, great or small, belonging to society as a whole.

In the preceding lecture we dealt briefly with the objectives of the people of the United States when they adopted our existing form of government and accepted the private property right formula. Compare them with the objectives of Socialism as stated in the second lecture. Certainly evidence is not lacking that the form and formula have proven beneficial to the people. The wonderful structure known as the United States of America exists wholly because the people have followed the theories advanced and sustained by the Capitalist School of Thought.

At this time (1930) we are hearing much about "depression," "unemployment," etc. And yet there is no country in the world enjoying as great prosperity right now as the United States. "If we had things in England or Germany as you have them here we would be highly optimistic," is the statement in the *New York Evening Sun* (September 10, 1930) attributed to Sir William Jowett, Attorney-General for Great Britain in the MacDonald (Socialist) cabinet.

Now, each School of Thought is sustained by the *beliefs* of its respective followers. At the present time the predominant *belief* is the one held by the followers of the Capitalist School of Thought. The Socialist School, naturally, can not place its theories in operation until this predominant belief is destroyed and there is established a predominant belief in the theories which this school presents. Our business is to prevent the present followers of the Capitalist School of Thought from deserting, and the business of the sponsors of the Socialist School is to secure such desertion and make followers of them.

The things with which we are directly dealing, then, are *beliefs*. What we are seeking to do is to present conclusive evidence that those who hold to the *beliefs* advanced by the Capitalist School of Thought are correct, and that those who hold to the *beliefs* advanced by the Socialist School of Thought are wrong. We are not dealing with individuals. We are dealing with the theories of government and economics held by certain individuals, which theories induce certain *beliefs* upon which those holding the beliefs act.

It may here be both proper and profitable to consider a well known and established principle of mental action. It is this:

Every person acts according to his beliefs; he gets his beliefs from the character of his thinking; his thinking is guided by and formulated from suggestions of some form or character, the spoken and written word being the most common form of suggestion, although pictures, the movies, cartoons and even music often contain powerful suggestions. Moreover, every person more readily accepts suggestions that are in accord with his desires, and more readily rejects suggestions that are contrary to personal desires. The principal desires of every person are to have more, be more, or do more, than he has, is, or does.

Dr. Thomson Jay Hudson, in "The Law of Mental Medicine," devotes much space to this important phase of mind action. He writes (page 76):

"The subjective mind is 'constantly' controllable and controlled by suggestions, coming either from without or from within, the latter arising from habits of thought, or settled principles, or convictions, or prejudices." Again, (page 25): "And, like every other force in nature, suggestions act most effectively on lines of least resistance. Thus a suggestion that is contrary to the moral principles of the subject will be resisted with strength and persistency proportioned to its moral obliquity."

Stop here just a minute to analyze the above principle. Men's actions are the result of their beliefs. Then before *action* can be changed the *belief* that produced the action must be changed. *Beliefs* are formulated by the character of one's thinking and a train of thought is put in motion by a *suggestion* or a series of *suggestions*. Then it follows that the first step necessary to change one's *action* is to supply the *suggestion* or *suggestions* that will start a new train of thought which, in time, becomes a *belief*. "Suggestion is the painless insertion of new thoughts and ideas into the minds of one with whom one is conversing," writes Prof. Edgar James Swift ("Business Power Through Psychology," page 59). He might have truthfully added that there are many other and more important and effective ways of conveying suggestions.

This principle of mind action is well known to the leaders of the Socialist School of Thought. It is the foundation upon which they base their propaganda. They are trained and skilled in the art of suggestion. In a later lecture we deal with their system of propaganda at length, but the principle of mind action is here pre-

sented in order to enable you the better to understand what follows in this lecture.

If we are to maintain our existing institutions, including the private property right, the church and the home, two things then become necessary:

First: Present the evidence and the logic to convince all that the theories of the Capitalist School of Thought, through trial, have been demonstrated correct, and that their retention will bring the most good, happiness, contentment, pleasure and prosperity to the largest number of people.

Second: Present the evidence and logic to show that the theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought are fallacious and wherever put into practice have invariably proven failures and brought much misery in their wake; and that, without questioning the sincerity of many who have adopted these unsound theories and believe in them, the change advocated by the followers of the Socialist School of Thought could bring only suffering, sorrow and poverty.

By doing this—and we can not do so until we fully understand the whole subject—we will prevent the unthinking, and those who are influenced by emotional appeals, “concern for humanity,” altruistic and abstract statements, from deserting the present Capitalist School of Thought and joining the Socialist School of Thought. Now, clearly, if there is no desertion from the army following the theories advanced and supported by the former School, those theories will continue to dominate in the United States.

Before undertaking to explain the system by which the Socialist School of Thought injects its theories and gains its followers, it is well to know something of the origin of the Socialist movement which operates the present Socialist School of Thought. Aristotle, I believe it was, who said: “In an inquiry the best way to obtain a clear view is to start from the beginning and observe the course of events.”

Philosophers there always have been and always will be. After reading the works of a number of them, one is forced to the conclusion that a philosopher is a fellow who has a decided grouch, is one of our army of fault-finders and kickers. He sets up a theory that places the cause of his grouch upon some one or some thing else. After presenting their theories, philosophers, it would appear, make no attempt to square their deductions with the facts in the case. To set up theories is a mighty easy thing. It requires neither mental nor physical effort, and has become something of a pastime—might we not better say profession?—on the part of certain individuals, who, but for this predilection, might never see their names in print. But demonstrating their theories is quite a different matter. “It is so easy to scoff and so difficult to learn thoroughly,” is a statement of Eliphis Levi (“The History of Magic”). To every hundred theories set up by philosophers of the past and of to-day, ninety-nine have failed in the test.

That the common people are unable to understand the position of philosophers is evidenced by the fact that they admit they cannot understand one another. The *London Post* (September 3, 1930) quotes Prof. R. B. Perry of Harvard as saying in an address before a congress of philosophers at Oxford the day before, "Let philosophers in congress assembled present to the world an example of the joy which men may take in association with others whom they cannot understand. We rejoice in one another and our pleasure is not diminished by the fact that we do not understand one another."

The astonishing thing about the theory advocated by the Socialist School of Thought is that it has been advanced by many people in some form or manner for centuries. Plato presented its idealistic phase. When tried, however, it has failed in every instance. There is no exception. A little over thirteen years ago a trial of this theory was initiated in Russia. Backed by the power of a government founded on force, violence and terrorism, encouraged by powerful influences throughout the world which influences, it would appear, are motivated by the "lure of loot," bolstered by the most extensive and costliest propaganda machine ever known, aided and supported by a large army of "liberals" who glory in the limelight, this Socialist experiment has proven a monumental failure. Instead of curing certain alleged economic, social and political ills, it has extended its demoralizing influences into all civilized countries and brought in its train evils and ills far more menacing to human advancement than those alleged to have existed and which it was to cure.

While a well-oiled and carefully organized propaganda machine to present the merits of the Socialist government of Russia has been, and still is operating, in the United States, evidence from reliable sources tends to show that this Socialist experiment is a gigantic and miserable failure. Today this propaganda machine is supplying the press—and the press is using much of it—material to create the false belief that instead of failure, Socialism is bringing great good to the people of Russia. Wonderful stories of what the Soviet government is *going to do* in the way of advancing the people are given much space. What that government *has done* to destroy peace, happiness and prosperity, however, is given little or no attention.

Prof. Arthur Shadwell, in "The Breakdown of Socialism," devotes considerable space to the failure of the Socialist theory as applied in Russia. In the introduction (page 16) he asks: "What has happened when and where Socialists have gained political power and wielded the authority of government?"

Turning to Russia where Socialism is in complete control of government (page 17) he writes: "Public attention has naturally been directed chiefly to Russia, not only because it is a resounding experiment on a great scale"—experiment in Socialism, mind you—"but also because the Soviet authorities, not content with their own revolution, have always and avowedly aimed at promoting similar revolution in all other countries, and have done their utmost

to achieve that object by systematic propaganda and the creation of an international organization for the express purpose."

Devoting two full chapters to the "experiment" and citing official Soviet documents as authority, Prof. Shadwell shows, with marked clarity, the utter absurdity of the whole theory of Socialism. "The proletarian revolution of Marx," he writes, (page 83) "was to abolish classes. In Russia it has abolished the old ones only to set up others in their place."

Roger Baldwin, whose well known attitude concerning things radical, certainly would cause him to furnish no evidence against the Socialist experiment in Russia, visited that country a few years ago and presents his impressions in a book, "Liberty Under the Soviet." Among other things, he says, "A member's life is controlled by the Party. His job, salary, outside activities, are all subject to orders like a soldier in an army" (page 59). "The Constitution contains no guarantee of rights to individuals" (page 61). "The theory of the Soviet state concerning parents and children is that all children are wards of the State, and parents are merely guardians during their competency to look after them" (page 127). "Freedom of the press exists only as the governing party interprets it in the interests of the Revolution. The censorship constitutes a control more complete and more thorough than has been achieved under any other dictatorship" (page 136), and he admits (page 196) that the dictatorship is forced by "less than one per cent of a people."

While this book of Mr. Baldwin's was evidently intended to bolster the Socialist theory as now practiced in Russia, it damns with faint praise the whole system.

Prof. Charles Sarolea of Edinburgh, in a lecture to the students of the Egyptian University, Cairo, January, 1927 (page 8, printed report), says: "Can we say that the Bolshevik Government is a humane and civilized Government? It is simply impossible under existing conditions that it can ever be made into a civilized government. . . . In the past years the Soviet Government was the most horrible tyranny in the annals of Modern Europe."

According to the Russian census of 1927 (World Almanac, 1928) that country had a total population of a little over 146,000,000. Very few of those acquainted with Russia place the peasant population under 80 per cent of the total and some insist it is fully 90 per cent. But taking the first estimate the peasant population would be, in round numbers, 116,000,000. A writer in the *Saturday Evening Post* for November 29th, 1929, places the total population at 150,000,000 and the peasant population at 120,000,000. An Associated Press dispatch from Moscow under date of November 19th, 1929, as printed in New York City papers, gave the total "membership of the Communist Party which rules Russia" at 1,655,000. "Of this total," reads the dispatch, "64 per cent are factory workers, 21 per cent peasants and 14 per cent of various categories."

Accepting the lower estimates of total and peasant population, according to the dispatch quoted, the 116,000,000 peasants are represented in the control of the affairs of government by about 350,000, or, a per cent of the total so small as to be negligible. When one stops to consider that under Socialism in action, the people have no voice in the government, and that a small percentage, by a system of terrorism, impose their will upon the great majority, the merits of the system will hardly appeal to sane persons.

The excuse now presented for the failure of Socialism in Russia is that the world can not continue to advance part Socialist and part Capitalist. I think we will all agree with that statement. But the Socialists insist that, in order to prove their theory correct and the theory presented by the Capitalist School of Thought wrong, all the nations following the latter should adopt and follow the theory presented by the former. In view of the fact that the Capitalist theory—the one we follow in the United States—has proven beneficial to the people, and the Socialist theory—the one followed in Russia—has proven detrimental to the people, we naturally reject the suggestion.

Prof. Arthur Shadwell ("The Socialist Movement") divides the movement into two periods or phases. The first he presents as beginning in 1824 and continuing until 1848, the second as beginning with 1863 and extending to date.

In the first phase a spirit of benevolence prevailed; in the second, a spirit of bitterness and revolution, says Prof. Shadwell. Referring to the difference between the first and second periods of Socialism as he divides the movement, he says (Vol. 1, Page 50):

"The differences between the two are numerous and great. The first phase had been confined as a movement to France and England, though it attracted attention in other countries; the second was international, but led by Germans and dominated throughout by German influence, with a strong Jewish element, which had been conspicuously absent in the first phase. In the second place the spirit was totally different; benevolence was superseded by bitterness, the motive of sympathy with the poor was overshadowed by hatred of the rich, the idea of cooperation was replaced by conflict, the voluntary principle by the compulsory, persuasion by aggression, aspiration and sentiment by hard-and-fast determination. Intellectually, free speculation gave place to rigid dogma, religious or ethical influences to pure materialism. In purpose, constructive aims were superseded by destructive ones, the improvement of existing conditions by their total abolition; in method the idea of force was introduced, and for gradual and evolutionary change more or less sudden and revolutionary action was substituted."

While it is true that the theories commonly advanced by the Socialist School of Thought first took the name "Socialism" about 1824—one writer places the date at 1817—the same theories presented earlier, took shape under an organization which we are forced to assume is the grand-parent of the present day system.

I refer to what is known as the Order of the Illuminati established in Bavaria in 1776.

I am not at this time going into that which motivates those who advance and those who adopt the theories of the Socialist School of Thought. We will arrive at our own conclusions through the study we are making. It may be well, however, for all of us to keep in mind the statement of Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw of London College, England, who presents that motive as "the lure of loot." Referring to those who accept the Socialist doctrines ("A Survey of Socialism," page 273), he says: "Their passions—cupidity, acquisitiveness, jealousy, envy, hatred, malice, and malignancy; * * * and not their intellects, are their guides and dictators. * * * How potent are these passions, when incited and influenced by the Marxian virus, was manifested by the orgies of unrestrained and blatant crime—robbery, sacrilege, bestiality, spoliation, merciless cruelty, wholesale murder—which signalized the communist upheavals of 1917-20 in Russia, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and elsewhere. That the same devilish passions would have the same diabolical consequences in this country cannot be doubted by any one who is acquainted with either the native or the imported Marxian propagandists in our midst." (Marxian meaning Socialist.)

Again (page 285) referring to Socialism, Prof. Hearnshaw writes, "* * * the secret of its success is clear and obvious. It makes no *intellectual* appeal to any intelligent person. Its appeal is purely *passional*; but that appeal is immensely strong. It stirs as no other appeal does the predatory instincts of the primitive man, who exists in vast numbers, with the thinnest veneer of civilization, in the midst of our modern society. The lure of Marxism is the lure of loot; and everywhere Marxism in practice means the dictatorship of the criminal class."

For the purpose of getting a better understanding of the whole subject, we will consider the Socialist movement of today, as beginning with the formation of the Order of the Illuminati. There are a number of reasons for this, most of which will be developed as we proceed.

The order of the Illuminati came into existence through the activities of Adam Weishaupt, who was professor of canon law at the University of Ingolstadt, Bavaria, about 1770. According to the written statements based upon Weishaupt's own utterances, he devoted five years to a careful survey of the ills of mankind. At the end of his study he presented his theory, which is the foundation for the teachings of the present day Socialist School of Thought, although the leaders in that School will insist they know nothing about Weishaupt and are expounding the theories of one Karl Marx.

Weishaupt, in substance and in effect, said that all human ills and evils came from two causes—civilization and Christianity. Therefore, he reasoned, destroy civilization and Christianity and all human ills and evils would disappear. His logic was all right but he started with an absolutely false premise, the fault of so

many of those who present unique doctrines today. Like all other vain theorists, he did not attempt to present facts to sustain either premise or conclusion. When facts failed, he perverted them.

We are indebted to Dr. John Robison of Edinburgh, Scotland, for a full account of Illuminatism, the grand-parent of the present day Socialist School of Thought. Dr. Robison traveled on the Continent about the time the Order of the Illuminati was exposed. He had access to many official documents in the handwriting of Weishaupt and other leaders. He quotes liberally from these documents in his book, "Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe," published in 1798. He points out many times that the leaders of the Order of the Illuminati not only engaged in deception but depended a great deal on perverting the facts to cover their true purposes. He quotes from Weishaupt (page 223) as follows:

"And then, we can so change notions by merely changing a word. What more contemptible than fanaticism; but call it enthusiasm; then add the little word noble, and you may lead him over the world."

After adopting the premise that civilization and Christianity were the causes of all human ills and evils, Weishaupt turned to the institutions that had come into existence because of civilization and Christianity. These institutions, by their very nature, enforced certain restraints upon the individual—legal, moral, ethical, economic. It was these restraints, he insisted, that were depriving man of his rightful inheritance. Remove them, return man to the primitive, give the individual a chance to express the traits and instincts of his more distant ancestors and the world would be much better, ills and evils would disappear and man would be happy, said Weishaupt.

It may be that if we returned to the primitive we would get rid of certain evils which now pester us, but whether mankind would be better off, happier and more content, is quite a different matter. Those who have followed the course of the Socialist experiment in Russia will admit that some of the people of that unhappy land have returned to the primitive and are exhibiting the instincts of their aboriginal ancestors, but I am sure no one will say they are happier or more content than we. Certainly no person living in the United States, no matter under what conditions, would willingly and knowingly change places.

Having established his theory, to his own satisfaction at least, Weishaupt presented the program which he held should be adopted. The six objectives of Illuminatism—some writers arrange them in a little different manner and with slightly changed phraseology—were:

- 1st—The abolition of governments (that is, capitalist governments that sustain personal liberty and equality of political rights);
- 2nd—The abolition of patriotism;
- 3rd—The abolition of the private property right;
- 4th—The abolition of inheritance;

5th—The abolition of religion; and,

6th—The abolition of the family relation (that is, morality as represented by the established and legally recognized family).

One of the reasons why I place the beginning of organized Socialism with the formation of the Order of the Illuminati, is because the six objectives given are the same as those presented by the Socialist School of Thought today, although not all are expressed in the terse language above, and the last two are probably not advanced by many of the so-called "liberal" constituents of that School.

Indeed, the so-called "liberal" elements will vigorously deny the suggestion that Socialism would abolish either the church or the home. No doubt such persons are sincere in their beliefs. Their beliefs, however, constitute further evidence sustaining our contention that these followers of the Socialist School of Thought do not understand the true aims and objectives of the doctrines they espouse. It further proves that such persons, in truth, are not Socialists but instead idealists, the victims of their own emotions. Certainly anyone studying the writing of recognized Socialist spokesmen must arrive at the conclusion that the cult holds "religion the opium of the people" as stated by both Marx and Lenin, and that the home as recognized today is wholly incompatible with the establishment of a Socialist state.

Turn to the Declaration of Principles of the Socialist Party in this country, cited in a previous lecture, and note the following:

"It also proposes to socialize the system of public education and health and all activities and institutions vitally affecting the public needs and welfare, including dwelling houses."

A dwelling house is a home. The private home of the individual is sacred under the old common law. Amendments III and IV of our Constitution deal with this subject, and reaffirm the common law. The dwelling house of the individual, whether it be a castle or one room in a tenement house, is a place from which the State is excluded save by due process of law. To socialize a thing means to place that thing in complete control of the State. Then, if the dwelling houses are to be socialized—and the Socialists declare that is what they propose to do when, and if, in power—then the home of the individual passes from his control to the control of the State. What then, pray tell, becomes of the home?

It may be claimed that the home will be greatly improved if it passes from the hands of the individual into the hands of the State. That claim will not, however, appeal to any great number of persons. Experiments along this line in Russia have been such as to prove their demoralizing results.

Ridicule is often more powerful than logic. H. I. Phillips, a columnist on the New York *Evening Sun*, sends home some very hot shots now and then when dealing with public questions. In the *Sun*, October 17th, 1930, he devoted a little of his clever humor to dealing with a proposed bill in the Congress to establish a Department of Home and Children with its chief a Cabinet officer.

"Can you imagine Home, Sweet Home, under Government supervision?" he asks. "It would have mother a nervous wreck awaiting a ruling from Washington on baby's diet, father running a fever while reading an order from the Secretary of Home forbidding him to sleep on his left side, and baby bawling himself into a delirium because the Government had placed an embargo on rattles. If anything goes wrong in the home it will be a matter for Government attention, once Uncle Sam begins playing nursemaid. Even the kiddies will be regulated. Couples having no children will notify Washington and get a couple from people down the street who have more than their quota. * * * There will be a big field force obviously, with official snoopers in complete touch with the goings on in every home. And how home will be improved and regulated! There will be a day decreed for rug-beating and a series of national Wash-Willie's-Ears, Sweep-Under-the-Rug, Mend-Daddy's-Shirt and Stop-Baby-Biting-Its-Nails weeks," with considerable more along the same line.

The Communist wing is frank enough to say that if Socialism gains control in the United States it will immediately take over *your home* in order to give it to some one who has not exhibited energy enough to attain one of his own.

Not only were the objectives presented by Weishaupt exceedingly bold for his day and altogether too bold, as a matter of fact, even for our day, but the system established to attain these objectives was carefully and well designed. While the founder felt that each of these objectives would appeal to certain individuals, he also felt that taken as a whole, they were more likely to cause a feeling of revulsion than anything else. In order, then, to secure members, Weishaupt set up a system of deception, fraud, intrigue, falsehood and conspiracy. The membership was divided into Degrees, those in one Degree knowing nothing of the other Degrees or even that the movement was divided into Degrees.

Let me illustrate the system of securing followers: Organizers or propagandists—this profession of organizer and propagandist is not modern—would go to some person known to be religiously inclined and tell him the whole object of the Order of the Illuminati was to advance the interests of the church. This being in harmony with the wishes and desires of such a person, he would apply for membership. After being elected he would be inducted into one Degree where all were like-minded and where the general discussions were such as to create no suspicion. Another organizer or propagandist would go to an individual known to be atheistically inclined and tell him the whole purpose of the movement was to wreck the church and destroy its influence. This being in harmony with his wishes and desires, he would apply for membership and after being elected would be inducted into a Degree where all were like-minded, and where the general discussions were such as to create no suspicion as to objectives, other than the one present in that Degree.

And so on down the line. Those who wanted to overthrow the

government were in a Degree where all were like-minded; those who wanted to destroy the sentiment of patriotism were in another Degree where all were like-minded. Those who were chafing at restraints placed upon them because of the moral code were in still another Degree where all were like-minded. Now, those in each Degree were gradually led into the common movement, their objections to certain aims of the Order being slowly broken down through a process of stressing the obsession that caused them to become a member in a certain Degree.

Dr. Robison in "Proofs of a Conspiracy," cites many authentic documents to show that deception was practiced to secure members. Referring to the system employed by Weishaupt to win those in all "degrees" to the common purpose of Illuminatism, Dr. Robison (page 211) writes:

"He employs the Christian religion, which he thinks a falsehood, and which he is afterwards to explode, as the means for inviting Christians of every denomination, and gradually cajoling them, by clearing up their Christian doubts in succession, till he lands them in Deism; or if he finds them unfit, or too religious, he gives them a *sta bene*, and then laughs at their fears, or perhaps madness, in which he leaves them. Having got them the length of Deism, they are declared to be fit, and he receives them into the higher mysteries." Deism as here used means atheism of today as that word is commonly understood.

Considering the large number of well meaning persons who today are following the theories and doctrines of the Socialist School of Thought, one often wonders if the Adepts of the World Revolutionary Movement are not using the old system of Weishaupt with marked success. At least a study of the question is interesting. Dr. Robison, referring to another system used to bring those of different "degrees" into a harmonious whole, if it can be called harmonious (page 216), writes:

"When he could not persuade them by his own firmness, and indeed by his superior talents and disinterestedness in other respects, and his unwearied activity, he employed jesuitical tricks, causing them to fall out with each other, setting them as spies on each other, and separating any two that he saw attached to each other, by making the one a Master of the other; and, in short, he left nothing undone that could secure his uncontrolled command."

The membership was divided into Dupes and Adepts. Little time need be taken in describing these. The names tell the story. The Adepts were those who were fully acquainted with the whole program of the organization; the Dupes, those who had been led into different Degrees through some form of fraud or deception.

The members took different names. Weishaupt for instance was known as Spartacus. For the purpose of deception and so that much which passed between the leaders might appear in code, the names of ancient cities and towns were given to the cities and towns in which the organization operated.

The Order of the Illuminati was the first movement of the kind, so far as we are able to ascertain, which grasped the fact that women would make very valuable aids in carrying out the program advanced. This in the theory, as Weishaupt sets forth, that their support could be gained through emotional appeals.

Referring to the plan to secure the influence of women, Dr. Robison quotes the language of one of the leaders as follows (page 193): "There is no way of influencing men so powerfully as by means of the women. These should therefore be our chief study; we should insinuate ourselves into their good opinion, give them hints of emancipation from the tyranny of public opinion, and of standing up for themselves; it will be an immense relief to their enslaved minds to be freed from any one bond of restraint, and it will fire them the more, and cause them to work for us with zeal without knowing that they do so: for they will only be indulging their own desire of personal admiration."

Another leader, Zwack, known as Cato, proposed the formation of a woman's auxiliary. Dr. Robison quotes from a document in the handwriting of Zwack (page 138), as follows: "It will be of great service, and procure us both much information *and money*, and will suit charmingly the taste of many of our truest members, who are lovers of the sex. It should consist of two classes, the virtuous and the freer hearted (i. e., those who fly out of the common track of prudish manners); they must not know of each other, and must be under the direction of men, but without knowing it. Proper books must be put into their hands, and such (but secretly) as are flattering to their passions."

Another writer on this subject (see Robison, page 176) wrote: "We must prepare themes for their discussion—thus we shall confess them, and inspire them with our sentiments."

"There is nothing in the whole constitution of the Illuminati that strikes me with more horror than the proposals * * * to enlist the women in this shocking warfare with all that 'is good, and pure, and lovely, and of good report'", writes Dr. Robison (page 243). "They could not have fallen on any expedient that will be more effectual and fatal."

The good doctor then devotes a number of pages to extolling womanhood and pointing out the harm that will come to civilization and Christianity should there ever be a time when women are enmeshed in schemes of destruction such as those advanced by Illuminatism. In this connection, remember Illuminatism of his day is Socialism of today.

Now, let us note the parallel between the program and the system of the Order of the Illuminati and the program and the system of our present Socialist School of Thought. As we later go into the theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought, we will, at this time, deal only with the parallel in system.

The Socialist movement today operates under a number of names, but no matter under what title the objectives are the same. While as generally operated it is not a secret movement, as was the

Illuminati—although the Communist wing maintains a secret directing body—and does not frankly divide into Degrees, yet Degrees are maintained and operated. These Degrees appear as separate, and apparently distinct, organizations. The great mass of those who join such organizations have little conception as to the true purposes. They do not understand that it is, in effect, and intentionally so, a subsidiary to the Socialist School of Thought.

To illustrate: Those who are religiously inclined are attracted by some organization with the word "church" or "Christianity" in the title, or one which sets up as its purpose the advancement of the "brotherhood of man." To gain the attention of the wage-earners, the title of these organizations will contain the word "labor," "worker," or "union." Indeed, today, the whole Socialist movement is presented as a "labor" movement and this deception has caused a great many persons to confuse Socialism with the American Federation of Labor. When one refers to a labor movement in the United States, we all think of the American Federation of Labor which does not advance the theories of the Socialist School of Thought, or approve the methods of this school. True, many persons who do approve both theory and method are members of the American Federation of Labor, but they are there for ulterior purposes, just as persons who have become members of many other organizations, not excluding the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A., different churches, women's clubs, farmers' organizations, etc., are there for ulterior purposes.

Now, do not misunderstand me. Of course there are hundreds of legitimate organizations to advance Christianity, to help the wage earner, to benefit the farmer, with names such as I have mentioned. What we have to do is differentiate between those formed along wholly legitimate lines, and those that are, in effect, "Degrees" of the Socialist movement. And this is not a difficult thing to do when one understands the full purpose of the Socialist School of Thought and the system employed to advance the theory taught therein. As we proceed with the study, the necessary facts will be developed.

To illustrate the system of using so-called Christian organizations to advance the theories of the Socialist School of Thought, let us turn to the Fellowship of Reconciliation. This is represented as an organization seeking to advance the teachings of Jesus the Christ. We are not here to question the honesty of its leaders. We merely wish, by quoting from its literature, to show its position, and to emphasize the fact that it follows only Socialist doctrines.

In a recent four page folder issued by the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, presumably mailed by the American Secretariat, 338 Bible House, Astor Place, New York City, entitled "Christ and the Class War", being the "findings adopted by the members of the Conference of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation held at Lyons, France, August 2-9, 1929, to consider the subject of "Christ and the Class War", appear these statements:

"We are agreed in our conviction:

"1. that the present economic system is incompatible with the principles embodied in the teachings of Jesus;

"2. that the class-war is a fact; that, whether we will or not, each one of us is involved; that, as a Fellowship, we must know where we stand in this matter and must work a radical reorganization of society; * * *

"5. that the ultimate abolition of the class-war involves a society based upon social justice, in which the dignity and worth of human personality can find expression; * * *"

Among the recommendations to Fellowship members is this one: "Joining political movements which aim at the replacement of private capitalism by a system of collective ownership which would not, like capitalism, create class divisions."

Since the only so-called political organizations that propose the "collective ownership" of "private capitalism" are the Socialist Party and the Communist Party, it is clear that members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation are urged to join either the one or the other. All the quotations above are evidently taken from the teachings of the Socialist School of Thought.

The following instructions are given: "Participating directly, where possible, in working class movement—of education, co-operatives and trade unions. * * * We urge on Fellowship members the study of the experiment of Soviet Russia in relation to the class struggle, and in those countries which do not yet recognize the Soviet union, we urge them to support efforts to establish normal diplomatic relations."

And this from a so-called Christian organization in the face of the undeniable fact that the Soviet union has banned Christianity, and that the government officially recognizes and encourages atheism! Since the Fellowship of Reconciliation is listed as a Christian organization notwithstanding its clear and undeniable Socialist teachings, many of its members, from time to time, secure engagements to speak from the pulpits of this country.

As the Order of the Illuminati had Adepts and Dupes, so has the modern Socialist School of Thought. The Adepts are few in number as compared with the Dupes. The former seldom present themselves in their true light, except those who have adopted the tactics of the left wing and are known as Communists. The connection between those who call themselves Socialists and those who call themselves Communists will be gone into fully in the next lecture. So far as the Adepts of the Socialist School of Thought are concerned, they would make little headway were it not for the large army of Dupes who follow the leader without questioning his motives or aims.

Naturally no person likes to be called a Dupe. Yet what other name can be applied to those who, without the slightest knowledge of the subject, give aid and support to the teachings of the Socialist School of Thought? If they clearly understand what they

are doing; if they actually are seeking the overthrow of this government, its institutions and its economic system; then, of course, the proper name is Adept. We are constrained to believe, however, that they do not know the true aims and objectives of Socialism.

Goethe, I believe, it was who said: "There is nothing more frightful than energetic stupidity."

The most dangerous of the Dupes, both to themselves and to the country at large, are those who, because it secures them public attention, accept unsupported statements and rush into print to denounce all who hold opposing views. We have noted the activities of this character of Dupe in the past and probably will have occasion to note similar activities in the future. As an illustration, consider the carefully planned attack upon the Daughters of the American Revolution, originated a few years ago. A number of pamphlets were printed and distributed. Numerous newspaper articles appeared in different sections of the country. That all these emanated from a common source, if there were any basis for the charges, is evidenced by the fact that all contained the same alleged statements of facts. Had any of these writers made an independent investigation, certainly he or she would have found something not discovered by all the others. Now since the "evidence" came from a common source, what was that source? The purpose of the attack was to discredit the Daughters of the American Revolution in the minds of those who knew little about them, and so cause anything they said to have little or no weight. The occasion for this line of combat was the fact that the Daughters of the American Revolution had become efficient in exposing the activities of certain Socialist movements. You can draw your own conclusions as to the common source of the alleged "evidence" which was given so much publicity.

A number of these Dupes—and frankly we know of no other name to apply—referred to a document called "The Common Enemy" circulated by the D. A. R. The charge was that this document contained personal attacks upon a number of prominent American citizens. The book contained no such attacks. The name of but one person, the Soviet ambassador to Mexico at the time, was mentioned. The book, however, did point out the menace of the Socialist movement. Had the writers who assailed this document read it, they would have ascertained that their statements were unfounded. One of two things is certain. Either they did not read the booklet and accepted, on faith, the statements of others, or having read it, knowingly perverted the truth. Either position is indefensible. If they accepted the statements of others without seeking the truth, then what name can one apply but Dupe? If they read the document and then made their untruthful statements, what name can one apply but Adept?

The modern Socialist School of Thought, insofar as its Left wing, called Communism, is concerned, still employs the system of adopting fictitious names for its leaders. This is more for the purpose of concealment than anything else. And the modern day

Socialist School of Thought has developed to a wonderful and a most efficient degree the idea, advanced by the Order of the Illuminati, of using women's organizations.

These parallels may be accidental, but a study of the subject forces an opposite conclusion, and they are well worth taking into consideration in our general study of a movement to put into practice a theory which we contend, if ever adopted, will bring ruin to the nation.

I wish again to impress upon you that we are not questioning the sincerity, the integrity or the honesty of any person. We are not interested in persons. We are studying theories reduced to *beliefs*, or *mental attitudes*. In this study, it naturally becomes necessary to consider certain organizations as well as the persons directing and leading these organizations. When we do this, we are not dealing with individuals but only with the *beliefs* of these individuals, and the extent to which they are seeking to impress their *beliefs* upon others as well as the legitimacy of the methods employed.

Now back to the Order of the Illuminati for a minute. It grew even faster than its founders anticipated. It gained control in many directions. It infected and took command of a number of Masonic lodges in the German Empire. Through this connection it finally infected Masonry, in several countries and the theory and the system of the Order of the Illuminati later dominated what is known as the Grande Orient of the Continent. You must not confuse the Grande Orient of Masonry, as it is practiced in several countries, with Masonry as it is known in the United States and Great Britain. They are quite different things. Here again we find the old, old system of deception through the use of names.

Certain professors of the University at Ingolstadt, through the influence of Weishaupt, had been induced to join the Order. After passing through several Degrees these men had their eyes opened. They recognized that the movement was a dangerous one designed wholly to wreck civilization and Christianity. They reported to the authorities. Arrests were made and while certain secret documents were not then obtained, and while Weishaupt and others denied all charges, some of the leaders were forced to flee the country and the Order was declared illegal. This was in 1783.

A few years later documents of a secret nature which exposed fully the whole scheme were unearthed. It was these documents that Dr. Robison saw and copied while in Bavaria. As soon as the movement was exposed it went underground, became secret. So far as surface operations were concerned, they worked largely through the Grande Orient, to which the name Masonry is wrongfully applied. However, the inner circle has remained secret until this day. Who the present leaders are can only be conjectured. The name was not again used save locally in Germany for a short period about 1880. The world at large knows little of Illuminatism. Indeed some encyclopedias refer to it as a "humanitarian movement" of its day.

(Copyright 1930)

LECTURE No. 6

THE TWO INTERNATIONALS: WHERE SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM JOIN FORCES

That which originally was called the Order of the Illuminati, described in the previous lecture, is now commonly known as the World Revolutionary Movement. Not that this name is applied by those who guide its destinies, but it is employed by all the leading students, and for two reasons:

First: The Socialist movement today is revolutionary; that is, the underlying feature of its tactics to gain control of all wealth, is the use of force, violence, terrorism, civil wars and revolutions; and,

Second: It is world-wide since there is no civilized nation that is not experiencing the effects of its propaganda and its activities.

The World Revolutionary Movement is a secret, underground organization. Just who is guiding it is a matter of conjecture. This secret, underground, directing body or council, operates on the surface—that is publicly—through two well known movements, thus dividing the activities of its army of followers into two wings or factions. These wings or factions are, in effect, “degrees” of the open movement.

These two above-board organizations are called Internationals. One is known as the Labor and Socialist International, sometimes the “New”, and sometimes the “Hamburg”. The other is known as the Third (or Communist) International. The first named constitutes what is known as the Right Wing of the Socialist movement, the followers of which are called Socialists. The second constitutes what is known as the Left Wing of the Socialist movement, the followers of which are called Communists.

Each of these Internationals, in turn, operates through prominent subsidiaries known as “labor” internationals. The one affiliated with the Socialist wing is called the Amsterdam International Federation of Trade Unions. The one affiliated with the Communist wing, the Red International of Labor Unions. We, in the United States, interpret the term “labor unions” in quite a different way than do those of these two wings of the Socialist movement. We think of a “labor union” as an organization or association of men and women working for wages who affiliate for the pur-

pose of mutual aid and protection in dealing with their employers. Certainly we do not think of a "labor union" as an organization of men and women seeking the destruction of our form of government with its institutions. And yet, as the term is used by the Internationals mentioned, that in effect is what it does mean.

The constant and persistent use of the word "labor movement" in connection with the operation of both the Socialist and Communist wings of the World Revolutionary Movement confuses the people. In Great Britain, for instance, the Labour Party is the right wing of the Socialist School of Thought; that is, it is made up of those who follow the so-called "legislative (or parliamentary) action" tactics of the Socialist School of Thought. When the Labour Party is mentioned in the United States it is only natural that a great many, not understanding the facts, think of it as some political movement that would be akin to one formed by the American Federation of Labor to combat the policies of both the Republican and Democratic parties. But the Labour Party of Great Britain is nothing of the kind. The platform of the party expresses the theories of the Socialist School of Thought. The policies and programs of the American Federation of Labor do not follow that School. On the contrary, the leaders bitterly assail these teachings.

While the Labour Party is in political control of the government of Great Britain, it should be remembered that it is in the saddle through the aid of the Liberal Party, and that it is operating under a capitalist form, that is, a form which sustains and defends the private property right. Again, the House of Lords is not in complete sympathy with the acting majority in the House of Commons so that, even should all the Labour members of both Houses desire to establish simon-pure Socialism in Great Britain they could not do so under existing conditions.

At this time (1930) certain Socialist leaders, largely those of the so-called "intelligentsia"—that is, those who do not engage in manual labor of any kind—are urging the formation of a political party in this country similar to the "Labour Party" of Great Britain. This proposal is not approved by the American Federation of Labor, and those who are foremost in the movement are among the most bitter critics of the leaders of the American Federation of Labor.

The four internationals we have named, to wit, the Labor and Socialist International with its affiliated Amsterdam International of Federated Trade Unions, and the Third (or Communist) International with its affiliated Red International of Labor Unions operate, in turn, through a number of other internationals. Thus we find, on investigation, a web of interlocking groups carefully and completely interwoven into an intricate mesh. It is no wonder the people of the world who have devoted their time and energy

to devising ways and means for human advancement; who respect and wish to support their respective governments; who have no thought of disrupting society or making any drastic changes; who give aid and support to the church and have deep love for the home, are unable to grasp the meaning of it all, or save themselves from being intrigued by the enticing pattern placed before their eyes.

The four main Internationals above mentioned are the governing bodies insofar as aims, purposes, objectives, policies, and tactics, are concerned. The decrees, decisions, manifestos and resolutions of these Internationals guide their followers in every country in which they operate—and they operate in the United States. Independence of thought or action on the part of a follower is not permitted. Those who have the temerity to think or act for themselves are subject to expulsion. Many have been so expelled.

Membership in both the Communist and the Socialist parties in the U. S. is by application only and dues must be paid. The application for membership in the Socialist party (see "What is Socialism" by Jessie Wallace Hughan, page 162) reads as follows:

"I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class, and the necessity of the working class organizing itself into a political party for the purpose of obtaining collective ownership and democratic administration and operation of the collectively used and socially necessary means of wealth production and distribution, hereby apply for membership in the Socialist Party and enclose \$. . . for dues. In all my political actions while a member of the Party, I agree to be guided by the constitution and platform of the party."

The following (Lusk Report Vol. I, page 791), is the Communist pledge:

"The undersigned, after having read the constitution and program of the Communist Party, declares his adherence to the principles and tactics of the party and the Communist International; agrees to submit to the discipline of the party as stated in its constitution and pledges himself to engage actively in its work."

A person joining either one of these organizations becomes the servant of its leaders. If he fails to support those leaders in all things he is subject to expulsion. The Communist Party recently expelled a number of its former leaders because they had objected to carrying out some instruction from Moscow.

In this great game of saving humanity from "exploitation," the emotional appeals of which gain the attention of the majority of the followers of Socialism, it is dangerous indeed for a person to assume any character of independence. Only the leaders, very few of whom live in the United States, are blessed with sufficient wisdom to have an idea of their own. And these leaders, one is

forced to assume, do little thinking for themselves, but take the orders of their superiors in the secret World Revolutionary Movement with the same faith a dog takes orders from his master.

Now the Internationals I have mentioned hold regular congresses or conventions. I believe no such international congress or convention ever has been held in the United States. Delegates from practically every civilized nation take part in these gatherings. The United States is well represented in all four, especially in the Third (or Communist) and its affiliations, the Red International of Labor Unions. Every delegate taking a part in these congresses or conventions, in view of his actions, must be held disloyal to his government, whatever that government may be—save in the case of Russia—because at such sessions plans and methods are formulated to destroy all existing governments that recognize the private property right and related institutions, and erect in their stead governments which deny the individual property right, and would destroy all related institutions.

Delegates to these congresses or conventions pledge loyalty to their Internationals above allegiance to their respective governments. Where there is a clash between the two, they stand by the International. This was demonstrated in the United States when we were forced into war with the Central Powers. The Socialists—save the few who as a matter of fact were only idealists—instead of firmly and loyally supporting the government of the United States, pledged allegiance to International Socialism and gave aid and comfort to the enemy.

The American Labor Year Book, Vol. III (page 400) says: "The Socialist Party carried aloft the standard of International Socialism during the war; * * * On International May-Day, 1917, the third May-Day since the beginning of the European War, the workers of America through the Socialist Party proclaimed with great joy: 'All hail the workers of Russia and the new Russian Republic, the forerunner of the United States of Europe!'"

In the above is a direct slander on the American workmen for they did *not* "hail the workers of Russia." They have *not* since "hailed" them. Those who did the "hailing" were largely aliens or disloyal Americans, members of Socialist organizations.

Because of the open disloyalty of the Socialist Party during the war, a number of its publications were denied the mails. Several of its leaders, including its titular head, Eugene V. Debs, were convicted of crimes against the nation and served penitentiary terms.

In this connection let it be understood that there is nothing in the expressed aims and objectives of the Socialist Party of today, nothing said by its leading exponents, to cause the belief that there has been a change in the general attitude of its members regarding our government since the World War. Nor is there anything in the

expressed aims and objectives of the Socialist Party of today that disassociates it from international Socialism; nor is there anything in the declared aims and objectives of the Socialist Party of today, or any of its leading exponents, save possibly a few idealists, to create the belief that, in the final analysis, those who espouse its theories believe they can be inaugurated in the United States without force and violence.

Possibly it can not be technically held that the delegates to the labor and Socialist International and those to the affiliated Amsterdam International Federation of Labor Unions, are disloyal citizens of their respective countries. Legally, they are not, because, as in the case of the United States, they propose the overthrow of the government and the destruction of its institutions—at least insofar as public utterances are concerned—through legal methods. But those who are delegates to the Third (or Communist) International and delegates to its affiliated Red International of Labor Unions certainly are both morally and legally disloyal citizens of their respective governments—except Russia—since they propose the overthrow of the government and existing institutions and the abolition of the private property right, through a system of force, violence, terrorism, civil wars and revolutions, all of which are illegal.

These two major and two affiliated internationals enter into, and work in, the United States through two organizations. One is known as the Socialist Party. The other, until recently, was known as the Workers (Communist) Party. The word “worker,” used wholly to deceive the people and give the movement the semblance of legality, has been dropped and the new organization is now out boldly and frankly as “The Communist Party of the United States of America, Section of the Communist International.”

There is a general misconception of the relationship between that which we call Communism, or the Left wing on the one hand, and that which we call Socialism and its allied isms, as the Right wing on the other hand. We hear of quarrels between these two wings. We note the denunciation of the one by the other. Because of this, a large number of idealistic and emotional persons have been swept into the Socialist wing of the movement; and because of the lack of definite information about the movement by those who write of it in such laudatory terms, or grow exceedingly sarcastic and bitter when denouncing its opponents, the public generally has been led to believe that while Socialism, and its allies, is something to be coddled and hugged with delight, Communism is a thing to be shunned and despised.

And while holding that Communism is wholly undesirable, these same idealistic and emotional persons, due we fear to the fact that they are saturated with clever propaganda from the Socialist

School of Thought, contend that there is not the slightest danger of Communism gaining a menacing position in the United States.

James Oneal, editor of "The New Leader," in his book "American Communism," devotes much space in an attempt to show that those who fear Communism are suffering from a peculiar form of hysteria. In the introduction (page 9) he writes:

"After six years of devoted service and sacrifice, the movement has made practically no converts among the American workers, * * * That this small group of organized immigrants could have so thoroughly frightened our bourgeois classes is due to the myths which they cultivated during the war and the post-war period. It is a humorous phase of post-war history."

It is interesting indeed to note that Mr. Oneal places the responsibility for the Communist movement in the United States on other than native-born citizens. It has long been the contention of the American people that the backbone of the movement was to be found in our alien population. Hence the insistent demand for more rigid immigration and deportation laws. Will Mr. Oneal now likewise admit that the branch of the movement with which he is allied also owes its inception and growth to a "small group of organized immigrants"?

Every person we know who has given any time or attention to even a most casual survey of the situation is alarmed. Not so much because of the following this school has secured, as because of the downright apathy and indifference of the average citizen. If the American people only understood the seriousness of the situation that apathy would disappear. If the theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought ever do become dominant in the United States, and a government which recognizes the private property right is replaced by one that does not recognize this right, it will be because of this apathy and indifference.

Already—and it is common knowledge—certain amendments have been grafted on to the Constitution and certain laws enacted presumably to cure certain alleged economic, social or political ills. As a matter of fact all these so-called reforms were "originally formulated by the Socialist parties," (Morris Hilquit, "Socialism Summed Up," page 86), and "are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole system of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry." (Platform of the Socialist Party, 1904). In a later lecture this system will be fully outlined.

Now, Socialism and its allies—and these allies sometimes appear under the names "liberalism," "internationalism," and "pacifism"—and Communism with its allies, which include all who believe in force and violence to destroy this nation in order that all wealth may be confiscated, *are one and the same thing insofar as objectives*

are concerned. We are concerned with objectives. We are more vitally interested in *what it is* they propose to do than *how* they propose to do it.

The Socialist and the Communist seek the same ends—the destruction of our form of government, with its institutions including the church and the home, and our economic system. When this has been accomplished they both propose the same thing—the establishment of a form of government which is wholly and completely in their hands, and which does not permit the private property right nor sustain the church and the home.

The first paragraph in the Declaration of Principles of the Socialist Party (American Labor Year Book, Vol. V, page 126) reads: “The Socialist Party of the United States demands that the country and its wealth be redeemed from the control of private interests and turned over to the people to be administered for the equal benefit of all.”

The wealth of the United States is in the hands of the people. It was acquired because they possessed the private property right and exercised their ability, skill, energy, genius, and labor, in creating wealth. It is this privately owned property, then, that the Socialists propose to “redeem” and use for the “benefit of all the people.” To redeem means to “purchase back.” You cannot “redeem” that which you never possessed. It it would seem they do not mean they are going to purchase back something to which they once held rightful title. What they do mean is that they propose to confiscate all private wealth and use it for the benefit not of all the people, as they state, but only for the benefit of those who join their so-called “class” by accepting their preachments. (See first lecture for citations on the question of confiscation of private property.)

In the platform of the Workers (Communist) Party for 1928, official document (page 11), appears this language; “. . . The Workers (Communist) Party * * * has as its aim the overthrow of capitalism, the establishment of a workers’ and farmers’ government, the establishment of a Communist society in which the means of production will not be the private property of the few, a society which will not be based on profit but on labor, which will not be founded on class divisions. * * *” That means the complete destruction of our form of government and all that goes with that form. In the same document (page 59), appears this:

“The Workers’ Government of the Soviet Union nationalized all dwellings of the employing class.” If that does not mean the destruction of the home what does it mean?

In a later lecture we deal at some length with the question of Socialism and religion. Let it here be stated, however, that while the abolition of the church is not fundamental in the Marxian

creed, it is held necessary by many Socialist writers and leaders. The position commonly taken by such persons is that the church is a product of capitalism, or is a supporter of capitalism, and so must be destroyed. Regardless of the statement of a few idealists who think they are Socialists, the adoption of Socialism as our political and economic policy would result in the complete disappearance of religion. There is no place for it, no occasion for it, where Socialism is in effect.

In a common assault upon our government and its institutions, the Socialists constitute the advance brigade of the division of the army, the purpose of which is to weaken our position. The Communists comprise the reserve forces of the same army that become active when the enemy is weak enough for direct attack. The enemy is the social order of today based on the private property right, the church and the home.

The theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought are those of all wings of the World Revolutionary Movement, whether called Socialism or Communism, "Labour" or "internationalism," "liberalism" or "pacifism." Those who come under the last three designations are, to a very large degree, unacquainted with the true purposes of the movements they follow. They are largely the innocent dupes of a clever agency that uses them for their own destruction. They are appealed to by "concern for humanity," and are not permitted to know the true objectives of that to which they give aid and comfort. No student of the subject holds that there is any difference between Socialism and Communism save in methods pursued to attain the common objectives.

Professor Arthur Shadwell of London, to whom reference has before been made, ("The Breakdown of Socialism," page 10), writes: "As it stands, then, the movement is sharply divided into Right and Left, instead of being united. The one is labeled Socialism, the other Communism; but as so used, these terms do not refer to the aims, but only to the means. That is to say, they do not signify a difference of attitude towards the existing economic order and the new one that is to replace it; the difference between them has to do with the means employed to abolish the old and set up the new. Both stand for the abolition of Capitalism, and so far support each other; but they would set about it in different ways."

Professor Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 91), writes: "The difference, then, at the present moment between communism and what still calls itself socialism is almost wholly one of method and of pace."

Prof. Harry W. Laidler, Socialist, devotes a chapter of his book "Socialism in Thought and Action" to the "Transition to Socialism." Under the caption "Conflict of Views" (page 168), he

writes: "The foregoing analysis thus shows the existence of two distinct wings in the general socialist movement. * * * The left wing, or communist-socialist or communist group, as it calls itself, regards politics merely as a means of propaganda, scorns the immediate demands in the socialist platform, expects that the transition from capitalist to proletarian control will come as a result of industrial rather than of political action, and argues for the establishment of soviets, for the suppression of the political forms of the bourgeois state, when the workers obtain power, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, and for the confiscation of private capital. * * * There is also a certain difference of opinion between the two groups"—that is those who call themselves Socialists and those who call themselves Communists—"regarding the expediency and ethics of the use of violence, and regarding the belief held by many that 'the ends justify the means'."

Standing firmly and fixedly for the destruction of all governments that recognize the private property right, in order that a form of government such as has been established in Russia, one that does not recognize the private property right, may be imposed upon the people, those who call themselves Socialists, and those who call themselves Communists are Siamese twins. They differ in tactics to attain their ends, however, and *that is the only difference*. The people through clever propaganda have been induced to fasten their eyes on *tactics* and forget *objectives*. *Objectives* are the things upon which we should focus attention.

True, in the Socialist wing, especially in its "liberal", "pacifist" and "international" branches, there are a large number of idealists, altruists and humanitarians, men and women with the highest motives. It would be unfair and incorrect to challenge their sincerity. Such persons—and it is such that give the whole movement its air of respectability and prevent the public from grasping the nature of the forces and agencies so cleverly working behind the scene—have adopted the fallacious teachings of the Socialist School of Thought because of the common belief that Socialism is a cult that proposes the uplift of humanity. Such persons certainly have not given the subject any consideration. They have accepted the clearly false premise that all human ills and evils come from capitalism which, as we have learned, is synonymous with the private property right; and that by destroying capitalism, in other words taking away the private property right, these ills and evils will be made to disappear.

These purely idealistic followers of Socialism insist the "present social order" based on the private property right must be abolished and a "new social order" based on "production for use and not for profit" be established. By so doing they contend they are going to wipe out all unemployment, suffering, misery, bad housing, etc., and destroy all human weaknesses and traits at one stroke.

"Production for use and not for profit" is the slogan of the League for Industrial Democracy, a subsidiary Socialist organization. This society was first known as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. "Social Progress, A Handbook of the Liberal Movement," (page 284) says of it that it "has for its object 'To promote among college men and women an intelligent understanding of the labor movement and of the movement toward a new social order *based on production for use and not for profit.*' The League is the successor to the Intercollegiate Socialist Society organized by Jack London, Upton Sinclair, George Strobell and others in 1905. It was reorganized in the Fall of 1921 under its present name in order that it might be able to cover a somewhat larger field of social endeavor." (Emphasis supplied.)

The Lusk Report (Vol. II, page 1247) referring to the "Intercollegiate Socialist," a publication later merged into the "Socialist Review," says:

"Its object is to 'promote an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women.' Mrs. Florence Kelley is the president of the society; Evans Clark is the first vice-president and H. W. L. Dana is second vice-president; Albert de Silver is the treasurer. Other persons connected with this association named by the witnesses were: Louis B. Boudin, Emily Balch, Helen Phelps Stokes, Mary R. Sanford, George Nasmyth, and Horace M. Kallen; also Norman Thomas, Jessie W. Hughan, Freda Kirchwey, Vida D. Scudder of Wellesley, Charles Zueblin, Caro Lloyd Strobell, Arthur Gleason, Louise Adams Grout, Nicholas Kelley, Alexander Trachtenberg, Darwin J. Meserole, Robert W. Dunn and Winthrop D. Lane."

It will be noted in the quotation from "Social Progress" that the League For Industrial Democracy is credited with being a part of the "labor movement." Yet it would appear from the names cited in the Lusk Report that but few of those then prominent in directing the affairs of the organization, or its official publication, were what we would call "workers." This persistent and continual misuse of the word "labor" is most confusing to those who know little about Socialism or its true purposes.

Again it will be noted from both of the above citations that the League for Industrial Democracy is designed to carry Socialism to the college students. "Production for use and not for profit" means in plain, unadulterated and understandable language "the abolition of the private property right."

Marx says in the Communist Manifesto (Rand School edition, page 30): ". . . the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: *Abolition of private property.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

Morris Hillquit ("Socialism in Theory and Practice," page 295), admits the term "communism" at the time of Marx was

used to cover the whole movement just as the term "Socialism" is so used today. In the same edition of the Manifesto (page 33), Marx writes: "In one word you reproach us with *intending to do away with your property. Precisely so: that is just what we intend.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

Would it not be more in keeping with the ethics of fairness for those who are advancing the Socialist theory, expressing their aims in language which can easily be misconstrued, to say just what their patron saint, Marx, said? Are they ready to admit that they have discarded his language and adopted a different wording because it does not seem so harsh? Is not the expression "production for use and not for profit" employed more to deceive than anything else? Did not those who invented this term feel that while Marx's abrupt way of stating the true purposes of Socialism might have been all right in his day and with the people to whom he made his greatest appeal, it would not do in the United States and with the people to whom this group of "intellectuals" are making their appeal?

We must of necessity credit the altruistic dupes of Socialism with honest motives. Certainly we all approve their aspirations, for what greater thing could happen to humanity than the elimination of evils, suffering, misery, etc.? The trouble lies, not with their publicly alleged objectives, but with the remedy they propose to apply—the destruction of our form of government, our institutions and our economic system, and the establishment of a wholly different form of government, wholly different institutions and a wholly different economic system. They can find no evidence in history to support their contentions. On the contrary there is an overwhelming mass of concrete evidence to prove that their ends can not be attained through the application of the remedy they urge. Since Socialism has been in command of about one-fifth of the earth's surface—Russia—for over thirteen years, one would naturally expect this remedy, if it has virtues, to show results.

Now, while seeking the same ends, having the same objectives, united closely in the prosecution of all movements to destroy the present form of government, its institutions and our economic system, the Right wing called Socialism, and its allies differ violently from the Left wing, called Communism, on methods to attain the common end. *It is this difference in methods, or tactics, as a matter of fact, that produces the Right and Left wing surface organizations of the World Revolutionary Movement.*

That there is a common understanding between those who direct the two wings of the movement appears clear from the nature of their activities. They both denounce our present form of government; both attack our economic system; both deride our institu-

tions; both—the Right insidiously and the Left openly—assail religion and the family relation, that is, morality; both insist the “present social order”—that is, existing government, institutions, etc.—must be destroyed and a “new social order,” one under which there is an entirely different form of government, entirely different institutions and an entirely different economic system, prevail; both attack the two existing important American political organizations and their platforms for national advancement and common good.

Both Right and Left wings of the World Revolutionary Movement, the Right being known in the United States as Socialism and the Left as Communism, base their theories on the existence of a “class struggle” which we have learned is not a “class” struggle at all but a struggle on the part of those who have adopted the theory of Marx to force those opposed to that theory to accept it.

On the question of tactics the Right wing, called Socialists, and the Left wing, called Communists, differ materially. The Socialists and their allies insist the quickest and safest way to destroy our present form of government, wreck our institutions and abolish our economic system, is through what they term “legislative action.” By this, they mean, securing the adoption of Constitutional amendments, federal or state as the case may be; or securing legislation, federal or state, which amendment, if adopted, and which legislation, if enacted, in some form or manner, would interfere with the government sustaining the objectives as set forth in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, or that would weaken governmental or business structures.

This question of “legislative action” is so important for a complete understanding of the methods of the Right or Socialist Wing of the Socialist School of Thought, that in a later lecture it will be analyzed. All the bold highwaymen who stick guns in one’s face and demand money, together in a year’s time do not obtain one-tenth the loot secured by the clever confidence men. The highwayman confesses his calling and if caught in the act expects punishment. Not so the suave confidence artist. He wraps himself in a cloak of respectability. He usually operates as “banker,” “broker,” “investment agent,” etc. He belongs to a number of clubs and lodges. He is a regular attendant at some church. He maintains elaborate and prosperous offices where the unsuspecting are successfully and painlessly relieved of their wealth. Moreover, he so conducts his activities that if detected he manages to escape punishment.

Many idealistic followers of the Socialist School of Thought will resent being compared to confidence men. That is to be expected. You have never known a person who, when bluntly told

he was being deceived by some one in whom he had confidence, did not resent your interference. But I am not referring to individuals following the Socialist School of Thought as confidence men. I am talking about the system.

The Socialists gain the attention and the confidence of a large number of well-meaning persons by their persistent and loud cry of "concern for humanity." They insist their whole program is to relieve the suffering and aid the needy. That has an appeal. It naturally wins the confidence of those who have the same aims. Officially, however, the Socialists frankly admit that they have no desire to relieve the suffering or help the needy so long as our form of government and its institutions prevail. They insist their aims cannot be attained under our form of government, our institutions and our economic system. And so, they say, that while their legislative proposals are to be cure-alls for existing economic, social and political ills, as a matter of fact such legislative proposals are designed to weaken and, in the end, destroy our form of government. This, however, they do not proclaim from the house-tops. They conceal it in their official platforms and manifestos and in language that those who are thinking only in terms of "concern for humanity" fail to understand.

Now the swindling "banker," "broker," "investment agent," etc., likewise gains the attention of his victims by appeal to their cupidity. He maintains a "front" that gains that attention and in the end confidence. The thing that motivates the Socialist leaders, says Prof. Hearnshaw, is "the lure of loot." The thing that motivates the clever swindler as well as his victims is likewise "the lure of loot." For these reasons, the illustration appears apt.

Now, those who follow the Left wing, called Communists, accepting all the preachments of the Socialist School of Thought so far as objectives go, hold "legislative action" is not sufficient, that it is too slow, that it can not win in the end. The Communists are for immediate results. So they propose to overthrow the government and its institutions and abolish our economic system through the use of force, violence, acts of terrorism, civil wars and bloody revolutions. In order to incite their followers to the point where they think only in sanguinary terms, everything possible is done to create hatred for our form of government and our institutions, as well as hatred toward all who support them.

While the Socialists and the Communists thus differ on the question of *means* to attain a common end, there are times when the one approves and supports the tactics of the other or applies tactics of the other to supplement its own system. For instance, recently the Communists entered the political field. Their argument for so doing will be dealt with in its proper place. This,

in effect, is an approval of Socialist tactics. The Socialists instead of supporting peace officers when such officers use drastic methods to quell rioting incited by the Communists, as a part of their force and violence system, support, and by so doing approve, the tactics of the Left wing.

Publicly protesting the use of force and violence the Socialist wing of the movement gives aid and support to the Communist wing when the latter engages in one of its "lessons in revolution." Certainly that aid and support was given the Communists during the Passaic "lesson in revolution." Certainly it was given during the Gastonia, N. C. "lesson in revolution."

The objection of the Right wing of the Socialist movement to the use of force and violence one is forced to assume from the evidence is not due to any antipathy to the system *per se*. The Right wing holds that the system will not be successful in the United States. Morris Hillquit, an accepted spokesman for the Socialist movement, when a breach in the American organization appeared certain, is quoted in the *New York Call*, May 21st, 1919, then the official publication of the Socialist Party (cited by Mereto in "The Red Conspiracy," page 40) as saying:

"I am opposed to it" (the Communist system) "not because it is too radical, but because it is essentially reactionary and non-Socialistic; not because it would lead us too far, but because it *would lead us nowhere.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

When a resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives (Seventy-first Congress) to name a committee to investigate Communist activities and propaganda in the United States in order to ascertain whether or not such activities and propaganda menaced our institutions, the Socialist wing of the Socialist School of Thought protested affirmative action. No sooner had the House adopted the resolution and the Speaker named the committee, than Socialists began to belittle the proposal. The large army of "liberals," ever fawning at the shrine of Marx, took up the cry. Instead of aiding the committee in securing evidence either for or against Communism, the Socialists, through their press, their speakers and their literature, disapproved of the gathering of all such evidence.

A Socialist adopting the pen name "Adam Coaldigger," writing in the *New Leader*, an official Socialist paper, for August 16th, 1930, under a three column head, "Poor Fish, Red Herrings, Plain Suckers," devotes more than a column of space to belittling the efforts of the Special House Committee Investigating Communist Activities in the United States headed by the Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr. "The most precious and the rarest jewels in this bone-headed world are ideas, and ideas that can not be kept down by knocking men's brains out are too valuable to be suppressed," says the writer.

The implication is that when policemen are compelled to use force in the suppression of Communist activities, it is because of the doctrine preached. That is not true. Arrests are not made because of words uttered, but because the Communists and their sympathizers have broken some well known and established law designed to protect the general public. When an organized band of Communists seek to invade an establishment which refuses to employ members of one of their so-called "Unions," or undertake to stage a parade or "demonstration" without a proper permit and, in the interest of common good, the police are called upon to interfere, at times it becomes necessary for them to use force, especially when the Communists and their sympathizers, knowingly and intentionally, first engage in force by assaulting peace officers. For police officers to stand idly by and permit law breakers to have their own way would mean anarchy.

The Socialists, while depreciating force and violence as a means to attain their ends, one is forced to assume, approve the use of force and violence by their Communist brethren in all conflicts with the police, at the same time apparently never overlooking an opportunity to denounce the police for using similar methods against the enemies of law and order. Again, we opine from the quotation above, that, in the minds of the Socialists, the "ideas" expressed by Communists are "rare jewels" and "too valuable to be suppressed."

If Communist activities and propaganda in the United States menace our institutions, certainly every honest citizen wants to know it; and if there is nothing to fear in such activities and propaganda, they also want to know it. If the Communists in the United States, as the Socialists contend, are not engaged in subversive or dangerous activities, and if, as they further contend, all those holding contrary views are "red-baiters," or hysterical individuals, then by what process of reasoning do they come to the conclusion that such evidence as they may possess to support their position should be withheld from the Committee?

Those who call themselves Socialists and those who call themselves Communists can well be compared to two islands in the ocean. They appear separate stretches of land but at the bed of the sea they unite and become one. The Socialists and Communists always join forces when any form of attack on our government, its institutions or the private property right, is in the offing.

As the followers of the Socialist School of Thought divide into two wings, or factions, wholly on the question of tactics to attain a common end, the followers of the Capitalist School of Thought likewise divided into two factions or wings to attain a common end.

The common end of those following the Capitalist School, and all factions thereof, is to *sustain* and *defend* the *existing form of*

government, existing institutions and the operating economic system. The common end of the Socialist School of Thought and all factions thereof is to *destroy* the *existing form of government*, existing in institutions and the operating economic system.

The two wings or factions of the former School, operating in the political field are known as the Republican and the Democratic parties. Mind you, those who are members or followers of both these parties are loyal citizens seeking the same ends. The thing that divides them into two parties is the question of *means* to attain the common end. While it is true, today, there is very little to so divide, in the past there have been important and marked issues, such as free trade or tariff, the gold standard or double standard, and other major issues.

Now, the two wings, or factions of the Socialist School of Thought, operate on the political field through two parties. One is called the Socialist, the other the Communist Party, which organizations frankly admit they are parts of an "international" movement. Both parties are seeking to attain the aims and purposes advanced by the Socialist School of Thought. They divide into these two wings or parties wholly on the question of means to attain the end.

The unanimity with which those who follow the Socialist School of Thought under the two names, Socialist Party and Communist Party and their respective allies, unite in a common attack upon those who seek to expose their aims and methods, is evident. Members of both wings are on boards of directors of subsidiary organizations—"degrees," if you please. Members of both wings, or parties, join in a common cause against the police when the police seek to preserve order in some industrial trouble. Members of both parties unite in a common assault upon our institutions. Members of both parties join in establishing what they term "defence" organizations which raise money to protect those who, using force and violence to attain the common end, come into conflict with the law. The members of both parties join in organizations to wage persistent war against all organizations and individuals exposing their purposes or combatting their tactics. And the members of both parties unite in a common front when attacking the principles, the leaders, or the members of both the Republican or the Democratic parties, and all others who refuse to follow the leaders of the Socialist School of Thought.

(Copyright 1931)

LECTURE No. 7

THE SOCIALIST SYSTEM KNOWN AS "LEGISLATIVE (OR PARLIAMENTARY) ACTION."

Today we take up the system employed by the Right, or Socialist, wing of the Socialist School of Thought to attain its aims, that is, the overthrow of our form of government, the destruction of its institutions including the church and the home, and the abolition of our economic system which presents the private property right principle. Going back to a statement that has been many times made and, we believe, fully supported by documentary evidence, that the two wings of the Socialist movement, one known as Socialists and the other as Communists, have the same aims—those just mentioned—differing primarily in methods to attain their ends, let me see if I can present a simple illustration that will make the tactics of each clear to you.

We covet a picture on this wall. We know it is not our property. While determined to secure that picture we do not propose to pay anything. In order to still our conscience we keep saying to ourselves and to each other that this club did not secure it legally and so does not own it. I say the best way to satisfy my desire is to walk boldly in the front door, stick a gun in the face of the elevator man and force him to bring me to this floor; then, still intimidating him with the gun, compel him to take the picture from the wall, hand it to me and return me to the ground floor. If any one interferes with my escape I should shoot him. *That is the method the Communists are employing to gain the wealth of this nation.*

You say that my system outside of involving personal danger, and none of you wish to take that chance, will not prove successful. You say the best way is to gain admission to the club, secure the confidence of the management and employes and then when the opportune time presents itself, every one being off-guard and no one suspecting your purposes, take the picture from the wall, conceal it under your coat and boldly walk out of the building. *That is the method the Socialists are employing to gain the wealth of this nation.*

The one, that of the Communist wing of the Socialist movement, is spectacular and gains public attention. The other, that of the Socialist wing of the same movement, lacks in the sensational and so gains little notice. Occasionally one reads of the arrest of Communists for the violation of our laws in their efforts to arouse class-hatred and induce incipient revolutions. Now and then the papers editorially comment on the event but seldom do they show the true aims and purposes of the Communists and the reason why they knowingly and purposely engage in rioting, public disturbances, and demonstrations. Some editors, in fact, in so commenting have taken occasion to deride the arresting officers. In the larger communities, especially in New York City, in more than one instance Communists charged with rioting on the streets and endangering the lives of the people, when brought into Court have been discharged while the arresting officers were reprimanded for making the arrests.

The press does not mention the aims and purposes of the Socialist Party, save possibly during the heat of a political campaign when Socialists seek to gain political preference through camouflage as, for instance, during the La Follette campaign in 1924. Those in the Socialist movement are treated as though they were legitimately working to benefit *all* the people of the United States through the enactment of certain legislative reforms. Many editors when dealing with both the Socialists and the Communists seek to cover their lack of knowledge by being either sarcastic or facetious.

Now let us turn to the methods of the Socialist School of Thought and ascertain just what is proposed. In so doing, we will cite only official documents or utterances of leaders of that School. The Communist wing while standing firmly for force and violence, within recent years has supplemented its system with an admixture of "legislative action." In other words, the Communists have entered the political arena. Unlike their Socialist brethren who cover their purposes with idealistic utterances, the Communists frankly admit they enter this field because it affords an excellent opportunity for agitation and propaganda.

William Z. Foster, the presidential candidate on the Communist Party ticket in 1928, in his speech of acceptance (official document, page 11) said:

"We are not going into the national election campaign solely for the purpose of getting votes. * * * But we also have other, bigger objectives in the national election campaign. Our aim must be to

arouse the class-consciousness of the masses in a political sense and to mobilize them for struggle on all fronts. Vote getting is only one aspect of this general mobilization of the workers. * * * We must utilize the campaign to carry on a widespread and energetic propaganda to teach the workers that the capitalist class would never allow the working class peacefully to take control of the state. * * * When a Communist heads a government in the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises (applause)—that government will not be a capitalistic government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.”

The Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist party, in an editorial November 4th, 1928, in part said: “The slogan under which the Communist Party is carrying on its campaign in the various municipal elections is ‘class against class.’ While mobilizing the workers on immediate demands and issues such as housing, transportation, Jim-Crowism, etc., the Communist Party is, at the same time, pointing out to the workers that the only way the working class of this country can free itself from capitalistic exploitation is through the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a workers’ and farmers’ government.

The same paper editorially, November 1st, 1928, stated: “* * * It (the Communist Party) tells the workers frankly that they can not be liberated by the ballot cast in a capitalistic society, that they can not attain Socialism by the machinery provided by capitalists. The building up of a Socialist social system can begin only after the working class takes control of a given country as the ruling class. And the rule of the working class can be attained only through militant, courageous class struggle, the revolutionary struggle, under the leadership of the revolutionary party.”

The following is from a statement of the Central Executive Committee of the Workers (Communist) Party of America, printed in the Daily Worker, October 18th, 1928: “The master class is beginning to realize that the Communist party is a new factor in the political life of the country. For the first time in the history of this country there appears a really revolutionary party of the working class, a party which conducts its campaign not for parliamentary gains but for revolutionary aims. * * * The election campaign of the Communist Party serves only one goal: the mobilization of the masses of workers against the master class. The aim of the Com-

munist candidates is not to grab offices but to spread the propaganda of the class struggle, to expose the celebrated American capitalist democracy in all its ugly nakedness as a capitalist dictatorship.”

While urging certain legislative reforms the Communists boldly and unequivocally declare they are so doing, not to present a cure for any political, economic or social ill that may exist under *but not because of* our form of government and economics, but instead wholly to give the people “bitter experiences.” They argue that the reformistic legislation they present will not, *per se*, cure the ill but on the contrary will intensify it or produce some new ill, hence the “bitter experiences.” When the secret, illegal convention of Communists at Bridgeman, Michigan, was raided in August, 1922, many documents of a strictly confidential nature fell into the hand of the government. During the trials of William Z. Foster and Charles E. Ruthenberg for violating the anti-syndicalism law of that state, some of these documents were introduced in evidence.

One, being confidential instructions for action in the United States, is of especial interest. It will be found as an Exhibit in the case of Michigan vs. Charles E. Ruthenberg. In it appears the following language:

“The Communist party must remember *it is not its purpose to reform* the capitalist state. The purpose, on the contrary, is to cure the workers of their reformistic illusions through *bitter experiences*. Demands upon the state for immediate concessions to the workers must be formulated *not to be ‘reasonable’* from the point of view of the State, but to be *‘reasonable’ from the point of view of the struggling workers* regardless of the state’s power to grant them *without weakening itself.*” (Emphasis supplied.)

The language is clear, to the point and admits of but one construction. The right or Socialist wing of the same School of Thought, takes the same position as the Left wing. In so doing, however, it adopts language which admits of more than one construction. When this language is cited and attention called to its clarity the Socialists, or at least their idealistic followers, insist that it has quite a different meaning.

To note the exact language that you may construe it as you deem it is intended, turn to the Socialist platform of 1904 (official document issued by the National Committee, Socialist Party, pages 307-8-9). Setting forth that the organization is not American but is “world wide,” and one that “pledges fidelity to the principles of

international Socialism," the platform divides the people into two classes, capitalists and workers, stating that "there can be no compromise or identity of interests any more than there can be peace in the midst of war or light in the midst of darkness." The platform then states that "Socialism means that all things upon which the people in common depend shall be by the people in common be owned and administered." In other words, that no individual shall enjoy the private property right. Declaring that the aim of Socialism is to secure possession of "all things upon which the people depend"—that is all things now produced or owned by individuals—there naturally arose the question of adopting a method to attain all this wealth, this property of others, the platform upon this point reads:

"To the end that the workers may seize every possible advantage that may strengthen them to gain complete control of the powers of government, and thereby the sooner establish the cooperative commonwealth"—remember cooperative commonwealth is the technical name for the form of government now operating in Russia—"the Socialist Party pledges itself to watch and work" for certain so-called legislative reforms. Among them we find the gradual taxation of incomes and inheritances, franchises and land values, old-age pensions, popular government, including the initiative and referendum, proportional representation, and recall of officers.

Nowhere in the platform or in the arguments favoring its adoption as printed in the official proceedings, do we find a word urging these legislative reforms because they will, *per se*, cure the ills alleged to exist. On the contrary, the Socialist wing of the Socialist School of Thought definitely states that the reason for urging them is, because if adopted they "will lessen the economic and political power of the capitalists"—that is, those who approve of our form of government and our economic system—"and increase the power of the workers"—that is, those who accept the Socialist formula. The language follows:

"But in so doing"—that is, urging these legislative reforms—"we are using these remedial measures as means to *the one great end of the cooperative commonwealth*. Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a *preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry.* * * *"
(Emphasis supplied.)

In other words, as one is forced to construe the official language of the two wings of the Socialist School of Thought, both enter the

political arena for identically the same reason, to wit:—to destroy our form of government, its institutions and its economic system. Nowhere do we find anything that would indicate a desire to effect reforms under our form of government and its institutions. Moreover, nowhere is any evidence presented to prove that existing political, economic and social ills under our form of government, its institutions and its economic system exist *because* of the form of government, its institutions or its economic system. As a matter of fact the Socialist School of Thought opposes any action that would cure any such ills, and at the same time not injure or weaken the form of government, its institutions and its economic system. This is not a conclusion. They so officially affirm. (See the statement of Prof. Harry W. Laidler, first lecture, page 18.)

The Communist wing boldly says its object in urging certain reformistic legislation is that, through its adoption, it will give the people "bitter experiences." The Socialist wing expressly states in its official platform that it is urging the adoption of the same reformistic legislation in order "that the workers may seize every possible advantage * * * * and thereby the sooner establish the cooperative commonwealth"; and, further, that this reformistic legislation in operation is "but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry." In other words and to be perfectly frank about it, they understand full well that their program of legislation if, and when, in operation will not effect a cure for the ills they allege but, on the contrary, will result in so weakening the whole governmental structure under our Constitution, that the change to a Socialist state will be easy and bloodless.

Now if this reformistic legislation is designed as "means to the one great end of the cooperative commonwealth," certainly its "one great end" is not the cure of certain ills and evils. In view of these official declarations, what becomes of the idealism that has been injected into the public utterances of Socialist School of Thought advocates? That structure erected to gain the attention of well meaning persons falls of its own weight.

If the purpose of the legislation urged by followers of the Socialist School—yes, carefully and skillfully prepared in the first instance—is to give the people "bitter experiences"; is designed "as means to the one great end of the cooperative commonwealth," certainly it was not originally designed to cure any political, economic or social ill. If the purpose of such legislation is, as the Communists state, "*to cure the people of their reformistic illusions,*" or as the Socialists state, "*to seize the power of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry,*" certainly it is not formulated and urged to benefit the people as a whole.

What position are we to take, that presented by the official documents of both wings of the Socialist School of Thought or, that

presented by innocent idealists who probably are honest in their belief that this reformistic legislation is presented to cure certain ills that exist under—but *not because of*—our form of government, its institutions and its economic system? If the purpose is to “*lessen the economic and political power*” of those who, through the application of energy, ability, skill, genius, or labor, have managed to attain some worldly goods, then certainly the purpose is not to strengthen the form of government and economics that have enabled persons to so attain. If not intended to aid the people of the United States as a whole, then certainly the people of the United States as a whole should know it and with all vigor oppose such legislation.

Whatever may be claimed for it, the fact remains that the great mass of reformistic legislation that floods the Congress and state legislature every session, is the product of the Socialist School of Thought. Our authority for so stating is no less a person than Morris Hillquit, one of the outstanding leaders in international Socialism. In “Socialism Summed Up,” discussing this reformistic legislation (page 86) he writes:

“Such measures of social reform are, as a rule, originally formulated by the Socialist parties”—the Communist party is a member of the Socialistic family—“on radical and thoroughgoing lines. They become the object of a persistent and widespread propaganda, and finally they acquire the force of popular demands. At this stage the ‘progressive’ and sometimes even the ‘conservative’ statesmen of the dominant political parties begin to realize the political significance of the proposed measure. The *Vox Populi* means votes on election day * * *.”

And then (page 89) he writes: “They never run short of demands for reform measures, and they can formulate them more rapidly and copiously than the other political parties can ‘steal’ them.” Adding, (page 93) “The Socialist movement is thoroughly organized, more so than any other movement in our days or in the past.”

It will be contended, perhaps, by the innocent followers of the Socialist School of Thought that we are going back to early platforms of the Socialist party and that times have changed and purposes have changed. Times have changed but purposes have not. The innocent advocates of Socialism possibly will turn to the Socialist platform for 1928 and therein fail to find the language I have cited. True, it is lacking, but at the same time the reformistic legislation to which Mr. Hillquit refers and which is outlined in earlier platforms is specifically set forth. The Socialist platform for 1928 presents a number of legislative proposals which are among those designated by the Communists as “unreasonable” from the point of view of the state, but “reasonable” from the point of view of those who believe the legislation will benefit them.

The outstanding reformistic legislation so advocated (American Labor Year Book, Vol. X, page 149) follows:

"Nationalization of our natural resources beginning with the coal mines and water sites, particularly at Boulder Dam and Muscle Shoals.

"A publicly owned giant water power system under which the Federal government shall cooperate with the states and municipalities in the distribution of electrical energy to the people at cost.

"National ownership and democratic management of railroads and other means of transportation and communication.

"A system of unemployment insurance.

"A system of health and accident insurance and of old age pensions as well as unemployment insurance * * * .

"Enacting of an adequate federal anti-child labor amendment.

"Increase of taxation on high income levels, of corporation taxes and inheritance taxes, the proceeds to be used for old age pensions and other forms of social insurance.

"Abolition of injunctions in labor disputes.

"Repeal of the Espionage law * * * .

"Legislation protecting foreign-born workers from deportation and refusal of citizenship on account of political opinions.

"Modification of immigration laws * * * to offer a refuge for those fleeing from political or religious persecution.

"Acquisition by bona fide cooperative societies and by federal, state and municipal governments of grain elevators, stockyards, storage warehouses and other distributing agencies and the conduct of these services on a non-profit basis.

"Social insurance (for the farmer) against losses due to adverse weather conditions such as hail, droughts, cyclone and floods.

"Cancellation of all war debts due the United States from its former associated powers * * * ."

And to prove that the Socialist party as constituted and managed today has in mind just what the Socialist Party for 1904 had in mind, attention is called to the fact that Morris Hillquit, then and now most prominent in the organization, sat in the convention of 1904 approving, if not actually helping to word the platform, and he sat in the 1928 convention approving, if not actually having a hand in wording the platform. Certainly no true Socialist will question Mr. Hillquit's authority to speak for the movement.

Let us, however, turn to another spokesman for the Socialist School of Thought, Jessie Wallace Hughan. She is one of the contributing editors of "The New Appeal," the official organ of the

Socialist Party. In 1928 she issued a book, "What is Socialism?" She writes (page 103, " * * * we find six lines of legislation that must be pursued simultaneously in order to reach the goal." The goal is the Socialist state, a form of government similar to that now imposed upon the people of Russia, a form of government that deprives the people of the private property right. In summing up what she presents in a chapter captioned, "Methods of Realization," (page 114) she writes: " * * * These demands show that the Socialist state is to be brought about automatically by economic forces, and *deliberately* by legislation of six general types." (Emphasis supplied.)

The propaganda extensively employed by the Socialists in the public press and by word of mouth, however, fails so to state. All this propaganda, as you have noticed, is to the effect that the reformistic legislation formulated and urged by the Socialists is designed to cure some existing political, economic or social ill. Nowhere have you read, nor have you heard a single speaker urging the adoption of any of this reformistic legislation say that its purpose was *deliberately* to bring about the Socialist state.

Now if this legislation, much of which has already been adopted and much of which is now being urged before the Congress or state legislature, is *deliberately* planned, as Miss Hughan affirms, to destroy this government—and it must be for that purpose since the Socialist state can not exist until the present government is destroyed—then clearly those who formulated and are now urging this legislation are "*deliberately*" practicing deception. What other conclusion can one draw from the facts?

That deception is necessary we admit; that it is justifiable we emphatically deny. Had it not been practiced, had the leaders in the Socialist School of Thought boldly and frankly informed the people they were urging this reformistic legislation *deliberately* to destroy our form of government, the many hundreds of thousands who are now already supporting such legislation would be lacking in enthusiasm.

Elaborating the six general types of legislation "*originally formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thoroughgoing lines,*" according to Mr. Hillquit, Miss Hughan (page 114) writes: (For a better and clearer understanding we paragraph the quotation.)

"These six types to be inaugurated simultaneously are:

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

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

“Third, the international demands, directed to the abolition of imperialism and of war.

“Fourth, the financial, consisting of inheritance, income and other taxes bearing heavily upon super-fortunes.

“Fifth, the industrial embracing various forms of labor legislation, social insurance and pensions, freedom to strike, the minimum wage and finally the guarantee of employment.

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

In the same paragraph Miss Hughan visualizes the final attainment of Socialism in the United States “*through educational propaganda.*” (Emphasis supplied.)

We are all fairly well acquainted with these six types of legislation “*deliberately*” designed for our destruction. One can scarcely pick up a newspaper without noting propaganda favoring some of this legislation.

From the foregoing citations, we have concrete evidence that the reformistic legislation is not to affect cures for any political, economic or social ills that may now exist, but on the contrary is designed to destroy our form of government in order that the Socialist state may be established. The Communists say such legislation is to give the people “*bitter experiences.*” The Socialists officially affirm it is a means to “*the one great end of the cooperative commonwealth*” and is, “*but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole power of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry.*” Miss Hughan says it is “*deliberately*” presented to bring about the Socialist state. And Morris Hillquit states that it is “*formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thoroughgoing lines.*”

Upon what, then, is based the public propaganda and the arguments, that are presented members of the Congress and state legislature, that the purpose of this reformistic legislation is to cure political, economic or social ills?

Understanding now the real purpose of the reformistic legislation, let us analyze the system of “*persistent and widespread propaganda*” which, according to Mr. Hillquit, is employed to popularize this legislation and cause members of one of the old parties to adopt and enact it.

The first step is to center upon some political, economic or social ill that may affect a certain class, group, kind or community, and utilize all available means to intensify that ill. In so doing, any plan that might actually result in a cure is derided and combatted. If the

alleged ill is of minor importance, then the first step is to create the belief that it is of major importance. This is followed—and often a part of the original propaganda—by the suggestion that the ill, no matter what it may be or what its cause, exists wholly because of the form of government, our institutions or our economic system. After establishing in the minds of the class, group or community affected, the belief that this premise is correct some character of legislation as the remedy is proposed.

Since those who, as a matter of fact, are adversely affected by a real political, economic or social ill are few in number, in order to popularize the proposed legislation it is necessary to gain support outside of the class, group or community affected. The formula for securing such aid was laid down by the founder of the whole system of Socialism as it is practiced today, Adam Weishaupt. Dr. Robison (Lecture No. 5), quoting from a manuscript in the handwriting of Weishaupt (“Proofs of a Conspiracy,” page 191), says:

“We must acquire the direction of education—of church management—of the professorial chair and of the pulpit. We must bring our opinions into fashion by every art—spread them among the people by the help of young writers. We must preach the warmest concern for humanity and *make people indifferent to all other relations*. We must take care that our writers are well puffed, and that the Reviewers do not depreciate them; therefore we must endeavor by every means to gain over the Reviewers and Journalists, who in time will see that it is their interest to side with us.” (Emphasis in the original.)

It will be well to do a bit of personal analyzing of these statements of Weishaupt. “*We must acquire the direction of education, of church management, of the professorial chair and the pulpit.*” Considering the ever increasing number of college professors and clergymen who are engaged in presenting Socialism, few of them, we assume, knowing little about the theory they advocate, one is forced to believe this feature of Weishaupt’s formula has not been overlooked.

“*We must bring our opinions into fashion by every art—spread them among the people by the help of young writers.*” Evidence certainly is not lacking that this has been done for several years, and is being done today. Is not “every art”—the movies, the legitimate stage, pamphlets, books, novels, and the press—being used to bring Socialism into “fashion?”

“*We must take care that our writers are well puffed and that the Reviewers do not depreciate them; therefore we must endeavor by every means to gain over the Reviewers and Journalists; and must also try to gain the booksellers who in turn will see it is to their interests to side with us.*” Are not new writers who turn their atten-

tion to the laudation of Socialism and at the the same time condemnation of our form of government, its institutions and its economic system. "well puffed"? A book or novel denouncing things American gets a creditable "review" in most of the papers and magazines; a novel or book extolling some Socialist proposal gains instant attention from the "reviewers." Do not the publishers turn out fifty books or novels that attack our present institutions and our economic system to one of an opposite nature?

It may be that all this is accidental. One is forced to assume, however, that it is not, but that, on the contrary, the formula so clearly expressed by Weishaupt is being employed by the Socialist School of Thought of today.

In the phrase above, "*We must preach the warmest concern for humanity and make people indifferent to all other relations,*" you find the key to all Socialist propaganda. Touch the sympathetic nature of a person and he becomes *indifferent to all other relations*. Again, the American people as a whole are sympathetic. Probably those of no other nation on the face of the globe do so much for charity. The average American is ever seeking to aid those in need. Through preaching *warmest concern for humanity*" the aid and support of well meaning and sincere people have been secured to further the mass of reformistic legislation formulated by the Socialist School of Thought. Such persons do not stop to analyze the ultimate result should the legislation be enacted. They are "*indifferent to all other relations.*"

And so we find those of the different groups mentioned by Weishaupt foremost in the general scheme to popularize Socialist legislation *deliberately* designed to destroy our form of government, our institutions and our economic system. In enlisting these and others, individual cases of suffering, misery, want, unemployment, etc., are exposed to public gaze. While these instances are exceptions and not the rule, the propaganda employed causes the more or less careless thinker to assume they are the rule and not exceptions. I ask every one of you to take instances where your sympathies have been played upon and carefully analyze the case in the light of what we have just said.

There are very few indeed who have not, at one time or another, "fallen" for some of the reformistic legislation presented by the Socialists. Those who have given such legislation support have been motivated by one of two things—the *belief* that the legislation if enacted in some manner would aid them personally, or "*concern for humanity.*"

A brief study of the methods applied by the Socialists and their army of "liberal" followers to secure the adoption of reformistic legislation formulated by the Socialist parties on "*radical and thor-*

oughgoing lines" intended "*deliberately*" to enable the Socialists to "*seize the whole powers of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry,*" may be of value at this time.

Opposition to all such legislation is never met with evidence or logic. There is a reason. The proponents have neither evidence nor logic to sustain their position. Opposition, therefore, is combatted in an entirely different way. The first move, usually, is to discredit the individuals opposing. They are held up to ridicule. They are charged with lacking in sympathy for the downtrodden or others for the reformation or relief of which the legislation is alleged to be designed. Sarcasm is liberally used. It is asserted that the opposition comes from a desire on the part of all taking part therein, to advance themselves in a monetary way. While insisting that all who favor the legislation are most sincere—and we are not here questioning the sincerity of many of them—all who oppose it are charged with marked insincerity and lacking in honesty.

Now, with this plan of operation before you, turn to two pieces of legislation over the desirability of which there has been much controversy. One, the Child Labor Amendment, for the time being at least settled, and the other the proposal to disarm the nation. As you will remember it was alleged that the Child Labor Amendment—and possibly you favored it because of the "concern for humanity" contained in the appeal—was the one and only cure-all for the evils of child labor. You will recall how all those who opposed the amendment were held up to ridicule by the sponsors of the amendment. You will further recall the common cry was that its opponents were lacking in sympathy for exploited children, or were themselves engaged in exploiting children for their own selfish ends.

During the entire campaign, evidence and logic presented in opposition to this socialistic measure were swept aside. Ridicule, sarcasm, and individual attacks became the tools of the proponents. Those who opposed it took the sound position that the amendment was not designed so much as a cure for an existing evil as to weaken the whole governmental structure; that, in fact, it would not cure the ill but instead create other ills; that to centralize, in a bureau at Washington, a function that lies with the States and with the parents, was most dangerous to the future of the nation.

Turn to the present extensive campaign to disarm the United States. We find a large number of well-meaning persons enthusiastically allied with this movement. The proposal originated many years ago in a Socialist international congress and the argument then presented for the disarmament of existing nations was that not until defenses had been destroyed could capitalism be destroyed. Evidence to sustain this statement will be presented in a later lecture. The

line of combat against those who oppose this character of legislation is similar in every way to that employed in the Child Labor amendment campaign. Every person in the land who has become at all prominent in opposition to the Socialist disarmament proposals has been subjected to bitter attacks, at times, almost libelous.

The charge is made by the "liberal" army of followers of the Socialist School of Thought that only those who are urging disarmament of the nation are honest and sincere in their desire to prevent future wars; that those who oppose the Socialist program are anxious to plunge us into armed conflict because in some manner, not explained, they will reap a monetary reward.

Now the fact remains—and no one can present either evidence or reason to disprove it—that those who are urging a program of efficient preparedness and a policy of proper armament, are so doing wholly because they have every reason to believe this will prevent—not cause—future wars. To charge them with lacking in sincerity is little less than insulting. Further, those who favor the Socialist measures have not, by study or experience, acquired any accurate knowledge upon the subject. Many of them are leaders of the Socialist School of Thought and will be found urging the overthrow of our form of government, its institutions and our economic system with the property right. On the other hand, those who are insisting upon a policy of proper preparedness and who are opposing the disarmament schemes, because of study and experience, are well qualified to speak with some degree of authority. Moreover, they are found among those working to support the present government and its institutions, the existing economic system with the private property right.

Go back to the statement of the Communists that reformistic legislation is designed to bring the people "*bitter experiences*"; to the declaration in the Socialist platform that such legislation is presented to enable the Socialists "*to seize the whole powers of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry*"; to the statement of Miss Hughan that such legislation is "*deliberately*" urged in order to attain the Socialist state; and the citation from Morris Hillquit that such measures are "*originally formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thoroughgoing lines.*" Revert to the system we have just outlined to discount all who oppose such legislation, and then do a bit of sound reasoning for yourselves.

With the movement to "popularize" the proposed Socialist legislation well formed and with many advocates who give it an air of respectability and reliability, the next step is to call public meetings to discuss the situation. It is at these public meetings, as a rule, that those who have been won to the cause by the emotional appeal, be-

come the most effective. While they may not directly charge that the fault lies with the government, its institutions or its economic system, they are loud in their demand that the ill be cured by a dose of legislation. Committees are appointed, resolutions adopted, and the movement becomes sufficiently pronounced to attract the attention of the demagogues, those who are ever seeking some popular "cause"—never a right principle—to sweep them into a political office.

The centers of activities now move to Washington or to state capitals. A proposed law has been drawn and presented for consideration. Lobbyists are numerous. Advocates of the legislation appear in great numbers before the committee to which the legislation has been referred. Little is heard in opposition for two main reasons. First, because few know the true purpose of the legislation, where it originated, or what will happen if it is enacted; and second, because those who do understand all that is back of it and just why it is being urged, gain little or no support when they seek to present the facts. Then there is another reason. The average American is exceedingly busy minding his own business. If the legislation does not directly affect him, he pays no attention to it and in many instances because it does directly and adversely affect some industry which he thinks is not treating him just right, he gives it moral aid and support. Such persons do not stop to reason that anything that injures one line of business, anything that tends to deprive one line of industry of the property right must, of necessity, in the end, affect all others, and deprive all others of that right.

At last the legislation reaches the point where the Congress or a state legislature is to determine whether it shall be adopted or rejected. While the great majority backing the legislation are sincere in their efforts, due to their "*concern for humanity*" and are eager for its passage, not so the originators. Whether adopted or rejected makes little difference to them. It has, to a large degree, served its purpose. It has extended and intensified propoganda against our form of government, our institutions and our economic system. If adopted, since it will not cure the ill or alleged ill, it will, as the Communist wing expresses it, bring the people "*bitter experiences.*" Or as the Socialist wing contends, it will enable them "*to seize every possible advantage that may strengthen them to gain complete control of the powers of government, and thereby the sooner establish the cooperative commonwealth * * **"

If the legislation is rejected, no matter what the army of sincere sponsors believe, the fact remains that those who formulated it have profited. The mere fact that it failed of passage causes the honest advocates to be a bit angry. They vent their feelings at the next election by defeating, or attempting to defeat, those who voted against the measure. Being honest in their advocacy they continue their agitation for similar Socialistic reform measures with even greater

zeal. This all helps the Socialist movement. It supplies its leaders with slogans and battle-cries. The clever Socialist propagandists and their large army of parrot-like followers reach the people through the press, pamphlet, book, novel, the public forum, and the pulpit, with something like this:

“We told you so. Wall Street is the government of the United States. The members of the Congress (or a state legislature as the case may be) are controlled by the capitalist class. The common people have no voice in this government. They are mere lackeys and slaves for the money trust. Here was a bit of legislation that would have greatly helped a large number of people but it was not pleasing to the controlling class. The common people can expect no better treatment in the future so long as those of great wealth direct and control all things. Take the government out of their hands. Take charge of the government yourselves. Make it a government for the common people. Establish a cooperative commonwealth in the United States, a form of government that gives all power to the common people. Not until this is done will you enter into your rightful inheritance.”

You can easily visualize the effects this sort of harangue has on those who do not reason for themselves—and there are many who do not—and those whom the Socialists have mesmerized with their “*concern for humanity*” cry. The members of the class, group or community, made the victims of schemes of this character are honest in their beliefs because they accepted the propaganda of the sponsors, and they accepted it because it harmonized with their desires. They were not progressing as they felt they should and so promptly turned to the government for aid.

Those who accept this propaganda as correct have heard a great deal about that monster “Wall Street” and its consort “The Money Trust.” To them these enemies are real. With the failure of the Congress, or a state legislature as the case may be, to enact the legislation which these persons hold to be legitimate and most desirable, and in the efficacy of which they had supreme confidence, they become discouraged. They hold to the fixed belief that all the Socialist propagandists say is correct—that they have been deprived of their legitimate inheritance wholly because “Wall Street,” “The Money Trust” or some other fearful monster and enemy of the people, interposed objections.

Put yourself in the place of such persons. Analyze the effect this sort of propaganda would have on you and you will get a fair idea of how it works. “*Concern for humanity*” still gains the attention and the support of the people. And it “*makes them indifferent to all other relations,*” even their own welfare.

(Issued by the Educational Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, 120 West 42nd Street, New York City.)

(Copyright 1931)

LECTURE No. 8

THE COMMUNIST SYSTEM OF "MASS (OR DIRECT) ACTION"

The Socialist School of Thought, we have learned, divides into two wings or factions—one, the Right or Socialist, the other, the Left, or Communist. The followers of both wings, however, accept and advocate the same theory, to wit, the theory of Marx, the fundamental principle of which is the abolition of the private property right. While the question of methods to attain this end appears to be that which divides the movement into two wings, the fact remains that each faction serves a special purpose in a united campaign to wreck existing institutions.

The function of the Right, or Socialist, wing is to weaken the entire political, social and economic structure. Activities to this end are carried on by means of propaganda and agitation. Assaults are made upon the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism upon these sentiments, as we all understand, rest national security and advancement. Attacks are made upon the home and the church. Individual instances of suffering, want, unemployment, acts of unfairness or injustice, are made to appear the rule rather than the exception. "Concern for humanity" which causes people to "forget all other relations" dominates their propaganda. In this line of activity they step outside the party machinery and use their "liberal" followers to advantage.

Among the documents secured when the government raided the secret, illegal convention of Communists at Bridgman, Michigan, in August 1922, was a long one from Moscow outlining a system that should be employed to win the Negroes to Communism. It was made plain, from the other documents seized at the same time, that the plan presented to deal with the colored races could also, with great success, be employed with the whites as well. This much is certain, the system specifically outlined has been used in connection with all groups whether that was the intent of the Moscow leaders or not. The salient features (quoted in "Reds in America," by R. M. Whitney, page 193) follow:

"In order that the negro may be reached with education and propaganda and that he may be organized for activity, the following methods are recommended:

"1.—Nuclei shall be established in all existing negro organizations, such as fraternal, religious and labor organizations, cooperatives, tenant farmers' leagues, etc.

"2.—Colored organizers and speakers shall be sent among negroes in order to inform them and win their confidence.

"3.—Newspapers and publications shall be established or, when this is not feasible, news service shall be established by friendly cooperation with colored newspapers of liberal tenets.

"4.—Friendship of liberal-minded negro ministers shall be sought, as these men are at the present time the leaders of the negro masses and many of them are earnest but lack scientific knowledge.

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

"6.—By means of its membership the party shall penetrate the existing forums, literary societies, lyceums, schools, colleges, teachers' institutes, etc., of the colored people, and establish forums of its own for the enlightenment of the negro population.

"7.—Where other forms of activity are impossible or impracticable, as in certain Southern districts, cooperatives may be formed."

The special function of the left, or Communist, wing of the Socialist School of Thought is to prepare for the day when the revolution, which those of both wings predict, shall have arrived. Communist activities are designed to train men and women in the proper use of force and violence, to educate them in the art of terrorism. To this end the Communists induce strikes in order to provoke rioting. This gives their followers a taste of blood and causes them better to understand this character of combat when the revolution must be supported. All such strikes are called "lessons in revolution." Jack Stachel, a young Communist, writing in the *Daily Worker*, February 24th, 1926, said: "One of the most important features of the Passaic strike is its educational aspect. The strike is a *schooling in revolution*." (Emphasis supplied.)

It is the theory of the Communists—and upon this point they appear for once to have adopted a proper premise—that out of every such "lesson in revolution" a few men and women will emerge, tested by actual fire, well qualified to take charge in bringing about other "lessons in revolution." It is their belief that from such "lessons" they will develop a well trained and reliable force of commanders for the big and final revolution for which they, at all times, are working. In other words the Communists, through their system of labor strikes, are training men and women to destroy this government just as we, through our Citizens Military Training Camps, are training men to prevent the overthrow of this government.

"Fundamentally, the Communist movement in the United States is illegal," says Charles G. Wood, Commissioner of Conciliation, Department of Labor ("Reds and Lost Wages," page 14). "It aims

to overthrow our government by force and violence. Its own thesis declares the adoption and maintenance of a 'period of illegality' pending its endeavor to establish the 'proletarian' control of production. When this is accomplished, the Communist agrees, the 'period of illegality' will pass. No matter what phrases are used by Communists to disguise the meaning of the 'period of illegality,' their objective stands out nakedly to prove them guilty of treason and inciters of riots and rebellion."

Volumes could be printed of mere extracts from Communist documents showing that force and violence is the method proposed by the Left wing of the Socialist School of Thought to destroy our government, our institutions and our economic system. It would appear that no Communist can write a hundred words without touching their revolutionary purposes, nor can one speak five minutes until he becomes excited over the plan to induce a civil war in the United States, or in other countries.

The following citations from "The A B C of Communism," an official text-book of the Third (Communist) International, are to the point and certainly seem sufficiently clear:

"To think that the revolution can take place without civil war is equivalent to thinking that there can be a 'peaceful' revolution." (Page 129.)

"Marx was an advocate of the civil war, that is to say of the fight of the armed proletariat against the bourgeoisie." (Page 130.)

"Engels, too, wrote as follows: 'Would the Commune of Paris have held its ground for a single day unless it had put its trust in the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie? Have we not, rather, the right to blame the Commune for having made so little use of its powers of compulsion?' And this is how Engels defines the term revolution: 'A revolution is an act in which one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part by means of rifles, bayonets, and artillery.' We see that the leaders of socialism took a very serious view of revolution. They understood that the proletariat cannot peacefully persuade the bourgeoisie; they understood that the workers must impose their will by means of victory in a civil war fought with 'rifles, bayonets, and artillery.'" (Page 130.)

"Civil war is an extremely intensified class war, and it occurs when the class war has led to revolution. The imperialist world war between the two groups of bourgeois States, the war waged for the repartition of the world, was carried on by the slaves of capital. It imposed such heavy burdens upon the workers that the class war was transformed into a civil war fought by the oppressed against their oppressors, the war which Marx had declared to be the only just war." (Page 128.)

“The civil war is not the result of any party’s caprice; its coming has been no chance matter. The civil war is a manifestation of the revolution, and the revolution was absolutely inevitable because the robber war of the imperialists had opened the eyes of the broad masses of the workers.” (Page 129.)

The important thing before us, however, is not so much the citation of evidence to prove that those who follow the Communist wing of the movement are planning a bloody revolution in this country as to understand the nature of present activities designed for the attainment of the ends sought. It would require altogether too much time to go into a history of the Communist Party in the United States. You are all probably well aware that it came into existence through a split in the Socialist Party. In other words, that the organizers of the Communist party were all Socialists. The faction that held that the major activities should be along the line of force and violence withdrew from the Socialist party and formed the Communist Party. Those who held that major activities should be along the “legislative action” line continued as the old party.

The following information concerning the formation of the Communist Party of America will be found on page 238 of Part 2, “Hearings before a Sub-committee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 68th Congress, First Session,” better known as the Borah Hearing on the Recognition of Soviet Russia:

“In 1890 the Socialist Labor Party of the United States was founded. A split occurred in 1899. From 1907 to 1912 there were numerous disputes in the Socialist Party of America, resulting in a definite split in 1912. In 1916 a number of the extremists organized the Socialist Propaganda League at Boston and issued a newspaper known as ‘The New International.’ In April, 1917, ‘The Class Struggle’ appeared. During 1917 and 1918 the radical elements of the Socialist Party continued activities contrary to its platform and, in November, 1918, a communist propaganda league was formed in Chicago. During the same year the Boston branch of the Socialist Party began the publication of ‘The Revolutionary Age,’ which advocated communist tactics. These activities resulted in the formation in New York City in February, 1919, of a Left Wing Section of the Socialist Party, the program of which was adopted by many of the locals of the Socialist Party, all of the Slavic federations of the party joining. The Socialist Party of America expelled every branch and local which adopted the Left Wing manifesto and program, in all approximately 40,000 members. In June, 1919, a National Left Wing conference was held in New York for the purpose of organizing a new party, but this effort was defeated and 31 of the delegates withdrew. These delegates issued a call for a convention on September 1, 1919, to organize a communist party.

“In August, 1919, at Detroit, Michigan, there was held a Russian convention, designated ‘The Convention of the Russian Socialist Federations in America, or the Fifth Regular Convention of

Federations of Russian branches of the Communist Party of America.' This federation had grown from 450 members in 1917 to 123 branches with over 9,000 members in 1919. The convention adopted a resolution of greeting to the Communist convention which was to be held in Chicago in September, 1919.

"In March, 1919, the Communist Party of Russia had issued a call for an international congress to organize a new International. The Left Wing Section mentioned above transmitted credentials to S. J. Rutgers to represent it at the congress.

"The first convention of the Communist Party of America was held on September 1, 1919, at Chicago, with 140 delegates supposedly representing 58,000 members. There was organized simultaneously the Communist Labor Party, with a reported membership of 10,000. The faction which formed the Communist Party of America was headed by C. E. Ruthenberg, I. E. Ferguson, Louis C. Fraina, Alexander Stocklitzky, John Ballam, Jay Lovestone, Dennis Batt, and Rose Pastor Stokes. Prominent in the organization of the Communist Labor Party at that time were John Reed, Marguerite Prevey, Ludwig Lore, James P. Cannon, Charles Baker, Charles Krumbein, and Max Bedacht.

"These names are given here in order to show the continued connection of the individuals with the Communist movement from its inception down to the present day, even into what is known as the Workers' Party.

"At the Convention held in Chicago in the summer of 1919 a manifesto and program was drawn up and adopted by the Communist Party of America, an examination of which is necessary as it was the first manifesto and program of this character to be adopted in the United States and which for the first time aligned the Communist movement in this country with the Third International."

The leaders of both wings of the Socialist School of Thought, at all times have been pronounced opportunists. They have been clever enough to take advantage of every opening to carry on their propaganda and agitational work. Both wings have long engaged in a systematic attempt to gain control of the American Federation of Labor. Indeed, in some state and in some local branches of the A. F. of L. such control has existed. When gained and exercised it has always resulted in great injury to the aims of legitimate labor organizations.

This control during and immediately following the World War, resulted in certain industries refusing longer to enter into agreements with the American Federation of Labor but to operate under what is known as the "open shop" rule. This naturally weakened certain branches of the Federation. The United Mine Workers Union was probably hit the hardest because many of its locals were in the hands of Communists or Socialists.

It will be recalled that in June, 1922, men working under "open shop" conditions in a coal mine at Herrin, Illinois, were attacked,

twenty of them being killed. This crime was laid at the door of the United Mine Workers Union. Ellis Searles, editor of the official publication of that organization, a little later, issued six articles which were widely printed in the daily press, later issued in book form, in which he denounced Communism in the most pronounced terms. Referring to the Herrin affair, ("Attempts by Communists to Seize the American Labor Movement," pages 24-5), he said:

"This revolting, inexcusable, terrible crime was fomented, promoted and caused solely by Communists. It was a carefully planned affair, schemed with all the diabolical cruelty and disregard for law that characterizes the activities of the Communist movement. * * * William Z. Foster was the dominating figure in the situation."

Just two months later this same Foster was arrested for participating in an illegal Communist meeting at Bridgman, Michigan. He was tried for criminal syndicalism. The jury disagreed. Before the trial started the Workers Defense League had been formed. Back of this were a number of the so-called "liberal" element. The purpose was to create the belief in the minds of the people that Communists were within the rights in carrying on their propaganda and activities. This movement gained much headway. Some eighteen months later, in fact, it was strong enough, due to apathy on the part of the American people, to force the Department of Justice to cease all activities in connection with Communism in the United States.

The system of the Communists is to "bore from within" existing unions as they had done at Herrin and turn them into revolutionary bodies, or completely destroy them and establish revolutionary unions. As soon as control is secured—and when secured it is largely because of acts of terrorism practiced on the members—the leaders make demands upon the employers. These demands are "unreasonable" from the point of view of the employers although held "reasonable" from the point of view of the employes. If granted, being "unreasonable", the employer and his business suffers. For instance, a demand for an increased wage is made. To the men induced to make the demand it seems "reasonable", for who is there who does not seek more compensation for his efforts? The employer is in no position to pay the wage sought. His business will not permit. To do so would mean bankruptcy. Now, the Communist leaders well understand that they have induced the members of the union they control to ask something impossible. They do not anticipate the demand will be granted. They expected it to be rejected. And so when it is denied they call a strike. The deceived working men who have blindly followed their Communist leaders suffer in consequence. The strike is at once followed by acts of violence. The "lesson in revolution" is on. The technical term applied by both Socialists and Communists to these "lessons in revolution" is "mass (or direct) action."

In the manifesto and Program of the Communist Party adopted in 1919 (Hearing of the Subcommittee of the Committee on For-

eign Relations, United States Senate, Sixty-Eighth Congress, first session, page 239), appears this language:

“Communism does not propose to ‘capture’ the bourgeoisie parliamentary state, but to conquer and destroy it. * * * The conquest of the power of the state is accomplished by the mass power of the proletariat. Political mass strikes are a vital factor in developing this mass power, preparing the working class for the conquest of Capitalism. * * * Mass action is industrial in its origin, but it requires political character as it develops fuller forms. Mass action, in the form of general political strikes and demonstrations, unites the energy and forces of the proletariat, brings proletarian mass pressure upon the bourgeoisie state. * * * The proletarian revolution comes at the moment of a crisis in Capitalism, of a collapse of the old order.”

Secretary of Labor W. B. Wilson (cabinet of President Woodrow Wilson) in a deportation case decided the Communist Party an illegal organization. In that decision (ibid, page 242) the Secretary says:

“Strikes are to be broadened and deepened, making them general and militant, and efforts made to develop their revolutionary implication. The strike is to be used not simply as a means to secure redress of economic wrongs, but as a means through which the Government may be conquered and destroyed.” (Emphasis supplied)

The Secretary presented the following quotation from the Communist Manifesto:

“The Communist Party shall participate in mass strikes, not only to achieve the immediate purposes of the strike but to develop the revolutionary implications of the same strike.” (Emphasis supplied)

Now, since Communist strikes are called not “*simply as a means to secure redress of economic wrongs but as a means through which the government may be conquered and destroyed,*” and as all such strikes are “*to develop the revolutionary implication,*” certainly those who bring them about are not seeking to help the wage-earners induced to take part in them. If such strikes are but “*means through which the government may be conquered and destroyed*” then is not a criminal form of deception being employed when the working men and women are told the purpose is to raise their wages, better their working conditions, or lessen their hours of work?

Knowing, now, the true purpose of these strikes, termed “lessons in revolution,” let us turn to the system employed to secure the cooperation of working men and women. The first move is to gain control of an existing legitimate labor union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Where that is not possible an independent Union under Communist direction is formed. Demands are then presented that are “unreasonable” from the point of view of the employer but which appear “reasonable” from the point of view of the employe. These demands being denied, a strike is called.

Among the important confidential documents secured by the government in the Bridgman raid, was the stenographic report of an address made before this Communist convention by William Z. Foster, then head of the Trade Union Educational League—now known as the Trade Union Unity League. This address, transcribed by stenographers for the State, was introduced in evidence during the trial of Mr. Foster for violating the anti-syndicalist law of Michigan. Among other things (see records of trial Michigan vs. Foster), he said:

“This is the situation we must create in the unions: Get a following among the men and they will not dare expel you. Get into the unions and tell them the whole program but use your intelligence. It is pretty much the fault of the revolutionist himself if he is expelled. My conception of the communist movement is not a movement that is primarily a rank and file movement, but my conception is that it is a militant movement, and that does not mean you will always be in agreement with the masses. When a critical situation comes along you draw up your program governing it, and put it through *no matter how much the masses are against it*. The Russian revolution is a work of militant communists. In Russia if the communists decide on a program they put that program into effect *if they have to coerce the ignorant masses* that do not rise to the height of a revolutionary program. We of this country have to learn that lesson. The masses are mostly guided by emotion but the communist movement must not be guided by emotion.” (Emphasis supplied.)

Referring to the Trade Union Educational League and urging steps be taken to increase its membership, Foster said: “We are learning * * * to organize a left block in the labor unions which means the league will not consist wholly of communists but of *all honest susceptible material that can be induced to go along in a general way*. *The honest trade union man is the determining element.*” (Emphasis supplied.)

This system of using “honest susceptible material,” those whom we commonly refer to as dupes, has been employed in many Communist-controlled organizations. “Susceptible material,” has been easily induced “to go along in a general way” by some form of emotional appeal. Many writers, speakers, professors, ministers and even business men—the latter “honest susceptible material” because of the profit appeal—have aligned themselves with open Communist movements. Those who are, at this time, urging the recognition of Soviet Russia or protesting any action that will curb Soviet trade, one is forced to assume, fall in this category.

Mr. Foster did not leave the subject there. He went into detail as to methods to be employed to gain the support of “the honest trade union man” whom, he insists, “is the determining element.” Along this line he said:

“Talk is all right but work is necessary. Don’t just talk, work. When there is a committee to be appointed get on it. You must

get the average laboring man to liking you personally. You must be secretary, horse, dog, or anything else in the union. That is the communist's job. When there is anyone needed to be the captain of a picket job the communist must be on the job. When there is an accident and suffering the communist must be on the job. After a little while the worker will say, seeing the activity of the communist workers, 'I don't think much of John's talk about communism, but by God, he is a good union man'; and they begin to like him. The minute you have their prejudice removed and they are on your side, you have a *receptive mind and you can educate that mind to communism*. A bond of sympathy is established between the educator and the pupil. After you show your heart is in the struggle, and that you are helping him, he becomes attached to you and when they see that this is the kind of a union a communist is they are ready to adopt communist principles also. (Emphasis supplied.)

Understanding perfectly well that the great mass of the American people, indeed the great mass of those whom the Communists call "workers" and to whom they make their direct appeal, are not in a mental state to accept their preachments, the initial step compels a certain line of agitation and propaganda work. To reach the masses in industries they "plant" skilled and trained agitators in different unions. These trained men, as a rule very good workmen at their trades, have no difficulty in holding their jobs. They attend all union meetings regularly and exhibit great interest in the proceedings. They are always ready to do their part to help advance the organization. Skillfully the Communist leaders gain the confidence of those members who, because of some human frailties, are dissatisfied with their lot. Men who never wish to admit that their failures are due to themselves, who are ever contending all their ills and sufferings are caused by the government or our economic system, furnish fertile mental fields for Communist propaganda.

Persons thus carefully selected are equally as carefully inoculated with Communist doctrines. When a well organized and cohesive minority, a minority which the Communist leader feels he can control, has been secured, he arises in some union meeting, denounces the employer in bitter and often insulting language, presents certain demands to be made on that employer. The question of reasonableness of these demands is not taken into consideration by his followers. Old time members of the union, those designated by Foster as "the honest trade union men," protest but they are howled down. Threats are made of physical violence and if they persist in their objections, members of their families are threatened with physical violence. In most such unions the old time "honest trade union men" are in the majority, although within the past twenty years due to our excessive immigration, those who think in terms not American are to be found in large numbers. These sound Americans do not wish to quarrel. They have no desire to participate in personal brawls. They are satisfied with their employer. They believe they

are being paid a fair wage and they try to deliver a fair day's work for that wage. They appreciate the fact that the business is not one that will stand an increase in expenses.

Those following the Communist agitator, however, are of a different mind. They are, by nature, more or less quarrelsome. They enjoy a personal brawl. They denounce the employer for not granting higher wages, and it matters little to them that should their demands be met the business would be bankrupt. Indeed, many of them believe that if they can force a business to the wall, by superior force, they can take possession of that business themselves and make money operating it. This was the belief that enabled the I. W. W. leaders to gain many converts. At some meeting of the union when the old time sound American workmen, because of threats or some other reason, are not out in number and the Communist followers are on hand in full force and in control, a strike is voted. The "honest trade union men" do not approve but are forced out of work just the same and so made to suffer.

Demonstrations are at once staged. "Strong-armed" men are stationed around the plant involved. Men who seek to enter are assaulted. If any of the members of the union who did not join in voting the strike attempt to work they are severely beaten. If the employer brings men from the outside to take the places of those who voluntarily left their jobs, rioting at once results and broken heads are plentiful. The "lesson in revolution" is on. Since the activities of the so-called strikers—you seldom see them referred to as Communists—are sensational the press is filled with their version of the affair.

The employer, because of apathy and indifference in the past, fails to understand the reason for his troubles. He has a contract with the union. During his years of dealing with it agreements on both sides have been faithfully adhered to. The employer has contracts with his customers which must be filled or his business is ruined. Loyal workmen apply for positions. When such persons try to enter the plant the picket line, which has been augmented in most instances by professional sluggers, who did not work in the plant and who do not care for any legitimate employment, often imported for the occasion, turn the peaceful community into a veritable slaughter house. Many of the men seeking work are injured. Possibly some are killed. Then the employer appeals to the State for protection and the militia is called out.

Charles G. Wood ("Reds and Lost Wages," page 23), described one of these "lessons in revolution" in this language: "If the worker remained unshaken in his determination to go to work, other pickets joined in, and by the time he reached the mill he was surrounded by a bedlam of voices urging him to quit, calling him 'scab', and uttering threats of dire punishment. If he was hardy enough to withstand these forms of 'persuasion', emissaries of the strikers visited his home. Most always they were able to convince a wife or mother

or sister that the safest place for their relative was in the ranks of the strikers. Many a woman hurried to the mill and took her man out. None of these women really knew what the strike was all about, but she was convinced of one thing and that was that the mill was not a safe place for her relative. These methods served both to pick off the working force and cause others to stay at home."

The press, from the inception of the "lesson in revolution", has contained much sensational inflammatory matter. The Communists in control of the affair are experts, it would appear, in presenting the "concern for humanity" appeal. Stories reach the good people of the nation that the strikers have been exploited to the point where they can no longer endure their misery; that their babies are suffering for the want of milk; that their wives are starving; that fuel to keep them warm is not obtainable; that the members of the militia are acting like a lot of drunken brutes. That turns the trick. Relief committees are organized. Money commences to flow in to help the suffering, but most of this money goes to carry on Communist agitational and propaganda work and not to relief.

If, as the result of some purposely injected act of violence, one of the Communist followers is arrested, he at once becomes a "political prisoner." Appeals go forth for funds to prevent the "capitalist barons" from persecuting him. According to these appeals, the inciter of violence is never guilty. The offending one is always to be found among those who oppose the "lesson in revolution." "Defense Funds" are started. "Protest" meetings are held throughout the United States. If some man arrested has been convicted, his release is secured on bail pending an appeal to a higher court, and he becomes a star speaker at such "protest" meetings. Money is collected to prevent the "railroading" of others, or to secure the release of those who may have been convicted. And much of this money, again, goes into a fund to organize similar "protest" meetings in other cities and to carry on general Communist agitational and propaganda work.

Charles G. Wood (citation above) devotes a full chapter of his book to exposing the Communist system of raising money ostensibly for "relief" or similar work but most of which goes for propaganda. "The Workers International Relief has more than one objective in its crusades for money", he writes (page 26-27). "There is prestige in money; with it a strike or many strikes may be promoted, with always a hope that one or more of them may be won; but if not, there is still money. * * * All that is needed to start a money-raising campaign is the form of an issue which appeals to those who would like to appease a wrong. * * * Whenever the Communists are faced by court action, as in New Bedford, for conspiracy, or charges of murder, as in North Carolina, their press agents announce that the defense will be conducted by some well-advertised lawyer of national repute. Even the Associated and United Press, as well as the International News Service, which are likely to exclude propaganda, repeatedly fall for this form of bunkum. The lawyers, whose names are

used, are not offended. * * * The use of these names is important to the money-raising agencies of the Communists. They may slap into a folder a half-tone picture of the noted lawyer, and canvass their 'sucker list' with an appeal for funds to pay the expenses of conducting the defense of 'victims of a capitalistic government.' * * * What isn't collected from the 'sucker list' comes out of the pockets of workers."

Ellis Searls ("Attempts by Communists to Seize the American Labor Movement", page 33) says, "Collection of money from the American people for the promotion of the revolutionary movement in this country has become an organized industry * * *".

The system employed by the Communists is always the same. Turn back, if you will, to the many "lessons in revolution" this nation has experienced in the past ten or more years and note the similarity. Consider the so-called Passaic strike in 1924 as an illustration. Here certain Socialists or Right wingers first appeared upon the scene. Adopting fictitious names, they secured employment in one of the textile mills at Passaic. Once in the plant as employes, they began to inject their doctrines into the minds of others. As many in the mills spoke very little English there existed a fertile mental soil for Socialist preachments. The employers were assailed. They were charged with "exploiting" the workers. Outstanding misfortunes of individuals were magnified and the responsibility placed on the employers. All troubles, no matter what these troubles may have been, were laid to the capitalist system. Then came the demand for more wages, a demand that was clearly "unreasonable" from the point of view of the employers, no matter how "reasonable" it may have appeared to the employes. The strike followed. At once the picket line, made up largely of men and women from New York City among them a number of college students, was formed. Rioting followed. You remember the incidents, and the column after column of sensational matter that appeared in the press, most of which emanated from the publicity headquarters of the Communist Party.

The system does not vary as these elements move from manufacturing plant to manufacturing plant, from industry to industry. Note the many so-called strikes that have occurred in the coal, the railroad, the steel, the textile, the boot and shoe, and other industries. While some of them may have been legitimately originated by the American Federation of Labor, the fact remains that in practically every case in the past ten or more years before the affair proceeded far Communist agitators gained control and injected their system of "force and violence."

The great steel strike of 1919 is now only a memory. Probably not one out of a hundred persons will recall that this strike was directed by William Z. Foster, the present titular head of the Com-

munist Party of the United States. Foster at that time was known as an arch I. W. W., or syndicalist, and was not generally regarded as having anything in harmony with the American Federation of Labor. It will be recalled by a few, possibly, that the Federal Council of Churches made an "investigation" the conclusions of which were printed in a book of about 300 pages.

The impartial (?) leaders who took part in this "investigation" apparently could find nothing in the record of Mr. Foster, who was made secretary-treasurer of the steel strike committee, with which to take exceptions. On the contrary, when the question of veracity or conclusions as between the late Judge Gary, then chairman of the Board of the U. S. Steel Corporation, and Mr. Foster arose, Foster was given preference. The "investigators" ascribed no ulterior motives to anything Foster said or did, although, in effect they ascribed ulterior motives to practically everything Judge Gary said or did.

In substance (pages 34-5) the committee condemned those who had reprinted for general circulation the little book of Mr. Foster called "Syndicalism" in which he advocated force and violence to overthrow the government. On page 156 of the Federal Council's book, Mr. Foster is mentioned in this laudatory language:

"Mr. Foster's business might be described as making the labor movement move. His main personal characteristic is intensity. When he followed the sea he is reported to have been intensely a sailor for he qualified an A. B. and learned all the knots on a 4-sticker. When he was a homesteader, in the Coast mountains, he was intense enough to stick at it alone for five years, prove his claim and clear twenty-two acres of land. When he took up making the labor movement move, he tried it first as a very intense syndicalist, an I. W. W. outside the trade unions. Little motion resulting, he 'repudiated' syndicalist methods and joined the Railway Carmen's Union in order to 'bore from within' the A. F. of L. In the steel campaign he was most intensely boring from within and the labor movement knew it and let him bore. It was considered that his boring might be *through* the unions but was certainly *against* the anti-union employers." (Emphasis in original.)

Considering the laudation of Mr. Foster, one is forced to the conclusion that in the minds of those approving this report, those who refused to deal with a Communist union are anti-union employers. Charles G. Wood ("Reds and Lost Wages", page 37) writes: "No person in his right mind will make an agreement with a Communist, for no matter how many concessions the latter may offer the agreement will be violated and any promises made will be broken. An employer who enters into an agreement with a Communist has only himself to blame. The agreement is made to break—not to keep."

Admitting that Foster was an "intense" I. W. W. and syndicalist, and having read his book on Syndicalism, the impartial (?)

investigators said not a word in condemnation of his activities. Possibly they did not understand his motives. Possibly, led far astray by the "concern for humanity" appeal which was always present, these "investigators" held to the belief that Foster was honestly working to help the steel workers in their fight for higher wages. Since the true purposes of this man have become common knowledge, however, it would seem but fair if those who then, in substance, endorsed his program would now publicly seek to undo the harm that resulted. If any such steps have been taken we have failed to note them.

At least one citation from the little pamphlet "Syndicalism", written a few years before the steel strike, by Earl C. Ford and William Z. Foster, taken in connection with Foster's statement in the secret Communist meeting at Bridgman, Michigan, in 1922 (previously cited) will be of interest in this connection. On page 9 appears this language:

"In his choice of weapons to fight his capitalist enemies, the Syndicalist is no more careful to select those that are 'fair', 'just', or 'civilized' than is a householder attacked in the night by a burglar. * * * With him the end justifies the means. Whether his tactics be 'legal' and 'moral', or not, does not concern him, so long as they are effective. * * * He proposes to develop, regardless of capitalist conceptions of 'legality', 'fairness', 'right', etc., a greater power than his capitalist enemies have; and then to wrest from them by force the industries they have stolen from him by force and duplicity, and to put an end forever to the wages system. *He proposes to bring about the revolution by the general strike.*" (Emphasis supplied)

As the aftermath of every "lesson in revolution" there has appeared in the public press certain myths which, as the years pass, are handed down and accepted by the great majority of people as true. Every such myth has a purpose. Every such myth contains a weakening or destructive germ furnishing propaganda material for the Socialist School of Thought. All such myths are designed to create the belief in the minds of those who accept them as true that industry, as conducted under our economic system, is detrimental to the common weal of all the people: that in every conflict between the employer and the employes the employers are brutal in their methods; and that in every instance where the militia is called to preserve peace, the members of the Guard become ruffians of the basest order, shooting and killing in order to gratify the lowest instincts of man.

Let me refer to a few of these myths that you may better understand them and so the more easily detect those that will appear in the future. During a "lesson in revolution"—the so-called coal strike in Colorado in 1913 and 1914 when the I. W. W. was putting the present day Communist methods into effect—much appeared in public print about "the battle of Ludlow." The myth is that while the strikers were peacefully attending to their own business in a tent colony they had established, members of the militia swooped down upon them and began to shoot into groups

of men, women and children, finally setting fire to and destroying the tent colony; that during the fight a woman and several children were killed by the militia; that the strikers, in order to protect themselves, took up arms and fought for their lives.

The truth is that there were very few strikers in the tent colony. A great many miners did not wish to leave their jobs and when the strike was called went to other fields where they could work and not be disturbed by imported agitators. The tent colony was inhabited largely by aliens, many of them soldiers who had just returned to the United States after the Balkan wars. There was but a handful of militia in the entire strike area. These men were not prepared for a fight of any kind. They were cleverly divided into three parties when hired fighters started the so-called battle.

About five years after this "lesson in revolution" the Government of Italy made demands upon the State of Colorado for damages for the loss of the lives of some of its citizens and the destruction of their property and the property of others. On request of the Governor, the legislature named a committee to make a full investigation to ascertain whether or not the State was liable. This committee, in its report, found that the "battle began at nine o'clock in the morning after all the troops had been withdrawn except thirty-four; that a great many men, women and children left the colony before hostilities commenced; that the men taking part in the battle "took up strategic positions" and that "there were some five hundred or more armed men pitted against thirty-four militiamen."

The committee further found that the women and children who lost their lives were not shot but instead smothered to death, having been placed in a pit under a tent for safety. Their death occurred hours before the fire which later in the day destroyed the colony. "Each member of the National Guard and the organization as a whole were made the victims of unwarranted calumnies by many of the leading newspapers of the State while the few men against vast superior forces were upholding the authority of the State of Colorado," said the Committee. The demand of the Italian government was rejected because those for whom claims were made had been engaged "in open rebellion against the State of Colorado," and no more was ever heard of these claims. But the myth still persists.

There are myths of starving children, emaciated mothers who did not have enough to eat, crippled fathers walking the streets seeking aid. And with these the connected myth that certain Communist—and often certain Socialist—organizations are collecting money wholly to alleviate the suffering of those brought to the depth of misery because of the heartless attitude of the employers—and employers, of course, are held up at all times as typifying capitalism.

Then there are myths about the "injustice" of our "capitalistic courts." The Mooney-Billings case in California; the Sacco-Van-

zetti case in Massachusetts; the case of several I. W. W. now imprisoned in the State of Washington for firing upon and killing a number of Legion men, are illustrations of myths of this character. There are, also, myths of "political prisoners" "framed" by the "exploiting class." The very term "political prisoner" is a myth since there is no such a person in any prison or jail in the United States. No one has been convicted because of a political belief entertained. All convictions have been because of the violation of some specific law of the state or nation.

It will be only a matter of a few years until the case of the men convicted at Gastonia, N. C. for killing the chief of police will enter the lists of myths. The actual facts will be forgotten and these men will be painted as "martyrs" to a "great cause." The fact that they permitted their bonds to be forfeited will not be mentioned. Indeed, it will not be at all surprising if some member of the Congress, prodded to action by certain of the "intelligentsia" does not introduce a bill that will permit all persons who "jump bail" by going abroad to return to the United States freed from further court action. At least such a proposal would be no less absurd and dangerous than one (the Griffin Bill) introduced in the Seventy First Congress which, if enacted, would permit an alien to become an American citizen without taking the full oath of allegiance.

And, strangely enough, in face of the fact that all strikes induced by Communists are inspired from a foreign government and designed wholly for our destruction, many well meaning American men and women will be found giving moral, if not financial, support. Yes, even more, in many of these strikes college men and women are found taking an active part and seemingly approving of the "force and violence" system. Notwithstanding the apparent breach between the Right and Left wing of the Socialist movement over this question of "mass (or direct) action" these Communist "lessons in revolution" apparently have the support of the members of the Right.

Certainly every well informed person knows that the strike in the textile mills at Gastonia, N. C., was 100 percent Communist. This strike was brought about wholly to "develop the revolutionary implication"; and yet not a word of protest was heard from any Socialist leaders against the open acts of violence. On the contrary, the followers of the Right wing in substance, if not in many instances by overt acts, gave approval to the "force and violence" system. To illustrate, "The New Leader", an official organ of the Socialist Party of the United States instead of denouncing the Communists for their violence, denounced the officers of the law seeking to maintain order and to protect the rights and lives of innocent persons. The bail for the men convicted, which bail was forfeited, was supplied largely through Socialist organizations.

(Issued by the Educational Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, 120 West 42nd Street, New York City.)

(Copyright 1931)

LECTURE No. 9

Previous to the World War the word "propaganda" was not in common use in the United States except in Socialist circles. Although propaganda, in the past, has swept nations into war, established religions, destroyed governments and set up revolutionary dictatorships, only a comparatively few persons have given it serious consideration. Before we turn to the system of propaganda employed by the Socialist School of Thought to attain its ends, let us first get a clear understanding of just what the word means.

Propaganda is a method of presenting suggestions to individuals with the expectation that a certain percentage of those receiving the suggestions will accept and act upon them as true. It is effective because of the principle of mind action previously stated, and is here properly repeated:

Every person acts according to his beliefs; he gets his beliefs from the character of his thinking; his thinking is guided by and formulated from suggestions of some form or character, the spoken and printed word being the most common form of suggestion, although pictures, cartoons, the movies and even music often carry powerful suggestions. Moreover, every person more readily accepts a suggestion that is in harmony with his desires and more readily rejects a suggestion contrary to his desires. The principal desires of every person are to have more, be more, or do more, than he has, is or does.

Since men act according to their beliefs and get their beliefs from the character of their thinking, and since propaganda is the art of directing that thinking through supplying suggestions, it is well to note that this thinking may be for good or it may be for evil. "Our thoughts always continue to be creative," writes Thomas Troward ("The Law and the Word," page 101), "but in destructive use it becomes creative for destructive forces." This well known authority in another place (page 64) says that "thought is perfectly free and we can use it either constructively or destructively as we choose; but the immutable Law of Sequences will not permit us to plant a thought of one kind and make it bear fruit of another."

Propaganda, then, which supplies suggestions to start the train of thought, can be used both constructively and destructively. In the case of legitimate advertising for instance, it is used constructively. In the case of Socialist propaganda, it is used destructively. We give much thought to the former and no consideration whatever to the

latter. We hire able and well versed men to analyze its use in the first instance but employ no one to do so in the second. We spend millions of dollars each year for advertising and yet scoff at the very idea that the same force is, or can be, used to our detriment.

In this connection it may be well to elaborate a bit on the potency of thought. Thought is the father of the thing, not the other way around. The thought always precedes the thing. Our thoughts are the result of suggestions either from within or from without. Dr. Ernest Weltmer ("The Practice of Suggestive Therapeutics," page 295) defines a suggestion as "any influence from within or without that causes the mind to act." Thinking is mind in action. The character of our thinking results in the formation of our beliefs, and our actions are guided by our beliefs. S. A. Weltmer ("Regeneration," page 88) writes: "Our beliefs control us by holding us in the sphere of their own action." And, again (page 93), "Thought, in the form of belief, holds the man."

Knowing then that our thoughts form our beliefs and our beliefs direct our action, let us go back to the matter of the suggestion which starts the whole train of thought. Dr. Frederick Van Boden (quoted by Dr. F. L. Rawson, "Life Understood," page 228) says: "The soul * * * can be shaped by suggestive influences in any form, it can be bent, crooked, twisted and adulterated—morally and mentally—to an extent depending on its degree of plasticity, its inborn resistance and the power of suggestive forces at work." The word "mind" might be more comprehensive than "soul" in the above.

Edward A. Beals ("The Law of Financial Success," page 60) writes: "Suggestion is not a matter of argumentative effort, but of saying a thing so positively, earnestly and convincingly that the other fellow takes up the idea without argument."

Propaganda, therefore, as it is used by the Socialist School of Thought consists in the presentation of suggestions which start a train of thought in the mind of the individual accepting these suggestions that leads to the establishment of the belief that the Socialist theories are correct. When such a belief becomes fixed the individual acts in accord therewith. From our point of view those of the Socialist School are using the power of thought destructively. It is difficult, however, to make the average American understand either the nature of propaganda or induce him to believe that it is, or can be, harmful. There is a reason as we will later point out.

When the average American citizen has Socialist propaganda called to his attention he dismisses the subject with the slighting remark, "Oh, who will believe that stuff?" And, to sustain his position, he continues, "This country is too rich, the people are too prosperous, the wages are too high to cause any sane person to fall for Socialism. Let 'em howl all they want to, it can't hurt me." Those who take that position are unconsciously repeating sugges-

tions cleverly planted in their minds by followers of the Socialist School of Thought. Their attitude is the best evidence one can cite to sustain the contention that Socialist propaganda has done, and is doing, a vast amount of harm. In referring to the menace of Communism, Clarence A. Manning ("Introduction to 'Religion in Soviet Russia,' " by William V. Chauncey Emhardt) says that "it is hard to tell which class of persons is the more to be reprehended—those who refuse to believe that anything serious has happened or those who endeavor to explain away disagreeable facts to bring them in line with what we desire to believe. * * *"

There are two outstanding reasons why the average American citizen does not believe that Socialist propaganda is having any effect. *First*, because to so believe does not harmonize with his desires; and, *second*, he has not stopped to give the nature of suggestions as employed in Socialist propaganda the slightest consideration, and he has not given it that consideration because he does not want to believe it contains anything harmful.

This attitude on the part of the average big business man is especially surprising in view of the fact that he is spending millions of dollars every year on propaganda. He is so spending his money because it has proven profitable. This business man, however, calls it advertising, not propaganda. Both propaganda and advertising are employed wholly to carry suggestions in order to win converts, the advertiser to his goods and the propagandist to a theory or "cause." One difference is that the propagandist, as a rule, does not pay for his newspaper and magazine space, nor for the time he consumes on the radio—indeed, he is often paid to write pure propaganda or broadcast his views—while the advertiser pays heavily for his newspaper and magazine space, and for his radio time. Another difference, and an important one, is that the propagandist usually conceals his true purpose; the advertiser does not.

If propaganda, called advertising, presenting the merits of a toothpaste, to illustrate, induces literally millions of persons to buy that paste, then is it not a bit absurd to say that propaganda, not called advertising, designed to win converts to some theory will fail? Everyone reading an advertisement describing the merits of the toothpaste, or having that paste extolled over the radio, knows that which he or she reads or hears was presented wholly to implant the suggestion in his or her mind to buy that particular brand. Very few persons reading Socialist propaganda, or hearing it in a radio talk, understand that that which they read or heard was presented wholly to cause them to lose confidence in our form of government, our institutions, the private property right and they give their aid and support to a form of government of quite a different nature. That makes propaganda far more effective than advertising. No one questions but that properly prepared and presented advertising pays. Its value has been thoroughly demonstrated. Upon what evidence or by what

process of reasoning, then, does anyone base his conclusion that Socialist propaganda fails?

In studying the question of Socialist propaganda, it is necessary to consider three outstanding types of mind found in the United States. They are the confidence-minded, the emotional-minded and the oriental-minded. The confidence-minded are those who accept everything presented to them as being from honest sources and inspired by sincere motives. It is this type of mind that made the United States a great nation. Our whole business structure is founded on confidence. It is this type of mind that holds firmly and fixedly to the belief that nothing can destroy our form of government, our institutions or the private property right, because those of this type have confidence in the form, the institutions and the private property right. All have operated to their satisfaction. This is the type of mind that prevails today among the average American citizen regardless of occupation or location. It is a type that cannot understand deception, fraud, intrigue, secrecy and conspiracy. It is a type that believes in the common honesty of mankind. If this type alone were involved, Socialist propaganda would have little effect.

The confidence-minded person is, as a rule, constructive in his actions, leaning toward the conservative. While assuming those with whom he deals, or with whom he comes in contact in the ordinary affairs of life, are honest in their purposes, if presented with the suggestion that he do something contrary to his fixed beliefs, he brings into play his investigating turn of mind. He seeks evidence to determine whether or not the premise is correct and then whether or not the conclusion is logical. If he finds the premise is not sustained by trustworthy evidence, he quickly rejects the suggestion and refuses to act.

To illustrate: A confidence-minded person is told that all economic, social and political ills are due to our economic system and our form of government; therefore, to rid ourselves of these ills we must destroy the causes. After destroying the causes then, to prevent their recurrence, we must establish a wholly different formula of economics and a wholly different form of government. Now both the premise and the conclusion being so different from the average confidence-minded person's views, before acting he seeks evidence to sustain them. He finds none for the simple reason that there is no evidence that ills from which he suffers are due to the economic system, or to the form of government. Therefore, he rejects the suggestion and refuses to act.

The emotional-minded are those who are swayed in their actions wholly by emotions and desires, never by evidence or logic. This type while fundamentally confidence-minded lacks the investigating bent. For that reason he is unreasoning, illogical and not given to analysis. He thinks wholly in terms of objectives and never in

terms of methods to attain his objectives. No matter what evidence may be submitted, or what logic employed to sustain a position, if that position is not in perfect harmony with his desires, he rejects both evidence and logic and follows his desires. It is among those of this type we find our most pronounced egotists. This is the type of many of our modern professors, teachers and ministers. It is the type of many who call themselves "liberals," "pacifists" or "internationalists." It is the mind of those who, while preaching the Socialist theory, devoting their time and often their money to the protection of Socialist and Communist law-breakers, grow exceedingly indignant if classed with those whom they support. Those of this mind are never practicable. While their sincerity cannot be questioned, at the same time they are harmful both to themselves and to others. Most of them are pronounced idealists and "faddists." Let one lodge a suggestion in their minds that all the ills of this Nation are to be cured through some form of legislation, and without considering the source of the suggestion or the value of the proposed remedy, giving no thought to the truth or falsity of the premise, being told it will produce a result that is in harmony with their desires, they accept and act upon that suggestion.

Let me here again quote Everitt Dean Martin of the New School for Social Research (Socialistic) to sustain a point. Referring to the tendency of certain persons to readily adopt a particular character of suggestion ("Psychology and Its Use," page 22), he says:

"Thus there are many ideas which people hold because they can not help doing so. Such ideas are said to be 'compulsive' or obsessive. * * * The individual holds them to be true without question. He imagines that he has thought them out. Everyone knows people who hold beliefs and opinions in defiance of clear evidence to the contrary. They simply can not change their minds."

Permit us to add that probably the great majority of those who call themselves "liberals" and adopt the theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought "imagine they have thought them out." Certainly they "hold beliefs and opinions in defiance of clear evidence to the contrary."

The best illustration of the emotional-minded today is found in those who are following the organized pacifist movement. This is a simon-pure Socialist scheme as we will show by documentary evidence in a later lecture. The propaganda to secure followers is of Socialist inception and under Socialist direction. Armies and navies are employed to wage wars. Destroy these instruments, say the Socialist propagandists, and wars will cease. The fact that the conclusion is illogical and certainly not sustained by an iota of evidence, makes no difference to the emotional-minded. They are not thinking in terms of *remedy* but in terms of *objective*. Their minds are made up. They will stop wars and to do so will abolish all forms of national defense. That is the end of the argument with them.

Set in their beliefs, determined to a degree that transcends obstinacy, often arrogant and intolerant, they sweep aside all evidence, logic and common sense, and rush headlong on to their goal—the abolition of war.

Turn to your acquaintances of this mind. Most of them are well meaning, sincere, have no thought of being other than good citizens. Yet they readily accept a suggestion that some evil, such for instance as war, is to be cured through the application of a remedy which, upon analysis, any sane person would find impracticable; and having accepted that suggestion stand ready to forsake dearest friends to put it into practice.

Let us illustrate the system of “starting a train of thought” in the minds of the emotional-minded which leads to their ultimate acts. A Socialist propagandist appears in a local pulpit. True, he does not come with the proper label. On the contrary, he is billed as “Rev. So-and-So,” for a large number of these propagandists, it would appear, have a perfect right to the title. He has much to say about the “brotherhood of man.” He unfolds tear-producing tales of want, misery, suffering, and unemployment. Like all Socialist propagandists he dwells on the exception to create the belief that it is the rule. He urges as a correction of the evil, or evils with which he deals, a new “social order.” He glorifies the happiness, the comfort, the contentment, the truly Christian spirit that will prevail when all “production is for use and not for profit.” His suggestions lodge in the minds of every emotional-minded person in the room. Not one of them can tell you just what the propagandist said but it left a “pleasant taste.” Then he suggests the formation of a local branch of some “movement.” Those who accept his suggestions fall in line and regardless of what they think they are well on the road to the end—destruction, for they have turned *the creative power of thought in the wrong direction.*

We have a large number of the emotional-minded in positions which enable them to gain the complete confidence of certain groups. Many of them are professors and no inconsiderable number of them are ministers of the gospel. They are prominent in certain lines of charitable and settlement work. They see only the idealistic side of everything. Vida Scudder, a well known educator who for many years has been a prominent Socialist, appears not to see the destructive side of the theory she advances. One is forced to assume that she lacks wholly an inquiring turn of mind. In dealing with Christianity (“Socialism and Character,” page 105), she writes:

“Against this ideal, Socialism presents the image of a world in which free giving and uncalculating sacrifice appear to have no place; where human relations are regulated, not by intimate choice and personal emotion, but by unautomatic justice, impersonal and inevitable as gravitation. The religious soul rejects the image; seeking the social ideal most conducive to spiritual welfare, and confronted by

what well may seem the self-centered ease and softness of the promised Socialist land, it turns back and chooses the ancient battlefield, with all its blood, and all its wounds."

Previously (same citation, page 71) she refers to the feeling of those who join the Socialist movement in this language: "The joy the convert to Socialism knew held many factors. There was a sobering as well as an exalted element in it; for to join the Socialist movement demanded then as now no small degree of moral audacity. It meant abandonment of familiar paths; it called one to brand as inadequate the conceptions which had for centuries sufficed the noblest spirits. * * * To embrace it involved a subtle renunciation; and in this renunciation the seeker found a secret delight."

The above citations furnish a splendid illustration of the substitution of well rounded phrases for evidence and logic. To the person with an analytical mind it is meaningless. Not so, however, to the emotional-minded. They do not stop to analyze. And it is just such statements as these, lacking in logic, never sustained by any character or form of evidence, beautifully worded, that contain suggestions that win the emotional-minded to Socialism. In this connection we cite from the writing of a columnist in "The New Appeal" (Socialist), issue of September 6, 1930. In urging his readers to become Socialists he says:

"First of all, I would emphasize the spiritual delight which the individual experiences in joining a movement that has for its goal no less a glorious adventure than the making over of a new world which now looks drab and shoddy indeed into a real cooperative commonwealth whose humblest citizen has some part in the good life."

We cannot resist here, again, calling attention to the fact that Russia is a cooperative form of government. If the world of the United States is "drab and shoddy indeed," pray tell what language could be applied to the world of Socialist Russia? And where, may we ask, does "the humblest citizen" of that country have "some part in the good life?" He continues:

"And every other Socialist leader who in any way is entitled to that term has had that vision of a new world and that soul-cleansing experience of being a part of something large and beautiful in its conception that marks Socialism from every other political or economic creed."

However beautiful the word picture painted of a world where Socialism controls, and however ready may be the emotional-minded to accept the suggestions that the painting will become a reality, there is no evidence to prove that this "new world" will contain even one element of that beauty. Where it has been tried, instead of producing that which the propagandist insists will result, quite the contrary appeared.

Then there is the third type of mind which we may call oriental-minded, those who indulge in deception, fraud, intrigue, conspiracy and secrecy to further their ends whatever those ends may be. This type of mind was practically unknown in the United States fifty or sixty years ago. It made its appearance with the coming of a group of "political refugees" from Germany who had accepted the theory of Marx. This type, as a matter of fact, is foreign to our form of government, our institutions and our whole political, economic and social set-up. Those of this type have materially increased during the past thirty years due to the flood of undesirable immigration.

This was the type of mind of Karl Marx, of Lenin, of Trotsky and is the mind of Stalin. It is the mind of all revolutionists the world over. It is the mind of those in complete control of the World Revolutionary Movement. It is the mind of those who, today, direct and control the Socialist government of Russia. The oriental-mind is so different from the confidence-mind and the emotional-mind that the three cannot meet on common ground. Indeed, no two of them can meet on common ground. The reason we are confronted with a most peculiar situation in the United States is because the confidence-minded cannot understand the emotional-minded, nor can the emotional-minded understand the confidence-minded, and neither can understand the oriental-minded. For this reason the latter cleverly uses the other two. He scoffs at the credulity of the confidence-minded and laughs at the simplicity of the emotional-minded.

The emotional-minded, easily swayed by the suggestions presented them by the oriental-minded, reach the conclusion that the theories of Marx, if put into practice in the United States, will cure all social, economic and political ills. In time they become propagandists for the Socialist School of Thought and their persistent statements that there is nothing harmful in Socialist or Communist activities become powerful suggestions with the confidence-minded who do not want to believe anything menaces their government, their institutions, their business, their church or their home.

The man laying out an advertising campaign for toothpaste appeals to those who desire to preserve their teeth or to keep them white. The suggestion contained in his advertisements is that the use of the particular brand in question will satisfy these desires. A certain percentage of people accept the suggestion and buy the product, the number depending on the forcefulness of the suggestion and the total reached with it. It would be absurd for one writing an advertisement for a toothpaste to devote his time to describing some disease of the foot or the advantages of keeping the hair glossy. Moreover, it would be the height of folly for him to buy space in some publication the readers of which he knew to be toothless. He not only deals with a specific subject in a proper suggestive way, but he undertakes to reach a class of people who will be interested in his subject.

Now, the Socialist propagandists are no less clever. They stick to a subject and seek the attention only of those who will be interested in that subject. While their purpose is the overthrow of our form of government and the abolition of our institutions including the private property right, the church and the home, they know full well that to so advertise their aims would leave them without an audience amenable to their suggestions. Here is where the oriental-mind comes into play. The Socialist propagandists begin with deception. Their subject, as they present it, is the cure of all political, economic and social ills. That has an appeal. To make that appeal all the more powerful and their suggestions all the more readily accepted, they play up misery, want, suffering and unemployment, and cleverly place the cause by inference, if not by direct statement, upon the present form of government or upon our economic system. Their clientele, so to speak, is composed of those who have an intense desire to prevent misery, suffering, want and unemployment to which are added those who are chafing at some form of restraint imposed upon them by existing society such as legal, moral, ethical, financial, or environmental restraints. The stage is cleverly set for both groups.

The fellow who is chafing at some form of legal restraint accepts the suggestion that a change in the form of government, or our economic system will relieve him of that which he holds a burden. The suggestion harmonizes with his desires. He not only accepts the suggestion but seeks to put it into practice.

There are a large number of persons chafing at the restraints of the moral code. The Socialist propagandist, in presenting his theory, paints a most enticing word picture of a future form of society wherein men and women will live together in perfect harmony and peace under a system of "free love," rather than under the marriage relation. This suggestion offers such persons the solution they seek. They accept it.

There is a large group of persons said to possess an "inferiority complex," persons who believe that in some way nature overlooked them and that they are not mentally or physically equipped to cope with ordinary conditions. All such persons are naturally looking for a way out. That way is supplied by the Socialist propagandist who says that, in the society that is to exist when the present capitalist government is destroyed and the property right abolished, every person will have an equal chance. There will be no classes, no rich, no poor, no aristocracy, no proletariat, no bosses, no slaves. That is a most powerful suggestion. To say that it does not win converts is to deny the immutable Law of Sequences.

Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 333), writes: "As one hears the fiery speeches of the street corner orators, or as one reads the fervid rhetoric of the popular Socialist manuals, one is re-

mind of the lurid advertisements of the vendors of patent medicines who try to terrify the masses into trying their nostrums by horrible delineations, highly magnified, of their present deplorable conditions. The delineation contains just sufficient truth to engender credulity and stimulate trust. They create an emotional atmosphere in which it is easily forgotten that vivid description and passionate appeal are quite compatible with the false diagnosis and quack remedy."

The statements of the quack doctor contain suggestions which lodge in the minds of a great many persons suffering some ailment and who are seeking a remedy. Like the emotional-minded who accept, without investigation, the theories proposed by the Socialists to cure certain social, economic and political ills, they act on the suggestion contained in such advertisements because it harmonizes with their desires—they *want to be cured*.

And so on down the line of human aspirations and desires, those of each group are appealed to by certain assurances that their aspirations or desires are to be satisfied. The lazy, the indigent, the reckless, the greedy, each in turn are presented with suggestions that gain their instant attention because these suggestions contain that which is in accord with their desires.

Last but not least in the category of persons amenable to Socialist suggestions are those who are chafing at some form of economic restraint, especially those who work for wages and find it difficult, often because of individual incapacity, to lay up enough for old age, for a period of depression, or for a seige of sickness. Those in this group furnish fertile mental soil for the Socialist propagandist since they are not in a position to gather evidence, or employ reason and logic to offset this propaganda.

The leaders of the Socialist School of Thought are pronounced opportunists. They recognize that if they are to be successful in winning followers they must appeal to the passions, the prejudices and the emotions of those whom they seek to convert. Being oriental-minded they are wholly unable to grasp the ethics of honest statements, and in consequence engage in deception. Their standard of ethics, in fact, is opposite to that of the confidence-minded and the emotional-minded for the latter, however much we may deplore their lack of reason, at least intend to be perfectly honest in their position. The oriental-minded refuse to be hampered by the truth. Prof. R. Flint ("Socialism," page 105), calls attention to the fact that the Socialists select "only of what suits their purposes" and that "by the omission of facts, however certain and relevant, which would controvene it and by lavishness in exaggeration" create false impressions. He adds, "Assertions the most untrue, yet which are sure to be readily believed by many, and which cannot fail to produce discontent as widely as they are believed, are boldly and incessantly made in all ways and forms to gain attention."

"Perversion of present day economic and social facts," writes Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 346), "are the staple pabulum of almost every Socialistic book, pamphlet or periodical issued from the press."

Marx designed his "Communist Manifesto" specially to appeal to the wage-earners. Indeed, the Socialist movement is called a "labor movement," a most deceptive label since it is anything but a labor movement. Morris Hillquit, a well-known Socialist authority, says ("Socialism in Theory and Practice," page 241), that while "the field of Socialism and trade unionism largely encroach on each other * * * it would be a mistake to consider them as synonymous."

That the Socialist leaders fully understand the effectiveness of properly presented propaganda, we cite the statement of a columnist in "The New Appeal" (Sept. 6, 1930), to whom reference has already been made in this lecture. He writes: "To make effective propaganda whether it is for goods or services or ideas it is imperative for the propagandist first to seek out the vital interests of his audience and then so to frame his appeal as to set it squarely in the midstream of those interests."

That statement contains the core of Socialist propaganda. The first thing one of their propagandists must do is to ascertain what are the special desires or obsessions of those to whom he addresses himself. Having ascertained that, he then "frames the appeal" in such language as to gain their attention. This is followed with the suggestion that their desires or ambitions—and it matters little what they may be—are to be attained only through the establishment of Socialism.

Let us apply this method of gaining customers to the advertiser of a tooth paste. He first ascertains the desires of those to whom he addresses himself. He learns that he is talking to a group of bald-headed men all of whom have false teeth. He, therefore "frames his appeal as to set squarely in the midstream of their interests." Their interest is hair—not teeth. He spends no time in talking about teeth. On the contrary he presents his product as one that will grow hair on the head. Those with whom the suggestion lodges buy his article. The manufacturer of today who would adopt that system would soon find himself in the bankrupt, if not the criminal court, for those who followed the suggestion would discover they had been defrauded. Is the degree of dishonesty any the less when a person offers as a cure-all for certain economic, political and social ills, a theory which has always failed when tried and which, one is forced to assume, the advocate knows will not affect a cure?

The writer above cited continues: "This sounds elementary enough"—he assumes every Socialist propagandist understands it—"*but it is one of those first principles of propaganda technique often overlooked even by the most industrious propagandists.*" (Emphasis

supplied.) Illustrating this thought he continues: "A man or woman wondering where the next meal is coming from is not immediately concerned with the eventual overthrow of the going economic system. Show him or her, however, that to continue to support the very exploiters who are making life more difficult whether at the ballot box, in the trade union elections or in the brutal invasion of civil rights is nothing more or less than suicidal and you have *started a train of thought whose terminal must inevitably be one hundred percent Socialistic.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

Starting such a "train of thought" is the work of the Socialist propagandist. It is started in many ways, one of the most effective being pamphlets, booklets and other forms of printed matter. It would be impossible to say how many millions of documents issued by the Socialist School of Thought have been printed and distributed in the United States during the past ten years, all carrying clever propaganda designed to "frame an appeal" that will lodge in the minds of those to whom it is made. This literature deals extensively with the wrongs of the government, not the citizen; of the economic system, not the individual; of the employer, not the employee. It intensifies all suffering, misery, want and unemployment. It depicts the government, the economic system, or the employer always at fault, never the citizen, the individual or the employee. It induces those who think they have not had a "square deal" to believe that their troubles can all be traced to the form of government or to the existing economic system. Such persons are then in a proper state of mind to accept the further suggestion that that which oppresses and burdens them can only be removed by the overthrow of the government and the abolition of its economic system.

The Left, or Communist, wing of the Socialist School of Thought during the past ten years, have been far more persistent and, in fact, successful in this form of propaganda than has the Right, or Socialist, wing. That is, they have gained more followers from among the wage-earners. The accretion in the ranks of the Right wing has come largely from the emotional-minded, those often designated as the "intelligentsia." The documents issued by both wings are usually cheap—five or ten cents each with liberal discounts for quantities. Literally millions of them are given away, handed out at factory gates, on the street cars, or trains, passed to people on the roadside by the "jitney" tourist, or shoved under the doors of working men's homes. "The Daily Worker," a Communist propaganda sheet printed in English, with all its malicious misrepresentations, carries suggestions that lodge in the minds of the character of man or woman described by "The New Appeal" columnist—those "not knowing where the next meal is coming from."

Walter S. Steele, manager of "The National Republic," one of the outstanding loyal and sound American magazines, was a witness before the House of Representatives Special Committee investi-

gating Communist Activities in the United States. He filed a number of exhibits of special value. Two of them dealt exclusively with radical propaganda (Hearings, Part I, Vol. 2, page 22). One of these gave the title of eighteen (18) books and pamphlets, and the other 281 books or pamphlets, all of which were advertised by the "Workers Library Publishers," a subsidiary of the Communist Party. The lists, as divided by the publishers, were as follows: Recently issued, and not otherwise classified, 18; dealing with trade unions, 19; Soviet Russia, 31; History, 20; special studies, 30; political economy, 13; philosophy, 11; science, 11; Communism, 23; fiction, etc., 57; biography, 13; China, 6; Negro problems, 6; imperialism, 20.

It will be noted that while all of these are issued wholly as propaganda to present suggestions to those who read them that the Socialist theory, put into practice by Communist methods, will be beneficial to such individuals, the literature is classified to attract the attention of those who are thinking along different lines. For instance, a booklet coming as biographical will interest one who would not be interested if it were presented as scientific, and vice versa. It will also be noted that more are listed under the heading "fiction" than any other because this medium of propaganda is well understood by all leaders in the Socialist movement.

Pronouncedly opportunists, the present (1930) unemployment situation in the United States is being worked for all it will stand. Both right and left wings vie with each other in making sensational statements which are "framed so as to appeal" to those out of employment, or who fear they may be thrown out. Moreover, the situation is greatly magnified and instances of actual suffering vividly stressed. "Unemployment leagues" and "councils" are formed. Meetings are staged in many cities called "unemployment conferences" when, as a matter of fact, they are gatherings designed wholly to carry on Socialist propaganda. Every art known to the clever agitator and propagandist is employed to induce men and women out of jobs to drop into an "unemployment headquarters" where proper literature is liberally distributed. It may keep the spectre of the menace from one's door to say that the suggestions contained in this propaganda "framed so as to appeal" does not find lodgment in the minds of those who are interested. It does.

Literally millions of persons who are tuning in daily to hear the amusing sayings of Amos 'n Andy, are buying the toothpaste which they advertise. The actors themselves, it is true, never mention the subject. The suggestions presented in the minute allotted the announcer do that. Amos 'n Andy furnish what is called, in the language of the street, "window dressing." The "window dressing" of the Socialist propagandists consist in an appeal that gains attention and which is so presented as to cause the one thus attracted to believe that all his ills and woes, whatever they may be, are due to

our form of government, our institutions or our economic system with the private property right principle—never to himself. While he may be wholly, or at least, to a large extent personally at fault, he does not wish to so believe and when the blame is placed afar from him, he accepts the suggestion with alacrity. Being attracted, then, by this “window dressing,” he approves the remedy proposed—the overthrow of our form of government, its institutions, and the prevailing economic system. How often have you been induced to enter a store and make a purchase because of something you saw displayed in the window? You can be intrigued mentally to an idea in exactly the same way.

It does not make any difference how sound and loyal a man may intend to be, he will “fall” for certain suggestions if the conditions are ripe. “All normal men and women respond to suggestions if the conditions are favorable, and if the suggestions are of the right sort, and are given in a way suitable to the individual,” writes Prof. Edgar James Swift (“Business Power Thought Psychology,” page 161).

A person may be a staunch American. He may have utilized his private property right by buying a little home, purchasing an automobile for the benefit of his family, installing a radio for their enjoyment and edification. He may belong to the church and to some so-called “capitalist” organization. He may be “sold” to our form of government, our institutions and our economic system. He has been induced to read Socialist literature. It recounted the rewards a “worker” would reap if we abolished the private property right. To all this he has turned a deaf ear. He has heard his fellow workmen expound for hours on the “wonderful” Marxian theory. He has replied with the expressive word “bunk.”

Then comes a time of depression. He loses his job. He is unable to pay an installment on his radio. It is taken away. He is unable to take care of a payment on his automobile. He loses that. The interest on a small mortgage on his little home falls due. He cannot meet it. Foreclosure proceedings are started. No longer is his credit good at the grocer’s. His wife and children are not as well clothed. He tramps the streets looking for work, returning to his home night after night sad and depressed. Then he meets some one who tells him about an “unemployment council.” He is invited to drop in at the headquarters. While he finds no one there willing to give him a job, he hears clever harangues about the “rotten capitalist system.” The fact that certain persons of wealth are still enjoying that wealth is called to his attention. His own misery is stressed. He is told the reason he is out of a job is wholly because of the “capitalist system.” He takes some of the literature home to read. Seeking sympathetic companionship he returns the next day, and the next. The same old harangues. He is urged to join with his fellow unemployed and make a stand for his “rights.”

He thinks of his own condition, and only of his own condition. All the advantages he has enjoyed in the past because of the private right system and our form of government are forgotten. The suggestion implanted in his mind by a Socialist or a Communist agitator and propagandist commences to take lodgment. Then he reads in the morning paper that "Professor This" or "Dr. That," speaking before some gathering denounced the capitalist system and extolled the Socialist theory. He picks up an evening paper and notes that some well-known American business man speaks highly of Soviet Russia. He finds that editors generally scoff at the idea of a "Communist menace." His old distrust for the Marxian theory disappears. He says to himself, "Well, I don't know just what will happen if we destroy this form of government and abolish the private property right, *but it can't be any worse than this!*" The suggestions contained in the propaganda have taken effect. He acts in keeping with those suggestions because *they harmonize with his desires*. He believes he will benefit. He is in no mental state to apply reason, logic or evidence. He is not thinking of possible greater disasters. The only thing in his mind is getting work so that his family may have what they had when he was at work and drawing good wages.

To those of other groups the "window dressing" is of quite a different nature. When the farmers are sought it is in terms of agriculture. When the man who is chafing at the moral restraint is sought it is in terms of "free love." When those of foreign birth are to be interested, it is in terms of "alienism." When the audience to be reached consists of those religiously inclined it is in terms of "the brotherhood of man." Slogans are manufactured to gain attention. You have heard many of them.

To mention but a few will be sufficient for you will recall others. They are—"Wall Street," "vested interests," "ruthless exploiters," "profiteers," "capitalist system," "down with everything American," "production for use and not for profit," "industrial democracy," etc. Every slogan becomes mental "window dressing." It causes the one hearing or reading it, because of some special thought in his or her mind, to stop and ascertain what follows.

There is an appeal in the Marxian propaganda. Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 211) says it is potent "because it appeals to the primitive individualism of the subnormal man." He continues, "It excites his passions for plunder; it stimulates his love of fighting; it bemuses his rudimentary conscience, making him believe that he is out for justice and not for loot; it muddles his immature mind with ineffable nonsense concerning the complicated economic theories of value and surplus-value. Of the potency and efficacy of the appeal, there can be, unfortunately, no doubt."

Sir Phillip Chetwode, recently commander-in-chief of the British Army in India, in the London Telegram, July 27, 1930, said that "the Communists are masters in the art of propaganda."

He would be a nit-wit indeed who, reading the papers for the past two years, has not discovered that propaganda emanating from the Socialist School of Thought, largely the Left or Communist wing, has brought about a most unstable situation not only in India, but China, Egypt, Poland and many other countries. Recognizing, as most Americans do, that it has had effect in other countries they still insist that it has, and can have, no effect in the United States.

The power of suggestion, the value of propaganda, has long been well understood and employed by the leaders of the Socialist School of Thought. Without it there would be no such School today because the theory it advances, being founded on false promises, depending wholly upon a lack of understanding to gain followers, appealing to those of various groups chafing at some form of restraint, playing to the religiously inclined while at the same time coddling the atheist, could not survive save through its character of propaganda. "The Daily Worker" (Communist), July 6, 1927, quoted Li Ho Lin, director general of the Central Propaganda Bureau of the Chinese National Army as saying, "One propagandist is worth twenty armed soldiers."

"The Socialist propaganda is the very life-nerve of the movement," writes Morris Hillquit ("Socialism Summed Up," page 47). "Upon its success or failure depends the destiny of the movement. The educational and propaganda activities dominate all other forms of organized Socialist work, and none but the closest observer can appreciate the gigantic accomplishments of the movement in this field." He adds (page 106), "The American schools and colleges, as well as the press and church, are honeycombed with Socialists and Socialist sympathizers."

J. Bruce Glasier ("The Meaning of Socialism," page 28) says that "no propaganda has ever made such rapid and far-spread progress in the world" as that of Socialism.

We are forced to agree with Mr. Hillquit that "none but the closest observers" understand what Socialist propaganda has done and is doing to undermine our government and our institutions. We are, likewise, forced to agree with Mr. Glasier that "no propaganda has made such rapid and far-spread progress." And then we further agree with Ernest J. P. Benn ("About Russia," page 64) when he characterizes one advancing the Socialist theory as "the prince of propaganda" because, as he states (page 46), they are "doubly proficient" in the art of misrepresentation.

(Issued by the Educational Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, 120 West 42nd Street, New York City.)

(Copyright 1931)

LECTURE No. 10

THE SOCIALIST ATTACK ON CHURCH AND HOME

There are two well known ways of effecting changes. One is orderly. It is called evolutionary. The other is disorderly. It is called revolutionary. Let me illustrate:

When a person owning a building concludes to tear it down and erect a larger or more valuable structure on the plot, he does not proceed in a haphazard manner. In the first place, before destroying that which he possesses, he makes reasonably certain that by so doing and erecting the larger structure his return on money invested will be greater or more certain. Then, before proceeding to destroy the old, he has plans drawn for the new, its cost carefully estimated and arrangements made for financing the project.

We—the people of the United States—own a wonderful structure. It is our form of government supporting a demonstrated system of economics. It is paying splendid dividends in prosperity, peace, contentment and security. Possibly by destroying that which we own we may erect upon the foundation something much greater, or by going farther and destroying the foundation, we may secure something far more wonderful, something that will pay larger dividends in prosperity, peace, contentment and security, or make these dividends more certain. Would it not be exceedingly foolish, however, for us to destroy that which we have, and the merits of which have so many times been demonstrated, until we were certain something superior could or would be erected on the ruins?

Now the person who concludes that by destroying a building he owns and by erecting in its place something bigger and better he will be benefited, after completing all preliminary arrangements, he starts the work of tearing down the old. He does not go about this recklessly. He proceeds in a manner that will cause the least damage to surrounding property, to pedestrians who pass, and the least inconvenience to those occupying adjoining buildings. All material that may be utilized in erecting the new structure is carefully saved. The wreckers do not start upon the foundation. On the contrary, they commence work at the top and proceed slowly and cautiously to the foundation which is the last thing touched. This system of effecting a change is called evolutionary.

This, however, is not the method pursued by the followers of the Socialist School of Thought to change the "present social order" to what they term, the "new social order," which, they insist, will be far superior in every way. In the first place they cannot agree on what the new structure shall be like. They cannot agree on details connected with its construction. They do no planning whatever for the erection of the new structure. They center their attention wholly on the abolition of the existing one.

"It is in their indictment of the existing order that Socialists are most in harmony," writes Prof. O. D. Skelton ("Socialism, A Critical Analysis," page 16). "Theorists who are poles apart in the remedies or the tactics they propose join forces in anathematizing the common enemy."

Every student of Socialism has commented on the noticeable fact that there is no agreement among the leading advocates of the Socialist School of Thought as to the character of the structure they propose to erect if, and when, they have destroyed the existing government, its institutions and its economic system. The thing they first wish, and upon which they center all energy, is to destroy ownership of property in order that this property may be transferred to a government controlled and operated by them. Just what they are then going to do is nebulous. There are, in fact, three views on this question of participation. One says "to each as much as he needs, i.e., equality." Another says "to each according to his merits." The third says "to each according to his needs."

"Such is the chaos of Socialist opinion on this vital question of the distribution of wealth," writes Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 368). "They cannot tell what motives will operate under Socialism." He continues (page 369), "as though human nature were going to change with the economic system! * * * It would be pitiful if it were not so intensely disgusting that loose thinking, vague utterance, and flabby sentimentality of the sort, should be foisted off upon a half-educated electorate as a new social gospel. The only further general criticism of these conflicting, iniquitous and impossible principles of distribution which I will make is this: that one and all they contemplate the cutting down of the rewards which now go to capital and ability, and their partitionment among the thoughtless and incompetent. Such being the case, the folly and injustice of the Socialistic principles of distribution go a long way towards explaining the universal failure of Socialism in the sphere of production."

Jessie Wallace Hughan ("What Is Socialism," page 68) writes: "In what definite ways will the Socialist Commonwealth differ from the capitalist state of today? Contrary to current opinion, the typical Socialist is *very slow to give specifications as to the future.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

Harry W. Laidler ("Socialism in Thought and Action," page 136) says: "After the industries are socialized, many administrative problems will necessarily arise. Here again Socialists are *averse to predicting how the details of administration will be worked out.* Such details must be left to the decision of the mass of people when and after socialization takes place, and the final forms adopted will probably be the result of a long series of careful experimentations." (Emphasis supplied.)

Morris Hillquit ("Socialism in Theory and Practice," page 131) remarks that "we cannot, of course, attempt a detailed forecast of the political organization of the future Socialist state without embarking upon the domain of speculation." This "Socialist society," he insists, however (page 100), will differ "very radically from the modern state in form and substance."

Miss Hughan, Prof. Laidler and Mr. Hillquit are recognized spokesmen for the Socialist School of Thought in the United States. While seemingly anxious to destroy all that we have built under our system, they frankly admit that when, and if, they are successful in their efforts, they do not know what will result. Mr. Hillquit (page 108) even goes so far as to say that "the task of the man

who might have assumed a century ago to forecast present conditions would have been mere child's play in comparison with the dreamer who undertakes to describe the details of life and organization of the 'Socialist state.' Surely he errs in this conclusion. The "Socialist state" has been in existence in Russia for the past thirteen years. The whole world knows its "details of life and organization." Is there a sane person who wants like conditions in the United States?

The owner of a large building, from which he is collecting a fair return on the money invested, who proceeded to dynamite that structure and leave a mass of wreckage without any plan for the construction of a new building, would be regarded by any court as an incompetent. A trustee would be named to handle his business affairs.

Moreover, in the process of wrecking the old, those of the Socialist School of Thought fail to exercise even a moderate degree of care and caution. If great harm comes to the majority of the people—and only harm could result—it matters little to them. The slow process of taking off the roof, and working slowly to the foundation, preserving all material that may be of value in the erection of the new, is archaic according to their views. They propose to destroy the foundation first, letting the superstructure fall regardless of the damage to existing civilization. Their method of effecting a change is called revolutionary and that is the term many of them apply.

"Marxism is the outcome, not of evolution and reform, but of despair and revolution," writes Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 278). "It is in its very essence opposed to amelioration. Its fundamental tenets compel it to foster misery, increase strife, foment disorder, ruin industry, disturb commerce, prevent reform; lest peace and prosperity postpone the catastrophe on which its hopes depend."

What is the foundation of the existing "social order"? The family, because the unit of society is the family. The nation consists of an aggregate of these units—some twenty million of them. The family, in turn, is based on religion. Christianity is the predominant religion in the United States and the family in this country, therefore, is the product of Christianity.

Gino Speranza ("Race or Nation," page 114) says that "the Bible in the American public schools has been, both historically and spiritually, as much the symbol of self-government and of the national conscience as the American Flag." "It has been," he adds, "in every intimate sense, as much a charter of American liberties as the Declaration of Independence."

Admitting that due to human traits and frailties—and mankind always has been and always will be faced with these—there are defects in our present social order, yet no sane man would destroy a large building merely because he found faulty plumbing on one floor. He would simply correct the fault. It may be, indeed, that if we destroyed our entire structure including the foundation which is the family based on Christianity, these defects would be eliminated, and we would see erected upon some new foundation a more perfect structure. I say it *may be*. As yet, however, no person has presented the slightest bit of evidence to show that by this process

of destruction we would improve conditions for ourselves or our posterity.

The dynamite system of destroying the foundation for existing society cannot be employed because the mental attitude of the people sustaining both the family and Christianity is too firmly fixed to be suddenly changed. For that reason the followers of the Socialist School of Thought are engaged in a weakening process and that process consists of destroying the mental attitudes that support the family and Christianity. Direct attacks upon both are being made.

Most of the followers of the Right, or Socialist, wing of the Socialist School of Thought will protest against the charge that they are seeking to destroy either the home or the church. They contend, in fact, that what they want is a "new social order" where both family and religion will be on a much higher and more enlightened plane. This, at least, is the position taken by the army of "liberals" following the Socialist School of Thought, many of whom insist they are Christians and at the same time Socialists.

Now, regardless of what these "liberals" insist, the fact remains that Socialism, as a theory, aims directly at the abolition of both the family and the church. Documentary evidence is not lacking to sustain this statement. The holy script of those who follow the Socialist School of Thought is "The Communist Manifesto," by Marx. I am certain no true Socialist will question that assertion. In other words, the fundamentals of Socialism are based upon this document as the fundamentals of Christianity are based upon the Bible, or the fundamentals of Mohammedanism are based upon the Koran. Marx, Engels, Bebel and all of the earlier writers on Socialism, held to the theory that the family exists because of the private property right and so—it logically follows—to establish a social order wherein the property right is denied the individual, the family must be destroyed.

In "The Communist Manifesto" (Rand School edition, pages 34-5-6), Marx writes:

"Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists. On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution. The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital. * * * Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common, and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women." Prof. Arthur Shadwell ("The Socialist Movement," Vol. I, page 36) makes this significant statement: "The tendency of ardent regenerators of society to run to free love is a curious phenomenon not sufficiently noticed; a desire to indulge their appetites seems bound up with their objections to the existing order, which imposes more restraint than they like."

This phenomenon will be noted by all who give it a bit of study. It is not at all difficult to connect the pronounced wave of free love

under the coverage of "companionate marriage" with propaganda emanating from the Socialist School of Thought. It is a noticeable fact that among those who are the most open in their advocacy of some form of free love are, at the same time, among the most ardent supporters of Socialist philosophy. True, there are followers of that philosophy who do not so advocate but that does not in any wise affect the phenomenon.

Joseph J. Mereto in "The Red Conspiracy," devotes a whole chapter to the position of Socialism on the question of marriage and the family, presenting a number of citations that are convincing. The first two paragraphs of this chapter (page 317) read as follows:

"Most of the Marxians in America, when confronted with the charge that they advocate free-love, deny the truth of the accusation, claiming that it is a base calumny. False and calumnious, indeed, would the charge be, if it were directed against each individual among the Revolutionists, or if from its universality exceptions were not made for many, who, not having as yet accepted the full consequences of International Socialism, go no further than to cast their votes for the party candidates. Nor would it be fair to except no others from condemnation, for among the dues-paying members of the party are many who are extremely averse to the system of loose morals that their comrades propose to substitute for the monogamous form of marriage now in vogue.

"Books advocating free-love are advertised in the Socialist press and receive favorable notice in editorial columns. They have long been on sale at the leading Socialist book-stores of the country and even at the National Office of the Socialist Party in Chicago. Finally, the Revolutionary clubs and locals all over the United States have in their libraries books on free-love that are standard works on Socialism."

August Bebel, whose writings are as sacred to the average Socialist as those of Marx, in his book, "Woman and Socialism" (English edition, page 470), writes: "Bourgeois marriage"—and remember the Socialists employ the word "bourgeois" to mean that system which grants and sustains the individual property right—"is * * * the result of bourgeois relations. Closely connected with private property and the right of inheritance, it is contracted to obtain 'legitimate' children. Under the pressure of social conditions it is forced also upon those who have nothing to bequeath. * * * But in Socialistic society there will be nothing to bequeath, unless house furnishings and personal belongings should be regarded as hereditary portions; so the modern form of marriage becomes untenable from this point of view also. This also settles the question of inheritance, which Socialism will not need to abolish. Where there is no private property, there can be no right of inheritance."

On page 468 of the same book Bebel makes this statement: "That present day marriage is not suited to its purpose, is no longer denied by any thinking person." It would appear from this statement that this oft-quoted Socialist had a mighty low opinion of thinking persons.

We have, in some of the earlier lectures, dealt with the program of the Socialists in the United States on this question. With their

usual artfulness, they conceal their true purposes. In their Declaration of Principles (see lecture No. 3, page No. 7), they declare the socialization of dwelling houses to be a part of their program. Certainly if dwelling houses are placed under complete control of the state, the family, as such, of necessity disappears.

Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 380-381) holds that "Socialism is a menace to the family." Continuing, he says:

"Although directly and explicitly Socialism has no connection with the family or with the institution of marriage, indirectly and implicitly it is hostile to both. * * * William Morris, in his 'News From Nowhere,' depicts a state of society in which temporary unions of men and women prevail, and in which there is no divorce court, for the simple reason that there are no legal marriages to dissolve. Mr. Belfort Bax was an avowed and persistent antagonist of marriage and the family. One of his many typical utterances is: 'In a society such as Socialism implies, based on the communal production of wealth for social use and enjoyment, and hence where private property-holding has either ceased to be altogether, or at least has lost its importance * * * the principle of rigid monogamy enforced by law and public opinion, as at present, must break down before a freer conception of human relationships.' Mr. Harry Quelch, the friend of Mr. Bax and his collaborator in a 'Socialist Catechism,' for many years the editor of 'Justice' (the official organ of the S.D.F.), expresses the same views in less ambiguous and academic terms: 'I am in favor of free-love,' he says. 'I want to abolish marriage * * * we want no marriage bond. We want no bonds at all. We do want free-love.' Not even Mr. Quelch, however, is entirely explicit. For 'free-love' is a euphemism for 'unbridled lust'—something far lower than abysmal bestiality; for no animal is capable of such deliberate degradation and depravity."

Prof. O. D. Skelton ("Socialism, A Critical Analysis," page 216) says that "quite aside from what may be the practice or the theory of individual Socialists today, the inevitable result of the establishment of the Socialist regime would be the universal breaking-up of the family relation." This writer quotes Morris and Bax ("Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome, page 199) as follows:

"The present marriage system was based on the general supposition of the economic dependence of the women on the man, and the consequent necessity for his making provisions for her which she can legally enforce. This basis would disappear with the advent of social economic freedom, and no binding contract would be necessary between the parties as regards livelihood; while property in children would cease to exist. * * *" The same writer quotes H. G. Wells ("Socialism and the Family," page 30) as saying:

"Socialism, in fact, is the state family. The old family of private individuals must vanish before it. * * * They are incompatible with it. Socialism assails the triumphant egotism of the family today. * * * So far as English Socialism is concerned (and the thing is still more the case in America), I must confess that the assault has displayed a quite extraordinary instinct for *taking cover*, but that is a *question of tactics rather* than of essential antagonism." (Emphasis supplied.)

Prof. Harry W. Laidler, in his book, "Socialism in Thought and Action," devotes a little less than two pages to the subject of marriage in an attempt to disprove the charge that those who adopt the Socialist theory naturally soon accept the doctrine of free love. Admitting that a number of the leading Socialist exponents such as Bebel, Carpenter and Bax held what he terms (page 159) "unorthodox views regarding the reorganization of the family life," he refutes the charge that Socialism is opposed to the family by the simple statement "to this the Socialists reply that the movement as such has never officially taken any stand on the subject. * * *" In another place (page 240), the professor says that "under Socialism the state would take care of the children, parental responsibility would cease. * * *" If "parental responsibility" for the children "would cease" would not a mighty big hole be knocked in the institution of marriage?

Even though idealistic Socialists, such as Prof. Laidler, may not favor the abolition of the family as now constituted, the fact remains that a large number of those who accept Socialism do. A movement, the members of which possibly evenly divide upon this subject, is a dangerous one. Moreover, the fact that the movement, as such, has not seen fit even to "officially" consider the subject, and so has not found it desirable to place itself on the side of the family, is not in keeping with American ideals and institutions.

While the preponderance of evidence sustains the contention that Socialism, if and when, in operation would do away with the family as it exists today, even greater is the evidence to sustain the contention that Socialism, if and when, in operation would destroy religion, especially Christianity since the fight in the United States is aimed primarily at Christianity. Destroy! Destroy! Destroy! appears the always handy slogan of the Socialist School of Thought. It proposes not only the destruction of man's hope of material reward by owning property but it proposes also the destruction of man's hope of spiritual reward through living a life in keeping with the tenets of his faith.

Religion, a belief in a reward beyond the grave, appears an instinct of mankind. All peoples from the earliest days to the present have had a religion and all, in some manner, have predicated their spiritual reward on a Supreme Power or Being. There are many who seek no material gain. They turn their attention to the spiritual to compensate them for their efforts. Now this feeling, this instinct, this ever present hope, if you please, of a spiritual reward after one has passed from this mundane sphere, is so deep-rooted in mankind that if ever eradicated only anarchy and chaos in their most pronounced forms could possibly result.

Dr. A. C. Gabelein ("Christianity or Religion," page 15) says: "Religion is confined to the human race; man possesses a religious instinct or faculty. Religion is a universal fact. No nation or tribe of people has ever been discovered without a religious belief. Religion is not a new invention, but is as old as the race itself."

"Religion * * * is the great force that imprints on history that general character by which a people becomes conscious of its own vocation, and associates itself with the purpose it proposes of society as a whole," writes Henri Masses ("Defense of the West," page 86).

"There are two distinct things in Christianity * * *: one is its action on the human person, the other its action on society." (Page 90.)

Joseph J. Mereto in "The Red Conspiracy" (page 294), systematized a large amount of evidence along this line. He calls attention to the fact that "W. D. P. Bliss, the Socialist editor of the 'New Encyclopedia of Social Reform,' in an article on page 1135 of his work, admits that it is perfectly true that the large majority of avowed Socialists are divorced from recognized religion and the church, and that this leads many of them to extreme radicalism on all questions of ethics, money and the family."

Frederick Engels ("Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," 1901 English edition, page 17), says that "nowadays * * * there is absolutely no room for either a Creator or a ruler."

August Bebel who, before his death in 1913, was one of the leading German Socialists, declared in the Reichstag, September 16, 1878 (cited Mereto, page 294):

"Gentlemen, you attack our views on religion because they are atheistic and materialistic. I acknowledge the correctness of the impeachment. I am firmly convinced that Socialism finally leads to atheism." Those who have watched the parallel growth of Socialism and atheism will certainly agree with this authority that "Socialism finally leads to atheism."

Marx wrote of Socialism (quoted from "Information," London, November 16, 1928): "We shall have deserved well of it if we can stir up hatred and contempt against all existing institutions. We make war against all prevailing ideas of the state, of country, of patriotism. The idea of God is the keystone of a perfected civilization. It must be destroyed. The true root of liberty, equality and culture is atheism."

"The A B C of Communism" (page 257) states that "in practice, no less than in theory, Communism is incompatible with religious faith."

In April, 1921, The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co. of London, England, issued a little pamphlet titled, "The Conspiracy Against Religion," from which we take the following statements of well-known Socialists:

Liebknecht: "It is our duty as Socialists to root out the faith in God with all our might. Nor is anyone worthy of the name who does not consecrate himself to the spread of atheism."

Marx: "The idea of God is the keystone of a perverted civilization. It must be destroyed. The true root of liberty, equality, culture, is atheism."

Bebel: "Christianity and Socialism stand toward each other as fire and water. Christianity is the enemy of liberty and civilization. It has kept mankind in slavery and oppression."

Bakunine: "We declare ourselves atheists. We seek the abolition of all religion and the abolition of marriage."

H. M. Hyndman, the English Socialist: "Christianity is Anarchism, not Socialism. There is no word in Christianity about Socialism."

Let us come back to the United States. The Socialist Party during its 1912 Convention adopted a "Resolution on Our Atti-

tude Toward the Church" (official proceedings, National Convention of the Socialist Party, held at Indianapolis, Indiana, May 12th to 18th, 1912, published by the Socialist Party, page 247-248). In that resolution appears this language: "The ethics of Socialism and religion are directly opposed to each other."

Prof. Harry W. Laidler—and we again quote him because he is an accepted authority by those who openly follow the Marxian mandate, "the abolition of private property" and those who, fearing this is a little harsh, seek to conceal their real purpose in the confusing phrase, "production for use and not for profit"—in "Socialism in Thought and Action" deals with the question of religion almost as sparingly as he does with that of marriage. To the question of religion he devotes a little less than five pages. The book, to which reference is made, consists of 510 pages of printed matter so that in "exposing" capitalism and upholding Socialism, the professor devotes a little better than one per cent of his time to questions that are considered fundamental with the great majority of the people.

He writes (page 155) that "many of the opponents of religion, and even some of the adherents of Socialism contend that Socialism is opposed to religion." "This position," the cautious professor contends, "is based primarily on two premises: first, that many Socialists have opposed organized religion; second, that the philosophy of Socialism is itself diametrically opposed to the principles of revealed religion."

Admitting that many Socialists are opposed to religion, Prof. Laidler states that this is due to the fact that, in a number of countries, the church is controlled by the state, and that the Socialists "therefore found the church lined up with their enemies." He further admits that even where this condition does not exist—and it does not exist in the United States—the "workers"—that is, the Socialists—"frequently felt that the former (the church) was too largely influenced by commercial and industrial interests which supported it." He still further admits that those who have been oppressed by the church—just who have been oppressed and how, he fails to state—when migrating to other lands carried their opposition with them.

Bishop William Montgomery Brown, in his book, "Communism and Christianity," which can be purchased at most radical book stores, and has been advertised in *The Daily Worker* (Communist), after presenting his definition of the seven essential principles of Socialism (page 7), writes: "If a man supports the church, or in any respect allows religious ideas to stand in the way of the foregoing seven essential principles of Socialism, or the activity of a Party, he proves thereby that he does not accept Socialism as fundamentally true and of the first importance, and his place is outside."

"No man can be consistently both a Socialist and a Christian. It must be either the Socialist or the religious principle that is supreme, for the attempt to couple them equally betrays charlatanism or a lack of thought. (Emphasis supplied.) Again (page 9), he writes: "It is, therefore, a profound truth that Socialism is the natural enemy of religion." Further (page 86), "Clearly, then, the basis of Socialist philosophy is utterly incompatible with religious ideas."

While Bishop Brown, in the book cited, supplies a picture of himself in the robes of the church with the information that he is "Fifth Bishop of Arkansas, resigned; Member House of Bishops, Protestant Episcopal Church," etc., it should be stated in all fairness that his close association with the Communist movement, and his absolute rejection of the faith of his church caused him to be unfrocked.

And still there are those, having not the slightest conception of what Socialism is or what it aims to accomplish, who say they are Christians! No person can be a Socialist and a Christian at the same time. Socialism and Christianity, as Bebel points out, are "as fire and water" to each other; as Hyndman says, there is "no word in Christianity about Socialism," as the Socialist Party has by resolution officially declared, "the ethics of Socialism and religion are directly opposed to each other," and as Bishop Brown says, "No man can be consistently both Socialist and Christian.

Let us quote just one modern British Socialist who is exceptionally popular in the United States especially among the "liberals" and in the colleges. He is a regular visitor to our shores and does not find lecturing to American audiences at all unprofitable—Bertrand Russell.

A western Socialist publishing house issues literally millions of little booklets at the low price of five cents each. Among those issued during 1929 was one by Russell, "Has Religion Made Useful Contribution to Civilization?" The opening paragraphs read as follows: "My own view on religion is that of Lucretius. I regard it as a disease born of fear and as a source of untold misery to the human race. I cannot, however, deny that it has made some contributions to civilization. It helped in early days to fix the calendar, and it caused Egyptian priests to chronicle eclipses with such care that in time they became able to predict them. These two services I am prepared to acknowledge, but I do not know of any others."

It will be noted that Mr. Russell in his concealed sarcasm adopts the usual method of all Socialists—the avoidance of facts or logic. Later (page 10), the same booklet, Mr. Russell writes: "The objections to religion are of two sorts, intellectual and moral. The intellectual objection is that there is no reason to suppose any religion true; the moral objection is that religious precepts date from a time when men were more cruel than they now are, and therefore tends to perpetuate inhumanities which the moral consciousness of the age would otherwise outgrow."

Were we so inclined we might here inject a few sarcastic remarks concerning both the "intellectual and moral" attitude of the writer of the above but that would be neither evidence nor logic.

Prof. Arthur Shadwell ("The Socialist Movement," Vol. 2, page 156) says that "the vast majority of Socialists are definitely anti-Christian," and (on page 157), "There is obviously no room for any moral or spiritual element whatever in this (the Socialist's) view of life, and Mr. G. B. de Montgomery merely states a fact when he says that 'A real Marxian is always an atheist'."

In speaking of Marx and Lenin, Prof. Shadwell says (page 157) :

"They regarded religion with equal hatred and contempt, and denounced it as superstitious nonsense, a device invented by cunning and unscrupulous men to drug the people into insensibility."

Again (page 161), Prof. Shadwell writes: "Some of our (quite sincere) Christian or clerical Socialists may object that they do not give up the moral law or rely upon the system. Perhaps not as Christians; but as Socialists they do."

John Rae ("Contemporary Socialism," page 5) says that "attacks on religion, patriotism and the family are very usual accessions of their practical agitation everywhere."

Prof. Hearnshaw ("A Survey of Socialism," page 383-4-5) writes:

"Socialism is a menace to religion. Religion, like marriage and the family, lies outside the proper scope of Socialism, and it is possible for Socialist leaders in Christian countries, when anxious to secure the votes of the credulous devout, to contend, with Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, that 'Socialism has no more to do with a man's religion than it has with the color of his hair.' Nay, it is even possible for others—ignoring the predatory economic elements in Socialism, and repudiating the devilish dogma of the class war—to proclaim that the eviscerated utopian Socialism which remains, with its exaltation of community and its wish to elevate the low, is really nothing but applied Christianity itself.

"But neither Mr. MacDonald's bland indifferentism, nor the Christian Socialists' monocular sentimentality, affects the fact that all the great Socialist and Communist leaders have been, and are, definitely anti-Christian and anti-religious. Nor, again, is this a mere coincidence. There is a difference of genius, of spirit, of aim, of outlook, between Socialism and faith, so radical and complete that any concordat between the two is inconceivable. 'Socialism,' well remarks Eucken, 'has no spiritual background: everything it does affects only the limited surface of life.' It is fundamentally materialistic, and in its dominant or Marxian form is based on a conception of man and the universe which entirely precludes any divine influence or operation whatsoever. In all its forms it emphasizes the potency of economic environment in determining character and destiny to so extreme a degree as to rule out the effective action of spiritual forces. * * *

"Whether rightly or wrongly, Socialists regard religion as the natural ally and bulwark of the things that they hate, as, for example, of monarchy and private property. They look upon it as a reactionary force, conservative of the established order generally. Hence they condemn it to destruction as an inherent part of the capitalist system, and wherever they come into power (as in Russia or in Mexico) they endeavor to extirpate it. 'Whoever assails Christianity assails, at the same time, monarchy and capitalism,' wrote Dr. Zacher in the 'Red International.' Professor Flint, in that marvellous book of his, written a generation ago, in the tranquil Victorian days, saw to the heart of things, realized the essential antagonism of Socialism to the church, and prophesied, in words that have already received deplorable verification, that 'if Socialism triumph, another age of religious persecution will have to be traversed'."

There may be—and no doubt are—idealistic followers of the Socialist School of Thought who insist that, while following Socialism, they can at the same time be consistent Christians. The trouble with such persons is that either they do not know what Christianity is, or they do not know what Socialism is, or they do not know what either Christianity or Socialism is. Following their line of reasoning, one could, with equal consistency, say that a person can be honest and a burglar at the same time or that white can be black.

Are the utterances of the Socialist leaders which we have cited—and many along the same line might be cited—merely idle mouthings? To answer that question, one of necessity turns from Socialism as a theory to Socialism in action. We find Socialism in its “fullest and over-ripe form” in complete and absolute control of the government of Russia and so extending its influence over the people of that country. We have presented in this course many citations to show that the government of Russia is a Socialist government. Let us here present an additional bit of evidence along that line.

Mrs. B. L. Robinson, president of the Massachusetts Public Interests League, in her excellent little booklet, entitled “Christian Socialism—a Contradiction in Terms” (page 4), writes:

“Lincoln Steffens, one of the leading Socialist propagandists in this country, in his introduction to a book by Trotsky, speaks of him as an ‘orthodox Marxian Socialist,’ and the same Mr. Steffens, in speaking to a convention of Christian Socialists at Rev. Percy Grant’s church in New York, said: ‘The idea of the Bolshevik is, we will not only *think* Socialism, *talk* Socialism, but we will *do* Socialism.’”

In Russia, in truth, under the present regime, they are not only *thinking* Socialism, *talking* Socialism but they are *doing* Socialism. We have every right to assume that should the Socialist theory be put into practice in the United States the same sort of *doing* would follow here. So to determine whether or not the Socialist writers quoted have been engaging in idle mouthings or not, turn to Russia to see just what happens when their theories are put into operation.

The “A B C of Communism” is the official text-book of the Socialists dominating Russia. About twelve pages are devoted to religion. The opening paragraph (page 256) follows:

“*Why Religion and Communism are incompatible.* ‘Religion is the opium of the people,’ said Karl Marx. It is the task of the Communist Party to make this truth comprehensible to the widest possible circles of the laboring masses. It is the task of the party to impress firmly upon the minds of the workers, even upon the most backward, that religion has been in the past and still is today one of the most powerful means at the disposal of the oppressors for the maintenance of inequality, exploitation, and slavish obedience on the part of the toilers. * * * Religion and Communism are incompatible, both theoretically and practically.’”

The same document further states: “A Communist who rejects the commandments of religion and acts in accordance with the directions of the party, ceases to be one of the faithful. On the other

hand, one who, while calling himself a Communist, continues to cling to his religious faith, one who in the name of religious commandments infringes the prescriptions of the party, ceases thereby to be a Communist. * * *” (Page 257.)

“For the Communist, the church is a society of persons who are united by definite sources of income at the cost of the faithful, at the cost of their ignorance and lack of true culture.” (Page 258.)

Not only have all the leaders controlling the Socialist government of Russia adopted the ideas expressed in this text-book, but they have proceeded with a ruthlessness that beggars description to put their ideas into practice. Russia, under Socialist domination today, is the only nation that makes it a part of its official business to destroy religious faiths.

A condensed statement of the position of this Socialist regime upon the question of religion is found in an official decree issued in 1929. It is covered in a dispatch from Geneva to the London Post, November 12th of that year.

“It is the first legislative attempt to regulate the Soviet State's efforts to stamp out religion of all kinds in Russia,” reads the dispatch. The report continues:

“The Decree makes it clear that the Soviet Government intends to supervise all religious activity, to impose further restrictions on worship, and to make evangelization impossible. The Soviet claims the right to confiscate ecclesiastical property and to suppress all philanthropic and social work undertaken by religious bodies.

“Religious associations must be registered; they cannot hold services without this registration, which may, however, be refused. General assemblies of religious associations may be held only with the permission of the Soviet civil authority. Persons elected to executive bodies are liable to be ejected if they do not find favor with the Soviet authorities.

“Ministers of religion must limit their activity to the place where their parishioners are domiciled. Districts without priest or pastor are not permitted to obtain assistance from neighboring parishes; they must remain without ministers. Itinerant preaching is not allowed.

“Religious associations are prohibited from organizing special meetings for children or young people, prayer meetings or Bible readings, any form of medical relief or sanatoria, clubs, libraries, literary reunions, or any form of work, and from arranging any kind of religious instruction outside the services themselves.

“Buildings and objects serving for worship are nationalized property; the religious associations hold them provisionally by grace of contract. When a place of worship is closed down, as it may be at any time by order of the Commissariat for the Interior, all the gold and silver objects are handed over to the Commissariat of Finance.”

Propagandists and agitators in the United States, working under the direction of the Third (or Communist) International, openly seek to advance their atheistic program here. Our local atheists have their approval and support. This official attack on the religious faith of the people has done more to arouse the civilized world than all other forms of agitation, not excluding that dealing directly with revolutions.

William Chauncey Emhardt ("Religion in Soviet Russia," page 127) says, "Religion was the force considered most dangerous by the Soviet leaders. Religion was the basis of social ideals; and the social order must be abolished or subverted. Divide and attack; or better still, allow adversaries, nominally within the church, to destroy each other."

The "Pravda" (Moscow), an official organ of the government of Russia, in its June 12th, 1929, issue, printing a speech made by Comrade Yaroslavsky at the opening of the Second All Union Congress of Atheists, quotes him as follows:

"Comrades, we instill in the minds of the Atheists the feeling of internationalism which is a strong international fraternal link between the toilers. * * *

"We are against God, we are against Capital. We are for Socialism. We are for a World Union of toilers, we are for the Communist International. We are for such a system as will destroy the possibility of wars of any kind which will put an end to all kinds of exploitation of one man by another. We are for a Socialist Revolution."

"The Atheist at His Bench" (Bezboženik oo Stanker), an organ of the Moscow Committee of the All Russian Communist Party, printed at Moscow, in its issue No. 8, 1928, among other things said:

"* * * the Central Committee of the All Russian Communist Party (of the Bolsheviki) decided that the most important task at hand for the party must be the most attentive consideration of the problems on the program of the VI Congress, and *the most important question of that program for the Communist International is the militant demand, the fight against religion.*"

During the past year so much dealing with the activities of the Socialist government of Russia to destroy all religious faiths has been printed that it seems unnecessary to here present more evidence. That government has recently taken what they call an "advanced" step along that line. Teaching Atheism is now an important function of its universities. The story is told in a despatch from Rome, printed in the London, England, Morning Post, September 10, 1930, as follows:

"Messages from Moscow published in the 'Osservatore Romano' report the scientifically organised continuance of the Bolshevist war against religion. As an instance of the lengths to which Atheistic propaganda is carried on it is stated that at Vologda a university has been opened for anti-religious training. There are three 'faculties,' dedicated respectively to teaching against the Roman Catholic, the Jewish and the Greek Orthodox religions. After a training in general Atheism the students continue in any of the above faculties, and degrees are granted to those who qualify as specialist agitators."

The special committee of the House of Representatives investigating Communist activities in the United States has developed considerable evidence to show that in their determination to destroy all that goes with existing society, the Communists are ruthless in their attacks upon religion. Speaking before the Advisory Board of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies at the Carlton Hotel,

Washington, November 24th, 1930 (reported in *The Coalitionist* for December, 1930), Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr., Chairman of the Committee, said:

"So far as religion is concerned, every Communist must be an Atheist. His children cannot be baptized in a church and none of the members of his family can be buried or married with the aid of any religious ceremony.

"They have never tried to hide this fact, but it was not until a year and a half ago that they felt themselves strong enough in Russia to put into effect their program of destroying religion. They had destroyed a number of churches and turned them into clubs. They had desecrated graveyards and used them for parks, and so forth, but they were only material things. They did not start out to destroy the souls of the Russian children until about a year and a half ago, when they made it compulsory to teach hatred of God and of all forms of religion in the public schools of Russia.

"To me this is by far the most tragic and most appalling part of this entire situation. Think of Soviet Russia, that is much larger than the United States of America, that has a larger population, every day teaching to these young children hatred of God and of all forms of religion; and to such an extent that they make these children hold their parents in contempt and disobey them if their parents back home have any religious faith, and in this way to break down family life which, of course, is the main foundation and bulwark of all religion. When I speak of religion I do not mean our own religion, but I am speaking of the Greek religion, the Protestant religion, the Catholic religion, the Jewish faith, and so on. To break down the family life they even promote and further all kinds of vice among the school children throughout Russia. To me this is the most appalling thing about the entire situation."

That the attempt to eradicate all religious feelings in the minds of the people has been intensified among the young is evidenced upon every side. The Young Pioneers, a purely Communist organization, staged a large anti-religious demonstration in New York Christmas, 1930. Referring to this gathering the *New York Times* (December 26th, 1930) in part said:

"The Young Pioneers 'anti-religious circus' practically filled 1,500 seats in the Central Opera House. Most of the audience—as well as all the performers—were children, of course, but a sprinkling of their elders gave a correct applause to the speeches and hissed at proper intervals. When it was over the operators said it had been a success, that New York had done its bit in the general campaign to 'expose the religious bunk of the bosses'."

The *New York Herald-Tribune*, the same morning, in its news story said that "the youthful reds, as had been predicted, mocked Santa Claus and derided Christmas, religion and capitalistic society in a series of pageants."

The fourth annual convention of the Workers (Communist) Party of America held at Chicago, Illinois, August 21st to 30th, 1925, officially considered this question. In the printed report of that convention published by the *Daily Worker Publishing Co.*, (page 13) under the caption, "Anti-Religious Training Campaign," appears this language:

“Our campaign against religious training in the schools reached great masses of workers. In New York the campaign was carried into the schools, and in Ohio into both the schools and the unions. In some districts, as many as 100,000 anti-religious leaflets were distributed.”

Now from these citations turn to the address delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover, President of the United States on the occasion of the celebration of the 150th Anniversary of the Battle of Kings Mountain, South Carolina, as reported in the daily press of that and the following day.

Calling attention to the menace of “Socialism and its violent brother, Bolshevism,” the President detailed the merits contained in our form of government and our institutions. In giving credit where credit is due, he made this terse statement: “No student of American history can fail to realize that these principles and ideals grow largely out of the religious origins and spiritual aspirations of our people.”

It matters little what one's religious beliefs may be—or even if he calls himself an Atheist—but few will insist that good has not resulted from Christianity in the United States. The mere fact that our institutions are based upon faith in a Supreme Being or Power, and that we, as a people, undertake to conduct our affairs in keeping with the Golden Rule, ought to be sufficient to cause one to recognize the value of that religious faith. To cite instances where a person has not applied the Golden Rule, or where one professing Christianity has proven a rogue, and then charging the Church with the responsibility, is like citing an instance of unemployment due to downright laziness on the part of the individual and charging the government with being responsible.

It may be contended by some that without Christianity we would have advanced the same, or even more. But if there be one so bold, before we give his contention consideration, let him produce some evidence, no matter how questionable, to sustain his position. Mere charges and bombastic utterances will not do. Will such a person insist that had Socialism been in effect throughout the world for the past 2,000 years the present degree of civilization would have been attained? If so, where is the evidence? Or will he urge that without the institution of marriage the advance would have been the same? Again, let him produce the evidence.

If fault is found with Christianity, look to human traits and not to the teachings of the Savior. There are many who insist that the failure of Socialism in Russia is due not to the theory but to the individuals administering it. If Socialism takes possession of the United States what reason have we to assume the individuals who administer it here will not pursue the course of those in Russia?

The government that destroys, or even materially weakens, the family relation and crushes all religious faiths fails because it rests upon a frail foundation.

Copyright 1931

LECTURE No. 11

SOCIALIST ACTIVITIES AMONG THE YOUTHS

There is an old saying that you cannot teach an old dog new tricks. You cannot easily and readily change the fixed beliefs of matured persons. Beliefs are formulated during youth. They commence to be more or less fixed around the age of twenty, fairly well fixed around the age of thirty, and after one is forty, as a rule it is difficult indeed to change any established belief dealing with essential and fundamental questions.

Our form of government, its institutions and its economic system, are sustained and maintained because of the established beliefs of the present generation and no amount of propaganda and agitational work is going to change the beliefs of any considerable number of this generation. Each year, however,—and this has been true now for several years—the young men and women entering manhood and womanhood who are accepting the theories of the Socialist School of Thought are increasing while those who are accepting the theories of the Capitalist School of Thought are decreasing. Let this continue long enough and the preponderance of belief will be against our present form of government, its institutions and its economic system. Whether or not the proportion continues as it has for the past ten or more years, depends wholly upon the action of the present generation, that is, the mothers and fathers of the children and the youth of today.

In 1922, the Better America Federation of California issued a little booklet by Woodworth Clum, Western Reserve University, 1900, entitled "Making Socialists Out of College Students". Dealing with the remedy for the ill, he writes (last page) :

"We, who love America and believe in her institutions, must do a little studying. We must learn over again the full meaning of the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States. We must brush up on the basic reasons for our economic system and we must talk these things with our children, so that they will understand.

"Those of us who have children in the high schools and colleges must talk with them concerning the doctrines that are advocated by their teachers. We have demonstrated in America throughout a hundred and thirty years that our economic system is the greatest incentive to advancement in civilization, but we must know some of the reasons and be able to convey those reasons to others.

“And we must perfect in each state and in each county organizations of right-minded Americans who are willing to devote a little of their thought and time and money to saving America from those who would bring about a social revolution.

“The bomb-throwing Anarchist and bullet-shooting Radical will never retard America. The big job is with the pink variety,—whose poison is injected quietly and where we least suspect it.”

It has been aptly said that the first line of defense of this (or any other) nation is the youth of the land. The force of this statement will come home to you when you stop to consider that the boys and girls of today will be the men and women of tomorrow. Those now in command politically, economically and socially, will be succeeded by their children, plus the children of immigrants.

The United States today is what it is, and has what it has, because of the established beliefs of the majority of its citizens. The majority of these citizens were the children and the youths when the twentieth century was ushered in. Now let's move forward another thirty years. The United States in 1960 will be and will have just what the established beliefs of the majority of its citizens of that date hold it should be and should have. Those who will be in command at that time are the children and the youths of today. If those who will constitute the majority in 1960 are so educated that they believe our form of government, our institutions and our economic system should be sustained and maintained, then they will be sustained and maintained. If, on the contrary, the majority then in command—and they will be made up of the children and the youths of today—should hold to the belief that they should have a government fashioned along the lines of the one now operating in Russia; that the church and the family should not exist; that no man should own any property; that everything produced should be turned over to the state to be distributed as those in control of the state may see fit, then that is what the United States will be and will have.

The children and the youths of today are formulating their beliefs right now. They are formulating these beliefs from the character of their thinking; and their thinking is guided and directed by suggestions.

R. M. Whitney, author of “Reds in America”, published in 1924, opens a chapter dealing with radicalism in the schools with this significant statement which he credits to a Boston Communist (page 55): “Give us one generation of small children to train to manhood and womanhood and we will set up the Bolshevik form of the Soviet Government”.

If, in connection with what I have just said, you will reread carefully Lecture Number 9 dealing with propaganda, you will understand why the Socialist School of Thought makes but an idle gesture in an effort to gain the support of matured persons turning

its intensified attention to reaching the children and the youths. It is that they may implant in the minds of these children and youths suggestions to direct the character of their thinking which, in later years, will result in their fixed beliefs.

Now in order to gain this audience of children and youths and in a manner that does not expose its hands—for the approach is through a natural channel—the Socialist School of Thought has invaded the colleges and institutions of higher learning and, in many instances, the grade and grammar schools of the United States. In this line of activity, whether intentional or not, they employ deception in that they do not present their theories as Socialism. That word is carefully and persistently avoided. If Marx, Engels, Bebel, Lenin or some other leading Socialist propagandist is mentioned, he is not referred to as such but instead as one deeply concerned in the establishment of a “new social order”, or as a great “labor leader”.

The present day leaders of the Socialist School of Thought well understand that the words “Socialism” and “Socialist” are not popular; that they have a tendency to antagonize so that any suggestion coming in connection with either is readily rejected. Hence all the preachments of the School are cleverly sugar-coated. Emotional appeals form the basis for their presentation. If a young man or a young woman evinces some interest in idealistic teachings, he or she is induced to become a member of one of the so-called “liberal” clubs now found in many colleges, and urged to take part in discussions. The frank expressions of Marx and other leaders that Socialism proposes “to abolish the private property right”, that “Socialism and religion are directly opposed to each other”, and that “the family is merely a bourgeois institution” are changed to “production for use and not for profit”, “the brotherhood of man” and “companionate marriage”. These expressions have a tendency to attract rather than repel. At the same time they are misleading.

To carry on this work Leagues for Industrial Democracy, Liberal clubs, Social Problem clubs, Public Discussion clubs and other organizations with similar deceptive or confusing names are promoted. In no college today, so far as we are able to learn, does there exist a Socialist or a Communist frankly using either of these terms.

These clubs designed, however, to advance the preachments of the Socialist School of Thought and formed for no other purpose, elect student officers, and often have college teachers or professors as patrons. Socialist headquarters supply speakers to guide the general policy of club discussions. Questions for debates are furnished by Socialist and, in some instances, Communist organizations. Matured persons well trained for the work address these college clubs. These speakers do not use the words “Socialism” or “Socialist”, “Communism” or “Communist.” Problems are considered wholly from the theoretical, never from the practical, point of view. The students

are cleverly urged to be "liberal", to be "advanced", to stop thinking in the antiquated terms of their parents, to remember this is a "new age" with "new ideas" and that there can and will be no progress unless the young people assert themselves. Many students are appealed to by the expression "the revolt of youth".

There is nothing new in the theory that in order to produce a generation of men and women wedded to a certain belief it is only necessary to secure control of them when they are children and youths by guiding correctly their education. The theory was demonstrated correct years ago. Adam Weishaupt recognized it. He said (Robison, "History of the Conspiracy", page 191), "We must secure the direction of education—of the church—of the professional chair and the pulpit."

Now it matters little whether or not present day Socialism is the natural and generic descendant of the Order of the Illuminati. Many insist that it is; others that it is not. What interests us is this: Is there evidence to support the contention that efforts are being made to carry out this part of Weishaupt's program? Has the Socialist School of Thought gained, or is it seeking to gain, the direction of education? The evidence of proof is overwhelming that in some instances this control has been gained, while in many other instances every effort is being made to gain control. We would merely burden the record by presenting citations.

In the 1910 convention of the Socialist Party (Proceedings of that convention, page 61 to and including 72), Morris Hillquit as chairman of the propaganda committee submitted his report. It starts with this statement:

"The propaganda of Socialism is a subject as vast as the Socialist movement itself."

Dealing at length with the question, and going into the many activities of the organization to extend the theories of the Socialist School of Thought, he finally (page 68) touches "Propaganda Among the Young." Here he says:

"Among the special fields of Socialist propaganda the education of our boys and girls to an understanding of the Socialist philosophy is one of the most important. * * * Our public system of education is calculated to imbue the unformed and plastic mind of the child with the notions of the dominant class, and to develop in it an individualistic and capitalistic attitude towards life and life's struggles. This system takes hold of our children in their infancy and clings to them until they have reached the age of maturity. We must meet these malignant influences at all stages, but we must carefully adapt our methods to the intelligence of the child at the different ages."

After pointing out the method that must be employed with the younger child, Mr. Hillquit turns his attention to those in their teens. Here he says:

"Young people of that age"—14 years—"normally possess sufficient strength of mind to grasp the main philosophy and aims of our movement intelligently, and their training in the Socialist mode of thought and action cannot be conducted with too much zeal and energy. Young people's clubs and societies for the study of Socialism should be formed all over the country as regular adjuncts to our party organization. * * * But they should remain primarily study clubs. * * *

"In this connection attention should be called to the propaganda of Socialism in our high schools and colleges. The students in these institutions are not all, not even in their majority, the children of the wealthy classes. More often they come from poor parents, who submit to privations in the fond hope that a higher education would give their offspring an advantage in the struggle for existence. The bulk of these students face the uncertain future of professionals or salaried employees. * * * *They have all the idealism and enthusiasm of youth*, and are more susceptible to the propaganda of Socialism than men of their class *hardened and rendered skeptical and cynical by life's battles*. The Intercollegiate Socialist Society is doing good and fruitful work among them and the party should actively support and encourage the movement." (Emphasis supplied.) The Intercollegiate Socialist Society to which Mr. Hillquit refers is now called The League for Industrial Democracy.

The bulk of the college students, says Mr. Hillquit, "*have all the idealism and enthusiasm of youth*." They are not, he asserts, "*rendered skeptical and cynical by life's battles*." This self-evident truth has been employed to great advantage by the leaders of the Socialist School of Thought. They present Socialism, not as a proposal to destroy the private property right, not as a scheme to wreck the church and the home because the church and the home support the private property, but instead as a plan to create a "new social order," one wherein there is no suffering, no sorrow, no want, no harshness, no hatred and so one wherein the experience of "life's battles" do not render the individual "skeptical and cynical."

It is indeed true that youth is idealistic and anything that appeals is pursued with great enthusiasm. That is the reason why, in all the Socialist preachments in the schools and colleges, only that which is idealistic is presented. In the teachings of the Socialist School of Thought the average young man and young woman see a plan of life that will save them the work, the suffering, the hardships experienced by their parents. Often enough at home have they heard discussed the inability to have this or that because the income of the father was not sufficient. Every young man who goes to college expects to emerge full fledged in whatever line he is following. Ere the ink on his degree is dry he hopes to step—at least wants to step—into some niche in the business or professional world, where the income will be sufficient to satisfy all his desires. None of them

wants to start at the bottom and work up. None of them is looking forward to a life of hardship. What they desire is ease and comfort.

And the Socialist scheme seems to offer all they seek. If the government is Socialist, if all "production is for use and not for profit," then certainly, they reason from the premise supplied them, there will be no hardships, no bitter struggles, no death-like competition. Everything will be produced in abundance. All will have every wish gratified, they contend.

I need not take your time in elaborating this thought. You have all been young. Many of you attended college. Just turn back a few pages in your own lives. Recall—and most of you will—how ready you were to accept some idealistic theory as a most practical proposal and how great the disappointment in after life when these theories failed to operate. The youth of today is no different than the youth of yesterday. Human nature in all ages has been much the same.

It is true the boys and girls emerging from college this year and next, and for a number of succeeding years will be more or less saturated with Socialist doctrines. But they will be forced to enter a business world where these doctrines cannot yet be placed in operation because the fixed beliefs of the majority of the citizens prevent. Practical experience will cure many of them. But it will not cure others. These others will continue the leavening process with even greater zeal than shown in college. These others will be made up of two groups—those who, because of the wealth of their parents, are not forced to engage in any profession or line of business to sustain themselves, and those who, because of lack of ability or energy, or for some other reason, fail in the occupation they selected. Attempting to make square pegs fit round holes has produced many of our leading and most active Socialists and "liberals."

As the Right or Socialist wing is organized to extend its propaganda in the schools and colleges so, also, is the Left, or Communist, wing of the same School. The only difference is that the Left, or Communist, wing is far more frank in its declarations. It makes no attempt to cover its true purpose through the use of appealing or emotional slogans, or to disguise its purposes by working through organizations with deceptive names.

The "A B C of Communism" is the official text-book of the Socialist government of Russia. It has one full chapter on the subject of education. Stating that all present day literature is written by people who believe in the private property right, the document continues (page 237):

"In this way the scholars are imperceptibly stuffed with bourgeois ideology; they are infected with enthusiasm for all bourgeois virtues; they are inspired with esteem for wealth, renown, titles and orders; they aspire to get on in the world; they long for personal comfort, and so on."

Under the heading, "The Destructive Tasks of Communism" (pages 239, 240 and 241), the text follows: "In the matter of education, as in all other matters, the Communist Party is not merely faced by constructive tasks, for in the opening phases of its activity it is likewise faced by destructive tasks. In the educational system bequeathed to it by capitalist society, it must hasten to destroy everything which has made of the school an instrument of capitalist class rule. * * *

"In the schools of the old regime, teachers were engaged who had been indoctrinated with the bourgeois spirit; in these schools methods of instruction were practiced which served the class interests of the bourgeoisie. "* * * The minds of men must be made ready for the new social relationship. * * * it is the task of the new school to train up a younger generation whose whole ideology shall be deeply rooted in the soil of the new communist society."

It being, therefore, "the task" of the Socialist School of Thought to "train up a younger generation whose whole ideology shall be rooted in the soil of the new Communist society," no effort has been spared to that end, not only in Russia but in whatever countries the Communist program is carried out.

Both wings of the Socialist School of Thought have their own educational institutions in this country. They are called "workers' colleges." But these institutions are not colleges wherein the sciences, history, languages and other studies of regular schools are taught. On the contrary, the courses in these schools are designed to present Socialism and educate the students to become active Socialists or Communists. The Rand School of Social Science and the Brookwood College are probably the two best known, although similar schools are located in many of the larger cities. The Brookwood institution was charged with being communistic by an official of the American Federation of Labor at the New Orleans convention of that organization. This charge Brookwood, through its head, denied. The denial, however, seemed weak in comparison with the facts presented in the charge.

Common reports are to the effect that the "workers' college" under Communist guidance are increasing their student bodies each year. As the Communists are given to rash boasting, one must discount what they claim, however. The New York "Times" for February 9, 1928, contained the following news story:

"A national Communist college, the avowed purpose of which is 'to teach the art and science, the tactics and strategy of militant revolution,' was formally opened by the Central Executive Committee of the Workers Communist Party at a celebration at the Irving Plaza last night.

"The college is to be known as the National Training Course of the Workers' School, and is to include students from all parts of

the country. The college course will be for three months. The students will be paid ten dollars a week during the course and will study the following subjects: Trade Union Organization in Theory and Practice, American Political Problems, Economics, Marxism and Leninism, Organization Methods, Labor Journalism, Statistical Methods in Research, and the History of American and International Labor Movements.

“William Z. Foster, Ben Gold, Bertram D. Wolfe, and more than twenty others will comprise the faculty of the college. The students will be expected to live on their \$10 a week with such other aid as they may be able to get in the way of food and lodgings. They will study during the day, and will supplement their theoretical knowledge with the practical to be obtained by frequent excursions into meetings and offices of trade unions and other radical organizations.

“Irving Plaza was crowded last night with Communists. Many were students in the Workers’ School already established in New York. Others, who will study in the National Training Course, came from such distant places as California, Colorado, Canada, Nebraska.

“Mr. Foster addressed the students in behalf of the faculty. Characterizing the present leaders of most of the labor organizations as ‘corrupt and in the pay of the capitalists,’ he said that the national college would instill into the students a theoretical knowledge of all phases of Communism to serve as a background for practical application.”

Our study today deals with the well organized plan of the Socialist School of Thought to create in the minds of the next generation a fixed belief in the theories of that School, in order that the then majority of citizens may place these theories in operation. But one cannot touch that subject without mentioning certain activities both in and out of our regular educational institutions. I refer to what is commonly called the Youth Movement. We have only time to briefly discuss this phase of the subject. It is worthy of far more attention and I hope all of you will give it that attention.

In the United States we have two organizations menacing to the future of the nation if the government and its institutions are to be maintained. One is a subsidiary of the Right, or Socialist, wing of the Socialist School of Thought. It is called “The Pioneer Youth of America.” The other is a subsidiary of the Left, or Communist, wing of the same school, and is called “The Young Pioneers.” Both organizations are antagonistic to the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts. Neither teaches patriotism nor national loyalty. Neither seeks to inculcate in the minds of the members respect for existing institutions. Both are designed to wean the boys and girls from organizations or groups which do teach patriotism, national loyalty and respect for existing institutions.

Under the name of the National Association for Child Development, the Right, or Socialist, wing of the Socialist School of Thought, late in 1924 or early in 1925, formed what is commonly called the "Pioneer Youths of America." The astonishing thing about the name is that the organization is designed to teach the growing youth the theories of Socialism rather than "develop" them along sound American lines; and those who organized it can hardly come under the heading "pioneers" of this country since of the fifteen who are given as organizers, *ten were not born in the United States*. Of these, *six were born in Russia* and one in Austria-Poland. Clearly then it would be a stretch of the imagination to call their children "pioneers" as we commonly use that word.

The "New Leader," an official Socialist publication, in its issue of January 17, 1925, said:

"The introduction of 'anti-labor' and 'open-shop propaganda into the public school system' through the chambers of commerce and other anti-union bodies, and the development of 'an anti-labor and anti-social spirit' in the workers' children employers' organizations is the cause of the new effort, according to the call. The driving force back of the National Association is the aim 'to help the growing generation of boys and girls, who will make up the mass of laboring men and women of tomorrow, to understand the problems of the workers and thus create an ever stronger Labor movement'." The "anti-labor and the anti-social spirit" mentioned were in fact, an anti-Socialist and an anti-Communist spirit.

The Left, or Communist, wing of the Socialist School of Thought has a similar organization known as "The Young Pioneers." This organization has been somewhat prominent within the last year as the members have been introduced to the Communist picket line and have taken part in many Communist demonstrations not only in New York City but in other places. This system of putting children in the front line when rioting is induced is a clever move on the part of the Communists because no police officer is going to get too rough with children. Charles G. Wood, in "Reds and Lost Wages," cites a number of instances where this system has been used and quotes direct statements from Communist authority showing why it is employed.

Lincoln Eyre, writing (from Berlin, Germany) in the New York "Times" under date of May 27th, 1928, said: "It is a common mistake to suppose that the Red agitation is confined to the toiling masses. In Germany, at least, the exponents of Bolshevism reach into every social category. They concentrate, however, on the youth and childhood. Glittering baits are dangled before the eyes of the boys and girls in their late teens who face the prospects of working for a living and who don't like it much. Special propaganda pamphlets are prepared for young folks and for school children as well."

And the system of dangling "glittering baits" before the eyes of

boys and girls is employed in the United States, and has been for a number of years.

The system of reaching children with propaganda originating in the Socialist School of Thought has proven fairly successful, if we are to believe their own testimony which is, to a large degree, substantiated by testimony presented by the Special House Committee investigating Communist activities in the United States. While a number of witnesses, especially those connected with educational institutions, were asked to what extent this propaganda had permeated the schools, probably the most complete statement on the subject was that of Mrs. William Sherman Walker, National Chairman, National Defense Committee of the Daughters of the American Revolution, who has given much study to the subject and acquired a library of reference second to none.

In addition to her testimony, she presented the committee a large number of documents, all of which are printed in Part I, Volume 3 of the Hearings.

Mrs. Walker testified that "Communist children are urged to substitute the red flag for the American flag. They are asked to write letters to the Communist publications relating their experience in the schools (page 22). * * * Young children are encouraged to learn the tactics of street fighting so that they can heckle the police and share in the real 'struggle for the streets.' * * * Children are taught Communist games. In playing hide-and-go-seek children hunt for capitalists and bring them in trembling before a Soviet tribunal, or they hunt ammunition belonging to the capitalists, which is either destroyed or captured for use in defense of the Soviet Union. * * * Communists incite children to go to the Communist children's camps, there to be trained in street fighting, red flag saluting, international sport methods, games and songs, codes, signals and symbols. * * * To the tune of 'Onward Christian Soldiers' are sung vicious, obscene words. Other titles include such phrases as 'Hail Revolution,' 'We'll Keep the Red Flag Flying Here.' * * * Other songs are called 'The Red Army,' 'The Red Dawn,' 'Capitalism Is Falling Down,' 'The Red Flag Unites Us,' 'March Song of the Red Army,' 'The Scarlet Banner,' 'We'll Confiscate the Bank Upon the Corner.'" (Pages 23-24.)

Serious as is the effort to corrupt the minds of those in their teens or even of a lesser age, far more serious right now is the extent to which the theories of the Socialist School of Thought are being taught in college classes, because these boys and girls are soon to take command of this nation and those yet younger will be guided much by this immediate next generation. The number of professors and teachers who are openly connected with the Socialist movement has vastly increased in the past ten years, and the number who, while denying any Socialist connection and insisting on appearing under the label "liberal," has grown to a menacing proportion.

In 1924 when Senator LaFollette headed that which was the Socialist ticket under another name, among his main supporters were a large number of college professors. The list is too long to here present. In 1928 Rev. Norman Thomas headed the Socialist ticket as the candidate for president. A newspaper story from his political headquarters issued in October of that year reads as follows:

"A call for an exodus of liberal voters from both Democratic and Republican parties and for the concentration of their support behind Norman Thomas, the Socialist nominee for the presidency, as the first step in creating a new progressive party, has been issued by a committee of 36 educators, headed by Prof. Paul Douglas of the University of Chicago.

"The educators' manifesto was in the form of a letter sent by Prof. Douglas on behalf of the Educators' Committee for Thomas and Maurer. The letter, which was made public at Socialist National Campaign headquarters in New York, was sent to college professors, private and public school teachers and other educators. Only 4 of the 36 educators listed as the executive committee of the Educators' Committee for Thomas and Maurer are members of the Socialist Party, it was said. The committee intends to carry on intensive work for the Thomas-Maurer ticket, and has opened headquarters at 70 Fifth Ave., New York City."

"The letter, signed by Prof. Douglas on behalf of his committee, says that behind Governor Smith and Herbert Hoover 'are the same sterile and corrupt groups which have ruled the country for the last half century.' The Socialist Party, it is declared, has put itself at the head of the liberal forces of the country."

While it is more or less difficult to trace the actual source of Socialism in the schools and colleges, with little trouble one can locate at least one spring that fed it years ago and from this readily locate the many brooks that have added to the flood waters of this now dangerous stream. In the New York City library there is a document entitled "The Theoretical Preparation for Philanthropic Work," being "A paper presented to the New York Association of College Alumnae on May 14, 1887, by Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky," better known today as Mrs. Florence Kelley. From this document and other information concerning the author, it would appear that as an American she went to Germany years ago and became saturated with the theories of Karl Marx. She edited a Socialist publication in Germany and translated the works of Marx and Engels into the English language. You will notice that the title of this lecture does not indicate she is dealing with Socialism, nor does the word Socialism or Socialist appear in the text. Apparently, she is discussing "philanthropic work" and this naturally had then, as it has today, an emotional appeal. The document first lays a foundation to show that all ills and evils of mankind can be traced to our form of government, our institutions and our economic system. The

address winds up with an appeal to discard the economic system of the past and adopt the Marx formula. The following extracts from that document will be of interest in this connection:

“Our colleges being institutions owned by the ruling class (even when founded with public money) for the training of the rising generation thereof, and manned by its carefully selected employes, the economic and sociological teaching done in them is such as the employers require, of which samples may be found in the publications of Professors Sumner, Perry, Atkinson, Thomson and others. Lest this seem too sweeping, I ask: ‘Where are the teachers, men or women, who have placed themselves outspokenly on the side of the oppressed class?’, * * * since our professors of political economy do, as a rule, but present the now threadbare propositions of the few original minds who did work of their own in the last century and the earlier decades than the present one; or serve as mere apologists for the social system, the laws of whose development few of them attempt to investigate.

“* * * I wish to make clear the especial need which we college-bred women have of theoretical preparation before we can clearly appreciate the true nature of that bourgeois philanthropy which is an essential evil of our society. Born and bred among class prejudices and traditions, our college course of economic study usually affords us either no light on the subject or actual darkness, the teaching that should be in the direction of unprejudiced investigation being only too frequently dogmatic apology for the social system as it is today.

“Within a very short time there has, it is true, been some progress made in the direction of critical investigation, and the appearance of the journals founded by Harvard and Columbia for this purpose is a symptom to be greeted with warm welcome.

“* * * This other side is the theory of the development of society, the theory which is to political economy what the Darwinian theory is to the natural sciences. It is the working class which naturally espouses the theory of the development of society, and looks to the future for improvement just as the class now in possession of all that makes life pleasant naturally accepts the apology for society as it is, and reverses our threadbare orthodox political economy for its services in that direction.

“As to the book-work to be done by way of theoretical preparation for efficient work for the elevation of the race, we Americans have had slender opportunity of becoming acquainted with the literature of modern scientific political economy, because its fundamental works have hitherto been locked up in a foreign language. We have, indeed, been at a double disadvantage in this respect, for not only were the works themselves not accessible, but the reports upon their contents were, in too many cases, made either by men who had a direct interest in misrepresenting them, or by persons insuf-

ficiently qualified for the task, whose résumés and popularizations, though doubtless honorably meant, have nevertheless been misleading. Now, however, the works themselves are accessible to all who are willing to do the preliminary elementary reading requisite for understanding them."

From that day, it would appear, teachers and professors began to show a deeper interest in the theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought. Text-books, while not openly advocating the adoption of the Socialist doctrine in the United States but presenting it as a theory worthy of very careful consideration on the part of the youth, began to appear. Mrs. Kelley, in her lecture, recommended the reading of certain books. Among them were the works of Karl Marx, and "Woman in the Past, Present and Future" by August Bebel. This book, which is an attack upon the family and from which citations were given in the preceding lecture, in order to meet the demand was later printed in the United States under the name "Woman and Socialism." Other books along the same line found their way into the college reference libraries until today the shelves of such libraries in many instances have nearly crowded out books sustaining our form of government, our institutions and our economic system.

Among the text-books used (1929) in Columbia University is one called, "An Outline of Economic Geography." This book is not even printed in the United States, but in London. Furthermore, and of deeper interest is the fact that it was not prepared or published to be used in any of the regular British schools. On the contrary, it was prepared and issued by the Plebs League, a Socialist organization, and was designed for use in what are called "Workers' Colleges," that is, schools wherein the students are taught the economic and political theories of Marx. The book frankly states on the fly-leaf that it is "for the use of the classes conducted under the auspices of the National Council of Labor Colleges."

Denouncing capitalism and that which the Socialists refer to as "imperialism"—and imperialism as they use the term means trade expansion—and establishing the premise that the "workers" are entitled to everything, the books reads (page 127) :

"The enemy is Capitalist-Imperialism. And the struggle against Capitalist-Imperialism must be world-wide to be effective. It follows that the international organization of the workers must be based on as full and accurate knowledge as possible of world affairs and world problems. No section of the workers today can undertake an offensive against the common enemy without the reactions of that local struggle being felt to a greater or lesser extent along the whole battle line. And the better those reactions are understood, and the more accurately they can be forecasted, the bigger the chances of working-class victory. That necessitates a World General Staff

for the workers' movement. It also involves clear thinking by the rank and file about the issues at stake."

The last paragraph in this Columbia textbook reads (page 127): "Let us learn from our enemies; and by careful study of the world problems which Capitalist-Imperialism is raising, and failing to solve, equip ourselves for the task of translating 'The World for the Workers' from a war-cry into a reality."

From the date of Mrs. Kelley's address down to the opening of the World War, the trend toward Socialism in the schools and colleges was marked. With the coming of the War the attention of our people was focussed on other matters. After we were forced to enter the fray, while the minds of the great mass of the people were centered on winning, since the very life of the Nation was at stake, the leaders of the Socialist School of Thought, in addition to throwing every obstacle possible in our way, were not idle.

Their minds were focussed on something quite different. They were preparing for an intensified campaign along the line of education when the war was over. They appreciated the fact that with the coming of peace the mental strain under which the people had lived for a couple of years would result in a "throw-back" in our methods of thinking, and that we, as a Nation, would be giving our whole attention to considering ways and means to return to normal. At the same time they were greatly encouraged by what had happened in Russia. A monarchy had been destroyed and a Socialist government installed. With loud acclaim, they pledged their continued loyalty to that new government and intensified their efforts to establish the same form of government in the United States.

We know what has happened. The United States has prospered as never before. The leaders of the day, the present generation—those who were children and youths thirty years ago—turned their attention to business lines and have been so active that they have given no thought to what the next generation might or would be. Only those deeply interested in inoculating that generation with the virus of Socialism have given this matter consideration. "While the cat's away, the mice will play," and while the fathers and mothers of the present generation have been engaging their time and thought to making and spending money, their children have been, and are being, to an alarming extent, won to the Socialist theory. I shall not mention names but you possibly have noticed that recently the son of one well known millionaire has openly allied himself with the Socialist movement. The daughter of a prominent judicial official of the United States government is the head of a "liberal" club in a girls' school. These instances are merely illustrative of the trend.

In this connection the following from a leaflet issued by the Massachusetts Public Interests League in May, 1926, should be of value:

"The radical propoganda now being carried on in many women's colleges is of so demoralizing a character that it is highly important that parents and the public should know something about the degree to which it is encouraged in the different colleges. * * *

"American parents, good-natured and long suffering as they are, are beginning to be restive under present conditions. To send a wholesome American girl to college at great expense, and to have her returned at the end of her course a 'pink' or a 'red,' convinced that patriotism is 'silly,' that to support the Constitution of the United States is to be 'reactionary,' that the entire experience of the human race should be scrapped, and that the radical Youth movement, 'made in Germany' and strenuously seeking a foothold in our colleges, is the last word in 'progress,' is somewhat hard on the girl's parents, not to mention the fact that she becomes in consequence an undesirable type of citizen.

"Should not the public, which supports the colleges, demand that if all types of native radicals as well as wandering radicals of questionable character and antecedents from Europe are encouraged to air their theories before the girls in our colleges, some attempt should be made by the college authorities to see that the answering arguments are heard?

"This would be no curtailment of the right of 'free speech,' that right so frantically demanded by those who are doing their utmost by means of free speech to bring about in the United States the conditions now obtaining in Russia, where free speech has been thoroughly exterminated."

During the past ten years the educational program planned by Morris Hillquit and presented to the Socialist convention in 1910 has gained alarming proportions, in fact, dangerous proportions. Strangely enough, it is not the children of the "workers" who are being the most successfully inoculated, save in the case of certain foreigners. It is the children of the more wealthy. Not that they understand what Socialism means, or what would happen to them as individuals should it be put into operation in the United States, but that they are being guided by emotions rather than by sound reasoning. They want to be considered "liberal," "advanced," and look upon the theories of their fathers and mothers as antiquated. And the fathers and mothers instead of taking their children in hand—for the advice of the parent naturally is accepted before the advice of anyone outside the family—have been altogether too busy chasing the dollar and, after capturing it, too busy spending it. Because of this the college boy and girl of today, thinking that to be "liberal" or "advanced" they must depart from the formulas of their parents, have turned to Socialism. They have luxuries beyond the dream of their grandparents, but they do not stop to

reason that everything they have and enjoy is theirs because, when their grandparents lived and on down during the lives of their parents, we, as a people, operated and still are operating under a certain form of government, with certain institutions and with an economic system which gave to these grandparents, to these parents and to themselves, the private property right. In his excellent book, "Bat-tling the Criminal," Richard Washburn Child devotes considerable space to the question of lack of home influence in the guidance of the youth. He quotes a detective in a Southern city with saying (page 69):

"The real truth as to why these boys and girls get in here is that the home has stopped work. The bedrooms of some homes are used, but the sitting room and library, and sometimes the dining room, too, wouldn't be missed. When I was a boy the motto used to be 'God Bless Our Home!' now it's 'Let's Go!' And when they go, the parents go one way and the youngsters another. Today, in a lot of families, they are lucky if they meet at breakfast. The old companionship of the home and the evening lamp and having the young neighbors in has dwindled away.

"* * * It is principally the good home and the parent willing to put his effort and time into the future of the children which are the bulwark against all the other influences which are named as elements making for youth lawlessness," writes Mr. Child (page 74). "It is the home which supports education and religion; it is the home which wards off gambling, liquor, drugs, bad company, movies of the wrong type, immodesty, extravagant spending on pleasure, false pride and disrespect for law. All these elements named by judges, prosecuting attorneys and police as leading to wilfulness, a degenerating attitude toward obligations and finally to law-breaking and crime, can only be beaten by the American home."

I know what is uppermost in the minds of the majority of you. The question is, "What can be done about it?" That is a difficult question to answer and I do not feel that I am qualified to offer the proper solution. This much is certain, however. If every father and mother in the land would but give five minutes a day to considering where their children are going to school or college, what they are being taught; and give the same length of time each day to pointing out to them that they are enjoying certain advantages because of our form of government, our institutions and our economic system; and what would happen to them when they become men and women should we accept the Socialist theory and operate here as they are in Russia today, the number now turning to Socialism would materially decrease.

(Issued by the Educational Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, 120 West 42nd Street, New York City.)

LECTURE No. 12

ORIGIN OF THE PACIFIST MOVEMENT

During the past few years many books and pamphlets have been printed, many speeches made, many pages of the papers and magazines have been devoted to a discussion of a most important national policy—military preparedness. Those who favor a proper defense, one in keeping with the size and requirements of the United States, are unquestionably in the great majority. Their antagonists, commonly called pacifists, however, are far more noisy. Paradoxical as it may seem, these pacifists are the most militant fighters being ready to shed their blood, if need be, to maintain peace.

Now, as a matter of fact, all true American citizens, no matter which side of this question they have taken, are seeking exactly the same ends—the abolition of war. I think we can agree upon that. There are very few, if any, American citizens, who want to see us involved in an armed conflict. The division of the people into two Schools of Thought upon the matter of preparedness, is due to a difference in methods to attain the end sought by both. Trained individuals, those who have given years of study to the subject, those who because of experience are qualified to speak with authority, hold to the theory that if we are to continue as a nation, and if posterity is to enjoy the security and protection this nation has so far afforded its citizens, we must maintain a proper and efficient armed force on sea, on land, and in the air.

In another group are those commonly called pacifists. They are largely emotional-minded. Due to lack of training, experience, etc., they have little conception of the actual functions of a defensive force, assuming that those who are officially connected with such forces are anxious to induce a war. Those in this group hold to the theory that when we show faith in treaty pronouncements by scrapping our army, our navy and our air forces, other nations will follow suit and peace will reign in the future.

Well meaning but rather emotional—or publicity seeking—women have held several conferences to discover the cause of and the cure for war. So far as we are able to ascertain from reading the reports of these conferences, they neither discovered the germ nor sought to apply a proper remedy. That they failed to uncover the cause is not at all surprising. The majority of those called in to advise would hardly be considered qualified experts. If a group of physicians were seeking to discover the germ of a new disease, it is hardly likely they would invite for consultation a half dozen blacksmiths, a few cowboys, a couple of coal miners and the bereaved family of some person carried away by the disease.

In none of the books and pamphlets printed, addresses made, mass of newspaper and magazine material presented, nor yet in any of the conferences of those who call themselves pacifists, has there been even an approach to the germ of a future war. Whenever the

true germ is mentioned, the person so bold is attacked by all who disapprove of any form of military defense for this nation.

The germ of war—any war in the immediate future involving the U. S.—will be found in the proposals, policies and objectives of the Socialist School of Thought. Those following that School—I am referring to the adepts, not the army of idealists who have no conception as to what Socialism is—hold to the theory that every war between so-called Capitalist nations in the future can be used as an instrument to advance Socialism. In other words, they hold to the theory that through their propaganda they have already done much to destroy the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism, weaken the church, the family and other institutions built up on the private property right. In case of a war—and they are not seeking to avoid one if they can but place the nations where they are without defensive forces—they propose to intensify their propaganda and turn every such conflict into a civil war. This was the system employed to gain control of Russia.

It will be recalled that during the disarmament conference discussion at Geneva in 1928, the Socialist government of Russia sent Maxim Litvinoff to head its delegation. He presented a plan that by its very nature was unsatisfactory to all nations and yet one that was used in extensive propaganda to show the world that the Soviet was anxious for full disarmament. Lord Cushendun of Great Britain asked some pertinent questions regarding Russia's determination to push revolutions in all capitalist countries. Leland Stowe, special correspondent for the New York Herald-Tribune, in his article touching this subject, as printed in that paper, March 23, 1928, quoted Litvinoff as saying:

"It has never occurred to us, and we had no grounds for believing, that the League (of Nations) intended to include, under the question of disarmament and security, the prevention of *civil war and the class struggle*. I may say without the slightest hesitation that the Soviet government would never have agreed to participate with the British or any other government here represented in working out questions regarding the *class war or struggles against revolution*. It would be naive to expect such work from a government which owes its existence to one of the greatest revolutions in history." (Emphasis supplied.)

So much has been written and is available on both sides of the preparedness controversy that we will not go into details as to what military defenses we have, the need for them, cost, etc. You can easily secure literature along these lines and after reading it draw your own conclusions. In our particular study that what interests us is this:

Is there a relationship between the present wave of pacifism and the aims, purposes and activities of the Socialist School of Thought? Will research locate the germ of future wars in the preachments, policies and activities of the Socialist School of Thought?

In pursuing this study, let us keep these things in mind: *First*: The aims and objectives of the Socialist School of Thought are to

destroy our form of government, our institutions, including the church and the home, and abolish our economic system which presents the private property right principle.

Second: Those following this School divide into two factions on the question of means to attain the common end.

Third: The Socialists, or Right wing, follow what they term a system of "legislative (or parliamentary) action."

Fourth: The Communists, or Left wing, follow what they term a system of mass (or direct) action which means the employment of "force and violence."

Fifth: Both factions harmonize their activities when assaulting the common enemy, however.

The Socialist wing through its "legislative action" system is engaged in undermining our form of government. Anything that will weaken our defences is regarded as of major importance. In this connection, and to keep well in mind the purpose of reformistic legislation, turn to Lecture No. 7 and note the citations there presented. The Communist wing is engaged in teaching young men and women the art of violence, using every strike, every "protest meeting," every effort of the police to keep them within the bounds of the law, as a "lesson in revolution." (Note again citations in Lectures No. 7 and 8.)

Both wings, or factions, have always held to the theory that two of the strong pillars of the private property right are religion and the family. Because of this they have, as we have pointed out in preceding lectures, waged a continuous and relentless war against both church and family. To just what extent they have, so far, weakened these institutions remains to be seen. An emergency will demonstrate.

But there is another pillar of the private property right—the military defensive forces of the nation. Clearly, so long as these agencies of organized government are sufficient and efficient, there is little chance for Socialism to gain control in this nation. For many years, however, efforts to weaken this arm of the government have been waged, all schemes to that end originating in Socialist headquarters just as all reformistic legislation originates there. If our army, navy and air forces could be reduced to a mere skeleton and the efforts of the Socialists to destroy the sentiments of national loyalty and patriotism in the minds of the youths, should be as great as many of them believe today, then clearly should we be plunged into any kind of conflict with another nation, the chances of success would be small indeed. Failure would mean Socialism.

Back of every organized movement there is a motive. We are told—and a large number believe it—that the motive back of the present so-called pacifist movement is to prevent future wars and save, for constructive purposes, the enormous cost of a war. But who started the movement to disarm this nation? Was it those who have suffered the most through army or navy service or through the loss of brother, father, husband or son in the last war? Hardly; the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, their Auxillaries, the American War Mothers, and all similar organizations, the mem-

bers of which know through experience what war is, did not present the idea that wars could be abolished by the abolition of armaments and defensive agencies. On the contrary, they are bitterly opposed to a policy of non-preparedness.

Was the idea advanced by those who because of their wealth and property would be called upon to pay the greater financial burdens of a war? No; such persons are loud in their denunciation of any scheme that would weaken or injure our defensive forces. Practically every large business organization in the United States stands for a proper defense policy.

Was it the wage-earners who are always called upon to make sacrifices during a war? It was not. The American Federation of Labor stands for a policy of efficient and sufficient preparedness.

While we have not cited evidence in connection with the position of the Legion and similar organizations nor the men who must pay the expenses of war if one comes, since their positions are so well known, we must present some evidence as to the position of the American Federation of Labor because the Socialists are constantly confusing the people by using the word "labor" when they should use the word "Socialist."

At the convention of the American Federation of Labor in 1915 the matter of national defense and preparedness was injected into the gathering by Adolph Germer, then National Secretary of the Socialist Party and who officially spoke for that organization. He presented a resolution of protest "against the introduction in our public schools of military propaganda" and "to call upon the workers to desist from affiliating with any branch of the military forces." In his argument, Germer among other things said: "And I declare absolutely to refuse to go to a foreign nation to shoot other workers or to be shot by them."

The resolution failed of passage by the convention. Mr. Samuel Gompers, then President of the A. F. of L., said:

"A people unwilling to defend the institutions of self government are not worthy of a republic."

Then, if not these, the men who have been through war and know its horrors, the men who must pay the expense and the men who must suffer at home in case of a war, who originated the idea that wars could and would be abolished by the abolition of defensive forces?

The present world pacifist movement was inaugurated by the International Socialists not to accomplish what the most ardent pacifist actually believes, but to further the class war and so the final revolution in all countries save Russia where the final revolution has already taken place and where Socialism has been established.

The idea was first presented in an international Socialist congress held in Paris in 1889. That was the natural and logical place for it to originate. The Socialist School of Thought is international and violently anti-national. It does not recognize nations as such. Its members, in every land, are asked to pledge their first allegiance to the Socialist International, and not to their respective govern-

ments. The slogan of Socialism as presented by Marx in "The Communist Manifesto" is "Workers of all countries unite!" The Lenin phraseology is "Workers of the World Unite!" If the workers of the world—that is the Socialists of the world—ever unite, then, of necessity, national boundaries must disappear. What is more logical than the abolition of defensive forces to secure the destruction of national boundaries?

The whole theory of the Socialist School of Thought is antagonistic to nationalism. The proposal of Socialism is to establish its doctrines as a world policy. By this process, followers of that school hold that national boundaries can be destroyed, and the people of the world live under one government—so far as there is a government—in peace and security. The constitutions of both Socialist and Communist parties in the United States declare they are parts of international movements and are in no sense nationalistic. (See citations, Lecture No. Three.) Citations from the "war program" of the Socialist Party of the United States which will be given later in this lecture, indicate clearly the anti-nationalistic attitude of the Right wing of the Socialist School of Thought. "The A B C of Communism" (page 198) says:

"One of the forms of the oppression of man by man is the oppression of subject nationalities. Among the barriers by which human beings are separated, we have, in addition to the barriers of class, those of national disunity, of national enmity and hatred."

On pages 201 and 202 of the same document is this: "* * * it does not suffice that the Communists should declare war on the oppression of nationalities and upon national prejudices, that they should advocate international unity in the struggle against capitalism, and that they should desire to found a world-wide economic alliance of the victorious proletariat. We must seek a far quicker way towards the overthrow of all jingoism and national egoism, of national stupidity and pride, of mutual mistrust among the workers of the various nations. This legacy from a brutal period of human life and from the brutal nationalist quarrel of the feudal and capitalist epochs, still hangs like a heavy burden round the neck of the world proletariat."

The Second International, which emerged from the ruins of the First, founded by Marx—or rather claimed by Marx—convened in Paris in 1889. "Militarism was one of the most important subjects on the agenda at the opening Congress," writes Prof. Harry W. Laidler ("Socialism in Thought and Action," page 249). "*Demands were here made that standing armies be abolished, that international arbitration tribunals be formed, and that the people have a voice in the question of peace and war. These demands were reaffirmed at Brussels in 1891, at London in 1896, and at Paris in 1900.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

Referring to the 1900 international Socialist convention mentioned by Prof. Laidler above, we get the exact wording of this reaffirming resolution. He quotes it, in part (ibid, page 250), as follows:

"That it is necessary for the labor party in each country to oppose

militarism and colonial expansion with redoubled effort and increasing energy. * * * "The Congress suggests three practical courses for carrying this out.

"1. *The Socialist parties everywhere shall educate the rising generations to oppose militarism tooth and nail.*

"2. *Socialist members of parliament shall always vote against any expenditure for the army, the navy, or colonial expeditions.*

"3. The standing *International Socialist Committee* shall be instructed to *organize uniform movements to protest against militarism in all countries* at one and the same time, whenever there shall be occasion to do so." (Emphasis above supplied.)

Now take that official Socialist declaration and analyze it. The terms "militarism" and "colonial expeditions" have, to a large extent, been modernized into "armaments" or "national defence," and "imperialism." The Socialist parties everywhere "*shall educate the rising generations to oppose*" all forms of national defence. In passing, permit me to call your attention to this expression so that you may relate it to a similar expression which I will later cite in connection with Socialist activities in the United States. The origin of the present bitter fight against military training in the schools and colleges will be found in the above wording. Further, the International Socialist Committee is instructed "*to organize uniform movements to protest against*" all forms of national defence and in all countries. The language is plain enough.

Pacifism is "*a uniform movement against national defence,*" is it not? Pacifism is engaged in extensive propaganda in the schools and colleges to induce the rising generation "*to oppose national defence tooth and nail,*" does it not? Pacifism, then, is carrying out in toto the proposals of the Socialist international congress of 1900, is it not? This *uniform movement* against national defence became known as pacifism within comparatively recent years. The resolution presenting the theory was adopted 30 years ago. If pacifism denies its Socialist parentage then it is a case of son denying father. In the vanguard of the pacifist movement are many well meaning and sincere individuals who little understand the origin of the "protest" to which they are giving both time and money. Nor do they know that back of it all there is not a sincere desire to end war for all times but, on the contrary, a desire to produce a situation in this country that will make civil war or revolution a successful venture. Certainly they do not grasp the fact that should they be successful in attaining the ends sought by these "protest movements" they would themselves be deprived of their property right.

"The position so defined in 1900 (the Socialist convention) was reaffirmed at the Seventh Congress held at Stuttgart in 1907, where it formed the chief item on the program," writes Prof. Arthur Shadwell ("The Socialist Movement," Vol. 1, page 146). He quotes in part the Stuttgart resolution of 1907, as follows:

"Wars are therefore the very marrow of capitalism and will cease with the suppression of the capitalist system or else when the magnitude of the sacrifice in men and money demanded by the development of military technique and revulsion against armaments

shall force the people to abandon that system. * * * For these reasons the Congress deems it the duty of all workers and their parliamentary representatives to oppose naval and military armaments with all their might—thereby emphasizing the class character of bourgeois society and the motives which impel it to maintain national antagonisms—and to refuse all financial support to that policy. * * *

“In case war breaks out, nevertheless, it is their duty to intervene to bring it promptly to an end and to utilize with all their might the economic and political crisis created by the war in order to stir up the lowest sections of the population (*agiter les couches populaires les plus profondes*) and precipitate the overthrow of the capitalist regime.” (Emphasis in original.)

Prof. Shadwell says that he emphasizes the last sentence because it has an “instructive bearing on post-war events; advantage was to be taken of war to foment a revolutionary agitation amongst the lowest classes of the community.” Later we present citations from Socialist sources showing that at all times it is the proposal of the Socialist School of Thought to oppose the arming of so-called capitalist nations, yet approving arming those who have accepted the Socialist theories in order later to carry on a successful revolution in such countries.

A French resolution brought before the Stuttgart conference in 1907, maintained that militarism (*national defence*) was “to be viewed exclusively at the arming of the State in order to keep the working class in political and economic subjugation to the capitalist class.” The resolution further provided that it was the province of the International Socialist Bureau to take a part in preventing war “by national and international Socialist action of the working class by all means, from parliamentary intervention to public agitation and the general strike and insurrection.” (Emphasis supplied.)

You may say these resolutions were adopted many years ago, and that the pacifist movement was unknown in the United States until after the World War. True they are old; that is the reason we are calling them to your attention. Many may say that the pacifist movement is not the genetic descendant of these resolutions but came wholly as an aftermath of the War. That is not correct. The pacifist movement, but almost wholly within the official circles of the Socialist party, was carried on long before the World War—but it was not generally known as pacifism. The plan to jockey us into a position of unpreparedness was well under way before 1914 and was pushed with great vigor until we entered the conflict.

Before coming down to the movement in the United States with a view of continuing the genealogy, let us refer to a succession of conferences, commonly referred to as the Zimmerwald Conference, the first at Zimmerwald, Switzerland, in September, 1915; the second at Kienthal, Switzerland, in April, 1916; and the third at Stockholm, Sweden, in September, 1917. These are often referred to as the Zimmerwald, the Kienthal and the Stockholm conferences. All were engaged in carrying forward the program of earlier Congresses

to “organize uniform movements of protest” against all forms of national defence in the various so-called capitalist countries. All these conferences were attended by a large number of the revolutionary groups of Russia. Prof. Arthur Shadwell (“The Socialist Movement,” Vol. II, page 15) referring to the conference at Zimmerwald, writes:

“All the Russian revolutionary groups were represented at it, and particularly the Jewish Bund, which was later to furnish so many prominent members of the Bolshevik Government. A manifesto drafted by Trotsky was issued. * * * Among those who signed it were Lenin and other Russians.”

In the Manifesto mentioned appears this language, the language of Leon Trotsky, according to Prof. Shadwell (see complete Manifesto, Lusk Report, Vol. II, page 1764): “For decades the Socialist proletariat had led the fight against Militarism”—that is, all forms of national defence. “* * * This struggle is the struggle for * * * Socialism. * * * The time has now come for you to stand forth for your own cause, for the sacred cause of Socialism.”

“Trotsky, who had been entrusted with propaganda in France,” writes Prof. Shadwell (citation above), “was very active until he was expelled by the French Government, and went to America by the way of Spain early in 1917.”

It is interesting to note, in passing, that one of the dominant figures at this Socialist International Congress was Lenin. It was at this meeting that he and the thirty-nine other delegates perfected the plans which finally resulted in the overthrow of the government of Russia and the establishment, in that country, of a true Socialist state. Just 40 men! They came from Roumania, Bulgaria, Germany, France, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Poland, Holland and Russia. The Socialist party of Great Britain was not represented because the government refused passports to the delegates. The Socialists of the United States later approved of the action taken by this conference.

Now with the original manifestos which directed the Socialists the world over to inaugurate a great pacifist movement—not for the purpose of forever ending war but in order that so-called capitalist nations might be destroyed and Socialist governments installed—let us turn to the United States and briefly trace what was done here to that end. In 1904 an Indiana delegate presented a resolution to the National Socialist convention demanding propaganda be used to win men in the army and the militia to Socialism with the view of “making the rank and file of the army and militia disloyal to their brutal masters and loyal to their class in the battle for future civilization.” (Proceedings Socialist Convention, 1904, page 277.) The resolution was not adopted. A similar resolution was brought up in the 1908 and 1910 conventions. In 1912 it was again presented to the National Socialist convention and after some discussion was adopted.

We now come down to 1915 when, in May of that year, the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party approved the following resolution which was later ratified by a referendum of

the members of the party. Under the heading of "Disarmament" (American Labor Year Book, 1916, page 126), appears the following:

"Universal disarmament as speedily as possible. Pending complete disarmament:

"(a) Abolition of the manufacture of arms and munitions of war for private profit and prohibition of exportation of arms, war equipment, and supplies from one country to another; (b) No increase in existing armaments under any circumstances; (c) No appropriations for military or naval purposes."

In the Manifesto of the Socialist party of September, 1915, under the heading "Preparedness," appears this (ibid, same page):

"No increase in existing armaments under any circumstances. No appropriations for military or naval purposes."

These declarations harmonize, you will note, with the direction of the International Socialist congress to "*organize uniform movements of protest*" against national defence. The Socialists were holding their convention at St. Louis when the Congress voted to enter the war. True to their position not to aid this country in any conflict, and true to the dictatorial directions of their International, they adopted what they termed a "war program" as follows (American Labor Year Book, Vol. II, pp. 50-1-2-3).

"The Socialist party of the United States in the present grave crisis, solemnly reaffirms its allegiance to the principle of internationalism and working-class solidarity the world over, and proclaims its unalterable opposition to the war just declared by the Government of the United States. * * *

"We, therefore, call upon the workers of all countries to refuse support to their governments in their wars. * * * *The only struggle which would justify the workers in taking up arms is the great struggle of the working class of the world to free itself from economic exploitation and political oppression, and we particularly warn the workers against the snare and delusion of so-called defensive warfare. As against the false doctrine of national patriotism we uphold the ideal of international working-class solidarity.* * * *

"We brand the declaration of war by our government as a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world. * * * The acute situation created by war calls for an even more vigorous prosecution of the class struggle, and we recommend to the workers and pledge ourselves to the following course of action:

"1. *Continuous, active, and public opposition to the war through demonstrations, mass petitions, and all other means within our power.*

"2. *Unyielding opposition to all proposed legislation for military or industrial conscription. Should such conscription be forced upon the people, we pledge ourselves to continuous efforts for the repeal of such laws and to the support of all mass movements in opposition to conscription.* * * *

"4. *Consistent propaganda against militaristic training and militaristic teaching in the public schools.*

"5. Extension of the campaign of education among the workers to organize them into strong, class-conscious, and closely unified political and industrial organizations, to enable them by concerted and harmonious mass action to shorten this war and to establish lasting peace." (Emphasis supplied.)

I will not stop to comment. The language is plain. You have seen activities under Socialist guidance that prove they have not been asleep. And you will note the language employed at that time—a time when the fate of the nation was in the balance—more or less generally used now by the army of pacifists who are not openly allied with the Socialist movement. Further, you do not find in the above statement any direct expression against wars in general. "*The only struggle which would justify the workers in taking up arms is the great struggle of the working class of the world to free itself * * **" the Socialists declare. In other words, if we understand the language correctly, the Socialist party of the United States is not opposed to a civil war. And a nation without proper defenses would be a shining mark for those who would bring about just such a conflict.

Following the activities of the Socialist party of this country in strict keeping with the earlier resolutions of their International, we come to the National Socialist convention held at Chicago in 1919, called the Emergency convention because of the inside row between the Communists and Socialists, all then appearing under the name of Socialists. A resolution was adopted protesting against agitation for universal military training because "*one of the chief purposes of any army is to maintain the power of the capitalist state and supply it with a mighty weapon against a labor revolt.*" The word "labor" does not mean organized labor as we know it under the name of the American Federation of Labor, but Socialists. The Communist term for a "labor revolt" is revolution.

The resolution further declared "*that the war against militarism must proceed hand in hand with the general class war. * * * Wars are one of the chief supports of the capitalist class supremacy, and therefore of the economic and political oppression of the proletariat. * * * War is opposed to their (the Socialists') highest aim—the creation of an economic order on a Socialist basis, which will express the solidarity of all nations.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

Now keeping clearly in mind the declaration of the Socialist International "*to organize uniform movements of protest against 'armament' and 'national defense'*"—I have translated their wording for a clearer and better understanding—"in all countries at one and the same time." And keeping also in mind the official utterances of the Socialist party in its so-called "war program," of "*continuous, active and public opposition to the war through demonstrations, mass petitions, and all other means within our powers,*" let us turn to another phase of the efforts that has been productive of the present pacifist movement. If I may be permitted to use a bit of slang, Dr. Eduard David, a Socialist member of the German Reichstag "spilled the beans" when discussing a "good peace" for Germany, he is quoted by the New York Times, June 16, 1917 (Lusk

Report, Vol. I, page 971) as saying:

"Our tactics would be to *promote peace currents* in enemy countries. (Emphasis supplied.)

But even before this plan was publicly known, that system of "peace" movements, in harmony with the earlier Socialist manifestos "*to organize uniform movements of protest against*" all forms of national defense, was well under way in the United States. It will possibly be recalled by some of you, familiar with the events, that hardly had Germany marched into Belgium before there appeared in the United States alien Socialists, to start these "peace currents." They immediately made proper connections with American Socialists. Loudly shouting "peace," they gained the attention and the support of a large number of well meaning and sincere American citizens. None of these, and but very few others, knew that this movement was a part of a cleverly designed plan that, if successful, would wreck the United States, just as activities along the same line a little later wrecked Russia. A succession of "peace" movements followed.

I think we can safely say—and the evidence to sustain the position is overwhelming—that the beginning of the present organized pacifist movement in the United States began shortly after these alien Socialists reached our shores. Previous to their arrival, however, the Socialist party, through such instruments as it could command, had been paving the way. Today those still living, who sat in the 1900 International Socialist convention, can look with supreme satisfaction on the result of their proposal "*to organize uniform protests against*" national defense in all countries. Thirty years is a very short time to advance an idea to a reality—at least such an idea as there advanced. That it has attained its present strength is due to the fact that its germ is a deep emotional appeal, one that deals with "concern for humanity" and causes people to be "indifferent to all other relations." Security, prosperity, and in fact, peace itself, are forgotten in the fond hope that through a policy of disarmament war will become a thing of the past.

Let us turn again to the international phase of this question. In April, 1922, the International Federation of Trade Unions, the principal "labor" subsidiary of the Right wing International held a congress at Rome. Among the resolutions adopted was one declaring "*that the fight against militarism (national defense) and war and for world peace, based upon the fraternization of the peoples, is one of the principal tasks of the trade union movement which adopts the program of the overthrow of the capitalist system.*" (American Labor Year Book, Vol. V, page 247.)

This congress, made up of Socialist delegates, issued a call for a World Peace Conference, to be held at the Hague in December of that year (1922). The American Labor Year Book (Vol. V, page 251), issued by the Rand School of Social Science (Socialist), gives the following report of this peace congress:

"A resolution on the task of the labor movement"—that is, you understand, the Socialist movement—"in the war against war called specifically for the *general strike* and the economic boycott, and

proper preparations for their uses." Note in this connection that these instruments are those commonly advocated by the Communist wing of the movement. The report continues, "It was decided to form a joint body to coordinate the efforts of all peace societies. The *pacifist organizations were urged to unite their forces, remain independent of any governmental connection and establish close relations with the International Federation of Trade Unions.*" This, you will recall, (see page 2, Lecture 6) is a subsidiary of the Socialist International. Still continuing the quotation, "*A resolution on education detailed the forms of influencing the young man against war, and urging the definite organization of women into political, trade union and cooperatives. The Russian delegation consisted of Radek, Losovsky and Rothstein.*" (Emphasis above supplied.)

That's very clear language. The fact that three well known Communists sat in this convention, taken in connection with the fact that the oft-declared purpose of that Socialist government of Russia is to bring about revolutions in all so-called capitalist countries, should be sufficient to cause any sound, reasoning person to assume that the "organized movement of protest" against national defense, called pacifism, instead of being an honest effort in the hands of sincere persons, is wholly a part of the Socialist scheme to destroy all so-called capitalist countries. The congress that called the "peace conference" by resolution agreed that this program should be adopted in order to "overthrow all capitalist governments."

To ascertain what would happen when any Socialist proposal is placed in practice, we must, of necessity, turn to the one and only government on the face of the globe where Socialism reigns supreme—Russia. What is the position of Russia on this matter of the disarmament of other nations?

As we have several times pointed out, one gains a great deal from studying Communist documents because those in control of Russia, elated by their success—and made inhuman by their brutal excesses—are frank enough to speak their minds.

Senator George P. McLean of Connecticut, in an address in the Senate, Saturday, January 5th, 1929, dealing with the ratification of the Kellogg treaty, made some exceptionally pertinent remarks. Pointing out that the treaty was merely a system of "throwing peace paper wads at the dogs of war" and could not, and would not, affect human traits, he insisted that one of the best ways to produce world peace was to seek the cause of world unrest and deal with that in a more effective manner—and the cause of the world unrest is not to be found in the United States.

"In Russia," said the Senator touching on that phase of the question, "we find white autocrats supplanted by the red autocrats determined upon a world revolution that will destroy the individual and economic liberty and substitute a political and social regime of universal poverty for the common good."

The theory of the Socialists now in command of Russia is that, in order to produce world Socialism they must first weaken, if not totally destroy, the defensive agencies of all so-called capitalist na-

tions. While devoting much of their energy and far too great a part of their income to military training at home, they encourage pacifist movements that are urging the weakening of the defenses or the abolition of the armaments of other nations. And while so engaged in these other countries they are at the same time working to arouse a militant anti-capitalist sentiment in the minds of the growing generation.

Their tactics provide that, when the defenses of the so-called Capitalist nations have been sufficiently weakened, they are to maneuver a war between such nations, which war is to be utilized for the advancement of universal Socialism. In other words, it is their plan to engender civil wars or revolutions in all so-called Capitalist nations. A war between two nations is bad enough, horrible enough, but bad as it is, horrible as it is, what say you of a civil war, a war where father is against son, brother against sister, husband against wife? A thousand times more horrible, and I am sure even our well meaning pacifists would prefer to have the United States engage in a war with some foreign country, than see a civil armed conflict in this land.

The following citations from "The A B C of Communism" to which reference has several times been made, will give you a fair understanding what is in the minds of those now in control of Socialist Russia and who are determined to extend that control to the United States. Further, from these citations you will understand the determined and well carried out plan to weaken all so-called capitalist nations through the destruction of their defensive arm.

"* * * capitalist society is not one society but two societies; it consists of capitalists, on the one hand, and of the workers and poor peasants, on the other. Between these two classes there is continuous and irreconcilable enmity; this is what we speak of as the *class war*." (Page 45.)

"Civil war is an extremely intensified class war, and it occurs when the class war has led to revolution. The imperialist world war between the two groups of bourgeois States, the war waged for the repartition of the world, was carried on by the slaves of capital. It imposed such heavy burdens upon the workers that the class war was transformed into a civil war fought by the oppressed against their oppressors, the war which Marx had declared to be the only just war." (Page 128.)

"The civil war is not the result of any party's caprice; its coming has been no chance matter. The civil war is a manifestation of the revolution, and the revolution was absolutely inevitable because the robber war of the imperialists had opened the eyes of the broad masses of the workers." (Page 129.)

"To think that the revolution can take place without civil war is equivalent to thinking that there can be a 'peaceful' revolution." (Page 129.)

"Marx was an advocate of the civil war, that is to say of the fight of the armed proletariat against the bourgeoisie." (Page 130.)

“Civil war ranges one against another, with arms in their hands, the two classes of capitalist society, the two classes whose interests are diametrically opposed. The fact that capitalist society is split up into two parts, that it essentially consists of at least two distinct societies—this fact is obscured at ordinary times.” (Page 130.)

“The revolution as it develops becomes a world revolution for the same reason that the imperialist war became a world war.” (Page 138.)

“The Communist revolution can be victorious only as a world revolution.” (Page 141.)

“In the first place, the proletariat frankly declares that the Red Army is an instrument for use in the political class struggle against the bourgeoisie.” (Page 189.)

“In our revolution, which is a Communist revolution, the principal role, the role of leader, has been assigned to the proletariat.” (Page 191.)

“Forgetting all the national differences that tend to hinder union, they must unite in one great army to carry on a joint war against capitalism. Only by closing their ranks in such an international alliance, can they hope to conquer world capitalism.” (Page 200.)

“The Socialists of all countries, including the Russian social democrats, used to demand the abolition of standing armies. Instead of a standing army, the Socialists wanted the general arming of the people (a citizen army); they demanded the abolition of the officers' caste, and the election of officers by the rank and file.” (Page 212.)

“As the civil war develops, it assumes new forms. When in any country the proletariat is oppressed beyond measure, it leads this war by a revolt against the State authority of the bourgeoisie.” (Page 134.)

“To the civil war, the class war waged by the proletariat against the imperialist bourgeoisie, there are super-added colonial risings which help to undermine and destroy the dominion of world-wide imperialism. Thus the imperialist system is being broken up by two different groups of influences. On the one hand, we have the upward movement of the proletariat, the wars waged by the proletarian republics, and the revolts and the wars carried on by the nations enslaved to the imperialists.” (Page 137.)

That there has been no departure from the program as outlined in “The A B C of Communism” is evident from the declaration of every Congress of the Third (Communist) International, which is that branch of the Soviet government that carries on activities in other countries. The Sixth World Congress of this International adopted a long thesis dealing with the question of engendering civil wars in all so-called capitalist nations. An extract therefrom as printed in the Daily Worker, New York City, December 27th, 1928, the official organ of the Communist party of the United States, follows:

“To transform the war between imperialist states into proletarian civil war against the bourgeoisie, for the purpose of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and Socialism—this transformation to be achieved by means of revolutionary mass action in the rear, and fraternalization at the front. * * *

“Communists must not confine themselves merely to conducting propaganda in favor of this program; they must rouse the masses of the workers to fight for it by applying the tactics of the united proletarian front from below.

“‘Transform the imperialist war into civil war’ means primarily, revolutionary mass action. The Communists resolutely repudiate all so-called ‘means’ of combating war that hamper the development of revolutionary mass action. Consequently, they repudiate individual actions that have no connection with revolutionary mass actions or that fail to contribute to their development. * * *

“The Communists must tell the workers that the struggle against war is not a single and simultaneous act, and that revolutionary mass action on the part of the workers and poor peasants, in the rear and at the front, for the armed overthrow of the bourgeoisie, is the only proper means of combating war, to which all other means must be directed. While combating the above-mentioned prescriptions for individual action, which can only hinder mass action, the Communists must at the same time rouse the workers to display a spirit of revolutionary heroism in the struggle against imperialist war. * * *”

The Young Workers (Communist) League of America adopted a very interesting resolution at its second annual convention, held at Chicago, Illinois, in May, 1923. The following extracts from that resolution are taken from the Daily Worker (date not identified) :

“Immediate steps must be directed against further increase in armaments on the one hand, and on the other, toward a discouragement of voluntary military training.

“Our anti-military activities shall assume the following forms:

“1. War against armaments. (a) Continuous efforts to awaken the workers to opposition to armaments.

“2. Propaganda amongst the youth likely to be recruited for military training camps, student corps, or the like. (a) Printing of leaflets and circulars to be distributed among the young workers and working students, pointing out the purpose for which they are trained; (b) National campaigns against participation in military training at periods when the training camps are opened or at times when the question of military training is before the workers.

“3. Work among the children to point out the militarist character of the Boy and Girl Scout movements. (a) Every attempt must be made to reach as large a section of the proletarian children and prevent their membership in the Boy and Girl Scout organization; (b) Enlist the aid of the workers’ parents in the struggle

against the Boy and Girl Scout movement on militarist and anti-working class grounds. * * *

Will Herberg, a member of the above named organization, writing in the Daily Worker, August 8, 1928, among other things, said:

“Our Leninist position on militarism and war is very clear and certain. We are NOT against war and against militarism ‘as such.’ We are against IMPERIALIST war; we are against BOURGEOIS militarism (i.e., the militarization of the proletarian and farmer youth to fight in the interests of the bourgeoisie). But we are in favor of REVOLUTIONARY wars (wars of oppressed colonial peoples against the imperialist powers, civil wars of proletarian revolution); we are in favor of the military training of the proletarian youth to learn to use arms in the interests of their class and against the bourgeoisie. * * *” (Emphasis in original.)

The Daily Worker, January 3, 1929, in a thesis entitled “The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Task of the Communists,” referring to the plan to disarm presented by the Socialist government of Russia to the League of Nations, said that “the aim of the Soviet proposal is not * * * to support capitalism by ignoring or toning down its shady sides, but to propagate the fundamental Marxian postulate that disarmament and the abolition of war are possible only with the fall of capitalism.”

T. J. O’Flaherty, in the Daily Worker for October 11, 1928, wrote:

“It is sheer folly to think that there can be world peace under capitalism. War is indigenous to the capitalist system and until the workers of the world smash the system, and establish the rule of labor and build up Socialism which will automatically do away with the causes of war, there can be no peace. The working class are the chief sufferers from war. But they cannot have peace by merely protesting against war. The road to peace is class war.”

There is voluminous documentary evidence to sustain the statement that while the Right, or Socialist, wing of the Socialist School of Thought is actively engaged in every country in promoting pacifist movements in order to weaken the defensive of so-called Capitalist nations—and they all are Capitalists since they recognize the private property right—the Left, or Communist, wing is preparing to destroy all such governments through inciting local civil wars or revolutions. Those of you who desire to accumulate further documentary evidence are referred to the Overman Report, the Lusk Report, the Report of the Senate Sub-Committee on the Borah Resolution for the Recognition of Soviet Russia, and to the document, “Red Radicalism,” by former Attorney-General A. Mitchell Palmer, which documents have been previously cited in these lectures, also the hearings of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives of which Congressman Fish was chairman.

(Issued by the Educational Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, 120 West 42nd Street, New York City.)

Copyright 1931

LECTURE No. 13

As you heard these lectures, or as you read them, certain questions naturally arose. Among the most important ones, I dare say, is this:

“How did a theory so antagonistic to the very fundamentals of our society, so dangerous to the preservation of our institutions, gain headway in the United States and secure the support of many of our well-meaning citizens?”

The answer can be given in a very few words—our national laxity, national carelessness, almost criminal carelessness if you please, in the matter of immigration restriction, in the matter of selecting with care those who were to become members of our great national family. We have admitted into our household men and women who do not assimilate with other members of that household, who have no interest whatever in the general advancement of that household, but who, on the contrary, came here wholly and solely to destroy it.

In the past we have, figuratively, been lured into an institution for mental defectives by catchy slogans. Among those presented for our consumption and the acceptance of which has done a vast amount of harm was “the melting pot”. We were led to believe that by some strange system of human alchemy into a great cauldron called the United States, non-assimilable races and bloods could be poured indiscriminately and a race of supermen result.

The theory of the “melting pot” which appealed to the imagination of the American people was responsible for the common belief that prevailed for many years—and that still persists in certain quarters—that we should never close our doors to anyone who sought refuge here no matter what might be the political, the religious, the social or the economic beliefs of such person.

“The Myth of the Melting Pot was the great fallacy of the last generation—fortunately it is utterly discredited today,” writes Madison Grant (“Aliens in our Midst”, page 15). While this myth is “utterly discredited” among those who do a bit of reasoning for themselves, it is not “discredited” among that large and ever growing element who do not think for themselves. Charles Stewart Davidson (*ibid*, page 54) says that “the fantastic formula known as the ‘melting pot’ is a rank absurdity.”

Clinton Stoddard Burr (“America’s Race Heritage”, page 310) writes: “Can any one still listen to vague remarks as to the ‘melt-

ing pot' when we may daily observe the social and political divergence in the race life of the American people."

Montaville Flowers in a chapter entitled "The Great American Illusion" ("The Japanese Conquest of American Opinion", pages 200-201) says:

"A few years ago an entrancing fiction arose from the Utopia of a novelist's brain. It was named 'The Melting Pot' and put upon the stage. The title at once became a popular American phrase, for it aptly expressed and fixed a national tradition that had been forming in our country for a hundred years. It represented the United States as a great crucible in which all kinds of men of all nations and all races were mixing and transforming, out of which was to rise a new man, a superman, towering above all others in body, mind and power, containing all the golden qualities of all, but *none of the drosses of any*. That is The Great American Illusion.

"This illusive dream many Americans believe will come true and are ready to make of it a concrete experiment. I have found many who believe that to receive and mix all men and nations has always been the first principle of our government, carefully adopted and written into the Constitution, and having been so adopted we must follow that course to the end, no matter what the end may be.

"When, in the future, historians philosophize over the decadence of the United States, its division and the loss of its sovereignty, this great illusion will be set down as the psychological cause. They will speak in phrases of wonder and ridicule about a people so brilliant in material achievement who could be obsessed with a belief so fantastic, so unscientific, and so contrary to the experiences of the peoples of the past who had tried it, and who had gone over the abyss at the end of that road."

Edward R. Lewis ("America: Nation or Confusion", pages 131 and 132), touching this same question points out clearly that while we were seeking to "melt" those of different races into one blood called American, we did not grasp the fact that we had to be in the melting pot with all that come to our shores. He says:

"The immigrant was to be Americanized. He was to learn our language, to revere our Constitution, to cherish the deeds of our forefathers. The immigrant was in the melting pot but we were not. The average American had no idea that he was to be changed, or American institutions modified by the immigrant. Many Americans today, and most of the immigrants, believe that this attitude is not only unspeakably arrogant, but fated to disappointment. It is not their idea of the melting pot of institutions at all. It was not Zangwill's idea. They ask what right we have, because we came first, to impose our standards and customs on the immi-

grant. They roundly assert that it cannot be done. Their ideal of the melting pot, * * * is that as we are all cast into the melting pot of racial mixture, as we shall all be made over physically by intermarriage with each other, so inevitably our customs, our habits, our traditions and our political institutions are all in the melting pot together and from it will emerge a new America. * * * The standard ideal was that somehow we, the native blood, were outside the melting pot while the immigrants were in it. The foreign dross of the immigrants was to be burned off by our melting pot and they were to emerge Americans."

A good many years ago this nation was torn asunder because of an immigration problem. The Southern states had a colored population which could not be assimilated biologically. Unfortunately, due to agitation and propaganda based on emotionalism and a lack of understanding of the fundamental question involved, much unnecessary blood was spilled and the real question, to a large degree, remains unsolved.

The nation today is facing a far more serious problem due to like causes. During the past thirty or forty years we have injected into the body politic a large number of persons who, not only cannot be assimilated biologically but cannot be assimilated psychologically and politically. In the case of the blacks of the South this feature was absent. To a large extent the old black blood, when properly educated, readily accepted our ethical, moral and political views. Not so those of certain elements that reached our shores during the past three or four decades. The inability to assimilate biologically the black blood of the South, intensified by a false emotionalism, brought about a civil war. The failure to assimilate this other blood, not only biologically but psychologically and politically as well, presents a far more serious problem, and unless understood and drastic steps taken to cure, so far as possible, the ill another civil war is certain—this time along radical and class lines. Again, a false emotionalism is doing much to pave the way.

The whole South, then the richest section of the nation, was laid waste because in its formative period a blood was injected that it could not be assimilated biologically.

We are more and more of the belief, as additional data is secured, that the influences working for world destruction now were, in part, the influences that worked for our disintegration in the '60s, although both sides to the great conflict were ignorant of these forces. Certain it is that the system being employed at this time to wreck the United States was employed years ago. Propaganda played a most important advance part then. It is playing a most important advance part now. Had this influence been absent then, the immigration problem of that day might have been settled without a war.

When the South lay bleeding and the North victorious industrial activities were stilled below the Mason and Dixon line. The North took up these activities. I am not going into the great controversy over tariff but an import duty was laid to protect the American workmen and then, when industries reached important proportions, we began to import those of bloods far different from the American workman, to do the labor. The black blood of the South was introduced to do the drudgery of a great agricultural section. Trouble of necessity followed. Other non-assimilable bloods have been introduced in the North to do the drudgery connected with manufacturing and general industrial expansion. Trouble of necessity must follow. In this non-assimilable blood is found a most fertile mental field for the Socialist and Communist agitators, and is there one so bold as to say these agitators have failed to take advantage of the situation?

But you say we are a nation of immigrants since our ancestors came from some other lands. Some may have trailed the celebrated John Smith, some may have come with the early Pilgrims, with Lord Baltimore, or arrived still later after we had become a nation of sufficient strength to withstand the great shock of a civil conflict such as raged in the '60s. But the word immigration, unfortunately, is made to cover a multitude of sins. Any one who comes to our country to make it his home is an immigrant, but there is great difference between the majority of those who came up to the beginning of this century and the majority of those who came in the past thirty years. A horse is a horse, but there is a great deal of difference between a wild cayuse roaming the western plains and a highly bred racing animal. For the purpose of a better understanding of the subject, immigration is commonly divided into "old" and "new".

The "old" immigration, that which reached this country previous to 1890, as a whole was from most desirable stocks. These earlier immigrants came with sincerity and honesty in their hearts. They sought the United States because they believed when they became true American citizens they would have greater opportunities for themselves and for their children. With comparatively few exceptions—exceptions too small even to note—these immigrants did make good American citizens, and their children and their children's children of today are among the very best; far better, I regret to say, than many of the children's children of those who helped to form the Nation. The "old" immigration as a rule did not remain in the industrial sections. Those who made up this immigration turned to the undeveloped West, settling on land and taking their places in the building of a great empire.

Then there came a marked change. The "old" immigration ceased, due largely to the fact that land opportunities in the West were not so great, and a "new" immigration began to flow to our

shores. This was as different from the "old" as the long-horned Texas steer is from the thoroughbred Holstein. This "new" immigration did not seek the soil. It remained in the industrial sections. It became what later was termed "cheap labor". Those of different nationalities maintained in the cities where they located foreign settlements of their own. They did not learn the English language; they did not read American papers; they did not seek information or knowledge of our form of government, our institutions and our ideals. On the contrary, they remained wholly foreign even though, because of our easy naturalization laws, many of them became voters. They are no more able to vote intelligently than is the great mass of the rural negro population of the South. Yet they wield a greater force in many elections than do the good old Americans.

About 1900 the tide of this immigration was on the increase. By 1910 that tide had practically reached its crest. This "new" immigration drove out the "old". That which had made good American citizens, because it amalgamated with the blood that was here, ceased almost wholly. In its place, in ever increasing numbers, came the "new", an entirely different stock that, as a rule, does not make good American citizens for the simple reason that this "new" immigration appears mentally incapable of grasping the merits of our form of government, and the value of our institutions. That is to say this stock does not assimilate psychologically and politically since it does not accept our ethical, moral, cultural and political standards and views.

The "old" immigration adopted our ways and manners, learned what our form of government meant to the individual, understood the advantages of our institutions and our ideals, and stood ready, as it today stands ready, to support and defend this government and its institutions to the last ditch. The Socialist theories did not find fertile mental soil with this group. Indeed, the Socialist movement when first introduced here, lacking such mental soil gained little support in this country, save from the few of the "intelligentsia" who chase after every fad, no matter what that fad may be.

The "new" immigration was different—quite different. The majority of those of this "new" blood were saturated with the Socialist theories before they entered the United States. Indeed, many of them came not to become citizens of a great republic, but rather to remain enemies of that great republic and cause its destruction. Huddled, as this "new" blood has, in foreign settlements in our great cities and industrial sections, breeding spots have been created for revolutionary conspiracies. It is from these settlements that bands of well trained agitators sally forth to prey on those who may mean well yet are induced to align themselves with these revolutionary elements. These trained agitators and propagandists never seem to want for money to carry on their work.

Prof. Edward M. East of Harvard University ("Heredity and Human Affairs," page 285) writes:

"Few people not professional statisticians realize what a varied collection of individuals make up the population of the United States. In 1920, when the total population was 106,000,000, there were over 10,000,000 negroes, and about 11,000,000 belonging to the black, yellow, and red races combined, leaving a white population of 95,000,000. Of the latter, nearly 14,000,000 were foreign-born, and nearly 23,000,000 were children of parents at least one of whom was foreign-born, thus making a total of nearly 37,000,000 whose lives had been more largely influenced by foreign traditions than by the traditions of the United States. But census figures of first and second generation aliens cannot of themselves give a clear idea of the effect such masses have on governmental policies."

Edward R. Lewis ("America: Nation or Confusion", page 134) says that "the great mass of Americans has followed this ideal of the Melting Pot." He adds, "It has been the dominant ideal of perhaps three generations and it is potent today. Indeed most Americans, although they may have doubts of the physical blending of races, have no doubt whatever of the possibilities of assimilation psychologically and politically."

And it is because of this false belief in the minds of an exceptionally large number of well meaning persons that we find ourselves today menaced, upon the one side by the growth of the Socialist theory and the extension of the Communist methods to put that theory into practice, and upon the other side by a reign of lawlessness never before equalled in this or any other civilized country. We are, in fact, paying the penalty for our emotionalism of the past which caused us to accept as true the false theory of the "melting-pot."

As this myth prevented the United States from adopting any real system of immigration restriction or selection until within the past decade, another myth has done much to prevent the psychological and political assimilation of certain elements now with us, providing there was a basis for such assimilation to start with. We refer to the "free speech" myth.

The right of free speech has been, in a sense, a religious belief on the part of the people of the United States. From the day the Constitution was adopted down to within comparatively few years, no one even suggested that under this right the murder of a person could be advocated, the public peace disturbed, or the Government subverted. Those who used the right of free speech for any of these purposes, at once, came into conflict with the law and paid the penalty therefore. Justice Story many years ago clarified the Constitutional provision in language which has remained the law of the land. Senator Arthur H. Vandenburg

(“If Hamilton Were Here Today”, page 244) cites that celebrated ruling as follows:

“Every man shall have the right to speak, write and print his opinions upon any subject whatsoever without prior restraint, so always that he does not injure any other person in his right, person, property and reputation; and so always that he does not thereby disturb the public peace or *attempt to subvert Government.*” (Emphasis supplied)

During all the years that have intervened since this celebrated ruling of Justice Story, no one has thought of contending that the right of free speech went further than laid down in that ruling, and certainly no person publically contended that under the Constitution one had the right to advocate the subversion of the Government.

When, however, it became clear we would be forced into the armed conflict on the Continent, a certain group of individuals presented a new and truly remarkable theory as to the “right of free speech.” They employed propaganda and agitation to make it an “issue.” An organization, now known as the American Civil Liberties Union, was founded. The occasion for this was soon manifest. It will be recalled that “draft obstructors” and “slackers” appeared to create sore spots in an otherwise patriotic citizenry. Some few years before another element of our population, many of them aliens or at least alien-born, formed what is commonly known as the I. W. W.’s. At that time, this was the Left wing of the Socialist movement, the position occupied by the Communists today. Those in this organization exhibited their bitter opposition to the successful prosecution of the war into which we had been forced, by engaging in sabotage in mines, mills and factories.

The “civil liberties” group not only employed legal talent to protect the “draft obstructors” and “slackers” but also secured legal talent to defend members of the I. W. W. who engaged in overt acts in an effort to “subvert the Government.” The old I. W. W. was, in substance and effect, succeeded in the United States by the Communists who came with all the backing of the Socialist Government of Russia. Its members openly began the advocacy of the use of force and violence to overthrow the government of the United States. Whenever one of them was arrested the “civil liberties” group came to his defense even to the extent of providing bail-bonds and legal talent, asserting always that in so doing it was not necessarily endorsing the theories advocated, but, instead, was supporting the principle of “free speech.” No decision of the Courts, so far as we are able to locate, have changed the ruling of Justice Story under which the advocacy of the overthrow of the government by force and violence is an “attempt to subvert the Government.” Legally then, the American Civil Liberties Union have no basis whatever for its contentions.

The American Civil Liberties Union of today has a large membership, if we are to accept the word of its leaders. It appears well financed. It employs a huge force of attorneys and has offices in several cities. Its main work during the past decade as shown by its printed reports has been to defend and protect aliens, as well as citizens, who advocated the overthrow of the government by the use of force and violence, aliens ordered deported because of their efforts to "subvert the Government", aliens refused citizenship for the same reason, and aliens denied entry for the same reason. The organization takes the position that under the free speech provision of the Constitution not only has one—an alien as well as a citizen—the right to advocate the use of force and violence to overthrow the government but he also has the right to advocate murder so long, in both instances, as the advocacy is not part of the overt act. Just how one can separate the thought from the act it is difficult to understand since every act is preceded by the thought of that act even though the thought and the act—as in the case of sudden anger—appear simultaneously. There never has been an overt act without the preceding thought, and there never has been a preceding thought that was not the result of some form or character of suggestion. To advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence, or to advocate murder, is simply supplying suggestions to the proper minds that the overt act be committed.

Among the witnesses who appeared before the special committee of the House of Representatives investigating Communist activities in the United States was Roger N. Baldwin who stated that he was a director of the American Civil Liberties Union. The following is extracted from the "affirmed" statements of Mr. Baldwin—he did not take the oath saying that he did not believe in God—(Part I, Vol. 4, Committee Hearings, page 409-12):

"The Chairman: Mr. Baldwin does your organization uphold the right of an American citizen to advocate force and violence for the overthrow of the Government?"

"Mr. Baldwin: Certainly, insofar as mere advocacy is concerned.

"The Chairman: Does it uphold the right of an alien in this country to urge the overthrow and advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?"

"Mr. Baldwin: Precisely on the same basis as any citizen.

"The Chairman: That is not your personal opinion?"

"Mr. Baldwin: That is the organization's position. * * *

"The Chairman: Does your organization uphold the right of a citizen or alien—it does not make any difference which—to advocate murder?"

"Mr. Baldwin: To advocate murder?"

"The Chairman: Yes.

"Mr. Baldwin: Surely.

“The Chairman: Or assassination?”

“Mr. Baldwin: Of course.

“The Chairman: * * * you do uphold the right of an alien to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?”

“Mr. Baldwin: Sure; certainly. It is the healthiest kind of a thing for a country, of course, to have free speech—unlimited.”

Now thousands, yes millions, of those who entered the United States during the past three decades left the old country because they felt its government, in some form or manner, was interfering with their “rights.” Moreover, most of those who sought our shores because they believed *our liberty* was *their license* were saturated with Socialist theories. The majority of them came not to have our ideals and culture impressed upon them but, instead, to impress their ideals and culture upon us. When arrested for some overt act against our form of government they found a so-called American organization, with its large corps of lawyers, ready to defend them. If picked up for deportation because they had been open in their Communistic activities, even without making a personal appeal for aid, they found the “civil liberties” group advancing money for bail and engaging in obstructive legal methods to prevent the government carrying out its wishes.

Is there anyone so foolish as to hold that this sort of thing has not, to a great extent, retarded the psychological and political assimilation of a large element of our foreign population? When an uninformed alien, ardent in his support of the Communist method to put Socialism into practice in the United States, discovers himself openly supported by an American—they call themselves American—organization, he naturally arrives at the conclusion that what he is doing is proper, and that he is but advancing a theory that, if put into operation, is really desired by the people. In other words, instead of being taught that, if he wishes to become an American citizen and enjoy the advantages of such citizenship, he must conform to our ideals, our laws, our culture or ethical and political standards, he is encouraged to go the limit to force his ideals, culture, ethical and political standards upon us.

Psychological and political assimilation becomes an utter impossibility when those aliens, who object seriously to such assimilation, are given every possible encouragement in their position by our citizens. And without such an assimilation no nation can exist any great length of time. Even though the element lacking in this assimilability be relatively small, it yet acts as a cancer in the body politic.

Senator Arthur H. Vandenburg, touching this myth of free speech, although he does not refer to it as a myth (“If Hamilton Were Here Today,” page 244), wrote, “. . . we are entitled, with all the vigorous Law that can be put at our command, to curb license when it threatens the annihilation of liberty itself. In fact, it is

molly-coddle, maudlin nonsense for self-preserving Americanism to take any other view."

If you have failed to note it, permit me to call to your attention the fact that when legislation is proposed that might, in part, remedy the evils growing out of our non-assimilable population, or, at least prevent others of the same kind entering, the opposition is exceedingly active and strong. This opposition not only comes from established alien agencies, but, strangely enough, from American groups composed largely of those who, in the "melting-pot" lost the ideals of their forefathers and emerged with the ideals of the Socialist aliens who were placed in that "pot" with them. The myth of "free speech" is one of the natural products of the "melting" process.

The report of the special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Communist activities in the United States to which we made reference, recommended the adoption of certain legislation to correct some of the evils resulting from these two myths and which, naturally, followed our inability to assimilate psychologically and politically, as well as biologically, a large percentage of our present population. Instead of endorsing the recommendations which, clearly, are designed to strengthen the Nation, a number of the metropolitan papers denounced them. Some of the smaller papers, taking their cue from their city contemporaries, followed suit. Why, one naturally asks? Can it be that those responsible for the editorial policy of these papers emerged from the "melting-pot" shorn of the ideals of their forefathers, and now stand sponsors for the ideals of those they encountered in that "pot"? If not, must we infer that such persons are the descendants of those who refuse to be assimilated psychologically and politically? Or, are we to believe that the financial power of this non-assimilable group is so great that American editors dare not oppose them and their purposes.

Prof. William Starr Myers of Princeton ("The Alien in Our Midst," page 200), referring to the aliens in this country whom we have sought to absorb, says that "as the number of immigrants grew to overwhelming proportions, so did the class idea they brought fail to give away before the opposing American belief, and today we see the baneful political effect in many directions including much of the State and National legislation." He continues, "The Adamson law, the La Follette-Feruseh law, and more recent 'bonus' legislation, are good illustrations of an imported class spirit grafted on American democracy. Instead of following a sound American idea and ideal, that of helping the people to help themselves, and thus preserving equality of opportunity, we have presented the plan of helping the people in spite of themselves, a paternalistic idea brought here from the decadent feudalism of Continental Europe. The disintegrating effect of this movement on national and party unity is an outstanding condition at the beginning of this year of 1930."

What would you say of the father of boys yet in their teens who, knowingly, welcomed into his home men who frankly advocated the "hold-up" game as being the most desirable occupation for a young man, one that afforded the greatest opportunities and the easiest living? And having done that, what would you say of this father who, after he found his sons in jail for attempting a "hold-up" of their own, excused those who offered the suggestion that led to the overt act on the ground that they were merely indulging in the right of "free speech?"

While this character of "free speech" may ruin one home or even a hundred homes, "free speech" that persists in the advocacy of the overthrow of our government by force and violence may ruin an entire nation. As it is the unwritten law of ages that one has the right to protect his home from baneful influences so, also, it is the unwritten law of ages that those who live in a country have the right to protect that country from dangerous elements. "Self-preservation of nations, as well as individuals, is the first law of nature, and the adoption of a policy that will assure a sound, healthy and normal national development is one of the highest duties which a people owe to themselves and their posterity," writes Henry F. Suksdorf ("Our Race Problem," page 6).

Any act on the part of an alien that is contrary to our established laws and customs tends to the destruction of the Nation as a whole. "There are a million alien law-breakers, perhaps two million at the present time, in the United States and unconvicted," writes Judge Norman Dike ("The Alien in Our Midst," page 80). He adds, (page 83), "After 14 years of highest criminal work in the City of New York and from data I am able to procure, I find that about one-quarter to one-third of those charged with crime are aliens."

"What makes a Nation?" asks Edward R. Lewis ("America: Nation or Confusion," page 139). The writer in the following twenty-seven pages devoted to answering his own question presents the self-evident truth that a nation to be strong and able to defend itself must have (a) a common language; (b) a common law; (c) common political institutions; (d) must be closely knit together by common economic interests; (e) the people must be animated by common standards of life and thought.

Are all of these to be found in the United States? We have learned during the course of these lectures that there is a well organized movement operating here to abolish our economic formula with the private property, and to overthrow the form of government which recognizes the right and protects and defends the individual in the exercise thereof. That this is almost wholly foreign is not disputed. Our lax immigration policy of the past is responsible. We have permitted, without any form of interference, men and women not fitted mentally to become residents of this country, men and women who, not only held views diametrically opposite to those of the American people but who have insisted it is their right to destroy

our standards and set up theirs in place. And this, let us reiterate, has had the support of well organized groups who have dangled before the eyes of non-thinking citizens the myth of "free speech."

Because of the fact that a few emotional and idealistic Americans have occupied the limelight in their advocacy of Socialism, there are many who insist that the movement is not, as we have stated, largely alien. Those who hold such views, evidently, are not well acquainted with the facts. So far as we know prominent Socialist leaders recognize it is alien. Morris Hillquit ("History of Socialism in the United States," Rev. ed. pages 193 and 194), referring to the formation of the Socialist Labor Party in 1897 says, "It is estimated that not more than 10 percent of the members of the Socialist Labor Party, during the period described, were native-born Americans. All the rest, including the most active and influential leaders, were men of foreign birth insufficiently acquainted with the constitution, customs and habits of the country of their adoption."

Mr. James Oneal, another well-known Socialist authority, in "The Communist Movement" while possibly not seeking to stress the fact that the Socialist School of Thought is of foreign inception and control, makes some twenty references that, taken together, presents conclusive evidence. He states (page 56) that the Left wing of the Socialist Party was controlled in a Massachusetts convention "due to the large foreign-born population of the state." On the same page, he says that a National Socialist conference divided into two wings "a minority, dominated by the foreign language federations." On page 70, this: "Foreign federations constituted the overwhelming bulk of the membership of the Communist party convention." Again, (page 88), "The foreign language groups again have been the obstruction to unity." Referring to the underground Communist faction one infers it was formed "because of the numerous foreign language organizations which were attached to it as affiliated sections." On page 125 he lists a number of foreign speaking organizations that joined in a class to organize the Workers Party of America, now known as the Communist Party of America. Dealing with an article written by one John Pepper appearing in an official Communist paper, Mr. Oneal writes: "Pepper presented a valuable analysis of the composition of the membership. He reported that the party had sixteen foreign language federations and that it required great skill to 'keep this modern Babel together in one party'" and that Pepper said that "a great part of the members were not citizens." (Page 144.)

Some member of the special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Communist activities in the United States asked practically every witness who might have knowledge the question as to the number of aliens in the Communist movement. But one said as low as fifty percent; many around seventy percent, and some as high as ninety percent. William Z. Foster, the head of

the Communist movement in the United States who was on the stand as a witness stated (Part I, Vol. 4, page 364 of the Hearings) that sixty to seventy percent of the members of the Communist movement were foreign born. He further stated that "we encourage the workers to become naturalized, so that *they can participate in the elections.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

In the report of the special committee to investigate Communist activities in the United States, appear the following statements:

"The Communist Party in the United States was first organized in Chicago in September, 1919, and was composed mostly of foreign-born workers, and had but little contact or influence with the great masses of the workers in American industries." (Page 9.)

"It is the consensus of the witnesses that 70 percent of the Communists in this country are aliens and, therefore, cannot vote." (Page 15.)

"It is reported that there are 200,000 individuals connected with these foreign language groups who are more or less in sympathy with the Communist movement." (Page 81.)

Senator David A. Reed of Pennsylvania who is nationally known for his sound Americanism, and who is ever ready to defend our institutions whether in the halls of Congress or on the field of battle, in an address before the Chamber of Commerce of Chicago in 1928, among other things said:

"Somebody owns this country. Either we do or they do; and we got here first. We must realize that the America of the future, the America of our grandchildren, can not exist in the form in which America stands today unless we keep America for the Americans and suffice ourselves with the adequate population we have today. We have tasks enough without introducing vast groups who are alien to our language, alien to our political institutions, alien to our habits of life, alien to everything we hold dear, and if we depart from that system, then I think that more than in any other way we will be jeopardizing that America for our grandchildren."

But can we keep America for Americans if we do not take drastic steps to prevent those here still nursing alien thoughts, extending their operations? This is an English-speaking country and yet we have what is called a foreign press. Those who guide and direct this press are not thinking in terms of the United States but in terms of those who speak the particular language to which they cater. They enter politics and undertake to guide and direct thought along political lines. So strong and so powerful have certain alien-minded groups become, backed by an alien-minded press, that no man seeking public office in districts where they predominate dares to raise a voice in protest, or speak kindly of anything American.

Prof. Edward M. East of Harvard, in his book "Hereditry and Human Affairs," touching the disposition of the "new" immigra-

tion to retain their racial characteristics and at the same time dealing with the foreign press situation, (page 286) writes:

"They support over 1,000 newspapers and magazines published in 30 different languages, from Arabic to Welsh. They are united by social ties into groups of various sizes in which foreign languages are used almost exclusively as the means of intercourse. The last United States religious census, which is rather fragmentary, lists 202 different denominations of which 132 report that a part or all of their organizations use foreign languages. They group themselves together in society, in religion, and in business; and the natural result is that they become increasingly race-conscious. There are more Poles and Italians in this country than there are in Poland and Italy.

"I have recently had occasion to look over the files of a number of foreign-language newspapers. It is not only in their language that they are foreign; they are foreign in their psychology, in their ideals, in their points of view. Practically nothing is done to Americanize the reader. Their problems are the problems of the countries from which they came. In the New England mill towns the problems are French, in other places Italian, or Polish, or Lithuanian, or what-not. * * *

"One sees clearly from these foreign-language papers what country is their real *patria*. One cannot confer American conceptions like a college degree after 60 months of residence. The epithet 'bigamists in citizenship' which the editor of an anarchist weekly applied to some of our newer citizens is clearly appropriate. Furthermore, they know their power and use that power very largely for non-American ends. Various racial groups openly boast of their political influence. They threaten with oblivion statesmen who are thought to be independently American. Since we have few statesmen, and are mainly ruled by politicians who keep their ear to the ground for their own advancement, the Polish vote, the Jewish vote, the Irish vote, and the Russian vote must be reckoned with. * * "

Turn for a minute to the foreign press of this country. Three years ago I had occasion to make a very careful survey of this situation. While the number of papers with the circulation of each probably have changed somewhat, yet I think they will be found today substantially in keeping with the figures I cite. According to the N. W. Ayer & Son's 1927 newspaper directory, the total number of such papers printed in the United States then was 1,090 (the Foreign Language Press Service listed the number as 1,156).

The total circulation of the foreign language papers as listed by N. W. Ayer & Son per issue was 8,955,000. This may be a few hundred thousand too high and it may be a few hundred thousand too low. Estimates were supplied where exact circulation was not given. Again, it is common knowledge that many publishers boast of a circulation which they do not have. But when one takes into

consideration, not only the circulation of papers printed in foreign languages in the United States, but papers printed in foreign languages in other countries and circulated in the United States, it would be reasonable and safe to place the total circulation of all such in the United States at 10,000,000 per issue, some daily, some weekly, some monthly.

Accepting the figures of the Foreign Language Press Service for total publications in the United States printed in foreign languages, and for the distribution of the same by states, and securing the circulation figures of these publications from the 1927 Ayer & Son's newspaper directory, where such figures are found and estimates inserted where not found, we get the following results.

Printed in the German language, 203 papers with a circulation of 1,750,000; Italian 154, circulation 850,000; Polish 90, circulation 1,000,000; Spanish 83, circulation 500,000; Czech 78, circulation 625,000; French 55, circulation 275,000; Hungarian 50, circulation 350,000; Swedish 50, circulation 400,000; Greek 41, circulation 300,000; Yugoslav 41, circulation 350,000; Slovak 33, circulation 350,000; Norwegian 26, circulation 240,000; Lithuanian 25, circulation 225,000; Yiddish 23, circulation 750,000.

The other papers in the United States, printed in foreign languages are Danish, Portuguese, Japanese, Finnish, Russian, Armenian, Ayrian and Arabic, Carpatho-Russian; Chinese, Ukranian, Hebrew, Roumanian, Bulgarian, Esthonian, Flemish, Albanian, Esperanto, Korean, Ladino, Latvian, and Turkish, a total of 177 papers with a gross circulation of 890,000 per issue or an aggregate of 1,156 papers with a total circulation of 8,955,000.

Now turn to the City of New York. Here the same survey showed a total of 35 daily papers printed in foreign languages running from one Ukranian with a circulation of 7,000 to six Jewish with a total circulation of 370,000 daily. The total circulation of the 35 foreign daily newspapers in New York City was, at the time of the survey, 947,000 per issue. You will get some idea of what this means when told this circulation is 19,000 more daily than the combined circulation of the Times, the Herald-Tribune and the Morning World, or, 79,000 more than the combined circulation of the Times, Herald-Tribune and the American.

Many of the editors and publishers of these foreign papers will protest that they are not engaged in activities subversive to our form of government. We are not charging many with such. What we are showing is that, in a country where the common language is English, the circulation of so many papers printed in other languages is dangerous to Americanism.

While now and then an editor of a foreign language newspaper is found who takes the sound American view upon all important public questions, the great majority of such editors oppose all legis-

lation looking to more restrictive immigration, more rigid deportation laws, or legislation to compel the registration of aliens. The cold fact is that we can not have a solidified Nation so long as there exists such a powerful press printed in foreign languages, each engaged in advancing the cultures, the ethics and the traditions of those to whom it caters. Even if this press were but little affected by Socialistic tendencies, still the harm is great.

The special committee to investigate Communist activities in the United States (pages 20 and 21) give the names of eleven daily papers published in the United States but printed in foreign languages with a total daily circulation of over 231,000; and the names of 20 such weekly papers with a total circulation each issue of close to 60,000. These figures do not cover the large number of such papers published in other countries and circulated in the United States, which figures, if known, would materially increase the total.

And so you have the answer to the question stated at the beginning of this lecture, "How did a theory so antagonistic to the very fundamentals of our society, so dangerous to the preservation of our institutions, gain headway in the United States and secure the support of so many well meaning citizens?"

In a single sentence the answer might be stated, laxity, that amounts to criminal carelessness, in the matter of immigration legislation.

This laxity was the natural result of the "melting-pot" theory of some years ago. When this theory was exploded, when the American people aroused themselves from the stupor induced by the fumes from that "pot," and began to demand steps be taken to restrict immigration into the United States, then there appeared another myth equally, if not more dangerous in the final analysis, the myth of "free speech." To these two can be traced all early and much of the late opposition to legislation that would correct, in part at least, the evils which have resulted from national laxity of the past.

Socialism and Communism must have a fertile mental field else they perish, poisoned by their own false premises and illogical conclusions. This fertile mental soil has been found largely in our alien population. While some able minds have done much explaining how certain bloods can not be biologically assimilated, few writers have taken any time to point out that certain bloods can not be assimilated psychologically and politically and that of two evils, the latter is the more serious from the point of view of national solidarity.

(Issued by the Educational Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, 120 West 42nd Street, New York City.)

LECTURE No. 14

TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA

Several times during these lectures, as we dealt with the theories and philosophies advanced by the Socialist School of Thought, we called attention to the fact that one could get a fair understanding of what Socialism "in action" meant by turning to the Russia of today. That country has abolished the private property right principle. It has destroyed a form of government which recognized that right and which protected and defended the individual in the exercise thereof. It has set up a Socialist government and placed, not only the title to all property and wealth in the hands of the government, but it has given to the state arbitrary and autocratic control over the individual. In other words, all human rights have been destroyed.

Our interest in "Socialism in action" should be confined to two major questions. The first is, "Do we wish to try the same experiment in the United States?" The second, "What are those directing and controlling the Socialist government of Russia doing to overthrow our government and force us to adopt the Marxian theory?"

Admitting, as many of the apologists for the Socialist regime in Russia do, that the people of that country are experiencing great hardships, we recognize the right of the citizens of any nation to adopt, and to operate, whatever form of government they see fit, no matter what we think of it. There may be something about the government of China, Japan, France, Germany, Mexico or even Great Britain that we do not like and which we do not approve. Frankly, however, the kind of government these people have is their own concern, not ours. When, however, any other government starts to undermine or destroy ours we are deeply concerned, even to the point of declaring war, as we have been forced to do in every armed conflict in which we have been involved since the formation of the nation, save in the case of the civil war.

What my neighbor does in the sanctity of his own home is no business of mine. He may mistreat his wife, and teach his children to engage in criminal and immoral practices. While I may feel sorry for his wife and children and hold this neighbor in contempt, refusing to have any relations with him whatsoever, the fact remains that since the acts to which I seriously object do not affect me and mine, he is within his rights so far as I am concerned. When, however, he steps out of his home and over into mine, starts to abuse my wife and, through subtle methods such as the promise of candy, chewing-gum and ice-cream undertakes to win the confidence of my children that he may teach them to swear and engage in criminal and immoral

practices, and upon my interposing objections threatens to use force to further his plans, it is not only my right but my duty to do whatever I can to stop him.

And that is exactly the attitude we should take toward the Socialist government of Russia. So long as those directing that government experiment on the people remaining within the territory under their control it is their own affair, but when they step beyond and seek to injure or destroy our government and corrupt our people as they are doing, threatening us with force and violence if we interpose an objection as they many times have done, it becomes not only our right but our duty to do whatever we can to stop them.

Most sane persons are guided in their actions by experience. It may be their own experience or the experience of others. For more than two thousand years the government of all civilized countries have recognized the private property right and protected their citizens in the exercise thereof. Experience has demonstrated the merits of the system. For more than 140 years we have enjoyed the republican form of government outlined by the Constitution. Experience has demonstrated the merits and advantages of that form.

True, under the economic system which grants the private property right and under our form of government which recognizes that right, ills and evils have appeared. They are not, however, due to the system of economics or the form of government. Where they exist they are directly traceable to human traits and frailties. These ills and evils, whatever they may be, are the exception, not the rule. One does not try to correct a mistake in addition by abandoning the proven principles of mathematics. One does not discard the principle of harmony because a musician, in rendering a composition, strikes a few discordant notes. Why, then, pray tell, should one even consider abolishing the private property right formula and destroying our form of government, because some people have misapplied the formula or abused the form?

For the past thirteen (13) years we have watched the "noble experiment" of Socialism practiced on the people of Russia. The many advantages that were to accrue have failed to materialize. It may be contended by apologists for the system that the "experiment" has not yet had a proper trial, that a new generation must come into command before the real merits of Socialism can be demonstrated. There is some justification for this claim but knowing, as we do, what those of the present generation in Russia are experiencing because they assumed that benefits would accrue to them, the question we should ask ourselves is, "With the experience of ages in favor of the private property right, and the experience of nearly 150 years in favor of our republican form of government, shall we, on the mere assumption that Socialism will improve our lot, try the 'experiment' in the United States?"

It is not my purpose to detail conditions in Russia at the present time. A little more than a decade ago, by means of a bloody and merciless revolution, Socialism was placed in the saddle there. It has remained in the saddle ever since. The propaganda that has flooded the United States to win converts to Socialism has exceeded any other propaganda, both for and against any theory hitherto presented. One has but to visit his own public library to find its shelves filled with books and pamphlets advancing the theory of Socialism and extolling the "noble experiment" in Russia. To offset this he will find very little that points out the fallacies of Socialism or that shows the "experiment" has been one continuous use of force, violence, terrorism, rapine, crime and immorality.

In reading and studying the "noble experiment" in order to get a proper prospectus, it is necessary to keep in mind certain important facts. When considering the claims made by the Socialist government, and those who are clearly its spokesmen, remember that it is human nature for one to extol his own virtues and conceal, if possible, his faults. When one hires a person he hears what that person has to say for himself, considers his references and then, if he is wise and the applicant to be employed is to occupy a position of trust, he does a bit of investigating for himself. Through independent sources he ascertains what those who intimately know the person think of him, what they have to say as to his sincerity, his honesty and his integrity, and thus learn whether or not the person is to be trusted. If one fails to do this, and is injured in consequence, he has but himself to blame. The careful business man before extending credit hears what the applicant for credit has to say of his honesty and ability to meet obligations. Then, through independent sources, he ascertains the general reputation of the applicant, whether or not he has always paid his bills promptly, together with his general reputation for honesty. The business man who fails to adopt this cautious attitude often finds himself in the bankruptcy courts.

Let us be equally cautious in studying Socialism in action. In the previous lectures we considered it as a theory quite fully. We are now viewing it in practice. In so doing we should not overlook the fact that circumstantial evidence in a case of this kind is even stronger than direct evidence, since direct evidence is difficult to obtain and, when obtained, is liable to be greatly colored.

Sir Ernest J. P. Benn ("About Russia", page 18) takes the position that he is more than justified in condemning the whole system of economics and government as practiced in Russia without visiting that country. He points out that no person can, in truth, make an independent personal investigation since, if he is not an apologist for the system, he is ever under the watchful eye and guidance of government officials. He writes:

"I can claim as a justification of my method of investigation from the outside that it is the orthodox legal method. All vital decisions

of law are taken on circumstantial evidence. Circumstantial evidence if enough of it can be secured, is considered, in criminal cases at least, to be the best. It is only quite recently in English legal practice that the defendant in a criminal charge has been allowed to say anything at all about the matter. He can now go into the box and give evidence if he elects to do so, but as a rule little importance is attached to his evidence, and no judgment is given which relies entirely upon what he says. In the same sort of a way we must, I submit, study Russia from the circumstantial evidence which we can secure outside of Moscow. Only so can we get near to the difficult truth."

Ere we turn to certain evidence touching the system employed by the Socialist government of Russia through what may appear, upon the surface, as legitimate trade transaction, to directly injure us, let us fix in our minds certain established facts which, I believe, will not be controverted save, possibly, by a few of the most bigoted Communists. These facts are:

First: Socialism in action, as practiced in Russia today, does not express the will of the people. The government practicing Socialism was formed by force, violence, and acts of terrorism, and is maintained by the same agencies;

Second: Socialism in action, as practiced in Russia today, denies the individual property right and uses all the power of government to prevent any person exercising that right;

Third: Socialism in action, as practiced in Russia today, denies the individual freedom of thought and action, and is officially engaged, using force, violence and acts of terrorism, in a campaign to crush all religious faiths.

Fourth: Socialism in action, as practiced in Russia today, demonstrates the oft repeated charge that under the Marxian theory the individual becomes completely submerged while the State, in the hands of an arbitrary and ruthless minority, exercises all the rights commonly belonging to the individual.

All these are diametrically opposed to every principle laid down in the Constitution of the United States. They are repugnant to civilization and Christianity. They strike at the very foundation of human rights. The forces that are now engaged in the "noble experiment" in Russia are, at the same time, engaged in a well organized campaign to put Socialism in action in the United States. That forces us to take a hand. If our peace and security are menaced it is not only our right but our duty, to know the truth and to act for our own protection.

Sir Ernest J. P. Benn (ibid, page 31) says that "the problem of Russia is the problem of peace of the world, nothing more and nothing less," and it has become that problem not because of what it is trying out on its own people but what it is trying to do to people of other nations. "The settlement of Russia will carry

with it the settlement of the world," says Mr. Benn (page 32). "and until Russia is firmly established there can be no real peace or security for the rest."

Sherwood Eddy, who has long been an apologist for Socialism and who, after writing his recent book "The Challenge of Russia" resigned from his post with the Y.M.C.A. stating that since he had joined the Socialist party he felt further connection with the "Y" might embarrass it, in his foreword states that "this book is written in the conviction that Russia constitutes a challenge to America and the world." The writer in the same paragraph says that "the manuscript has been submitted for criticism and correction to experts both in Moscow and New York, to learn whether *in point of fact* there were any statements that were untrue or unfair * * *." (Emphasis in original.)

To get a clear understanding of what the Socialist government of Russia is doing in the United States to disturb the peace of this country and subvert this government, a few things should be fully understood. In the first place, the land once known as Russia, is a mere pawn in a gigantic conspiracy to bring about a world revolution and reduce the people of all countries to the level of those of Russia. Russia is no longer a country or a nation. Insofar as the Communists are concerned, Russia does not exist. If you address a letter to some person "Moscow, Russia," it is returned at the border. The official title "The Union of Socialist Soviet Republics" must be used.

The advancement, the welfare, and the prosperity of the people involved in this "Socialist experiment" are not considered. The individual becomes a mere piece of machinery in the operation of the State. Nothing matters so long as the State gains power and strength in order to attain its one end—world revolution. Those now in command of Russia do not think in terms of the individuals over whom they hold sway. They recognize the fact that insofar as human welfare is concerned the "noble experiment" has been a gigantic failure. The many promises made have failed of fulfillment.

Prof. Calvin B. Hoover ("The Economic Life of Soviet Russia," pages 334-5), says that "never in history have the mind and spirit of man been so robbed of freedom and dignity." He continues, "It is not merely that academic freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of thought are forbidden * * *. Men must publicly deny their real thoughts and feelings. * * * That the Soviet regime is founded upon force and fear there can be no question.

Arthur Feiler ("The Russian Experiment," Eng. edition, pages 206-7) says that "there is no freedom of political organization. * * * There is no freedom of the press, no freedom of the written word, no freedom of opinion. * * * No freedom of discussion and

opinion, and no personal freedom." He adds, "The whole population lives under a system of espionage which is carried to such a point that no person any longer trusts another, that even Communists mistrust each other and that over the whole country hangs an atmosphere of fear and intimidation like a perpetual, intolerable oppression."

"Socialism means wealth, we are taught," writes Mr. Feiler (page 17). "But the present experiment of Russian humanity is poverty, deprivation, and in many districts of that gigantic country stark hunger." And this condition, faithfully expressed by one who appears to have a "fondness" for the theory of Socialism, exists because the Socialist government of Russia, overlooking the needs of the people, has its whole attention centered on bringing about revolutions in other countries. Mr. Feiler writes (ibid, page 18) "The internal market is ruthlessly depleted in order to procure, by export, the foreign money that is needed."

This money is needed not to ameliorate the conditions of the people upon whom the "Socialist experiment" is being tried but, instead, to aid the government in its campaign in other countries to induce revolutions.

Mr. Eddy ("The Challenge of Russia," page 17) say that Communism "as a party organization is seeking progressively to realize its philosophy by means of a continuing revolution, through the Soviet government in one country, and through its Comintern, or Third International by the same revolutionary means in all lands, until its new social order shall be established throughout the world."

The same writer (ibid, page 34) writes: "They are straining every nerve to treble their 'heavy industry,' i.e., all that is needed for future production in electric power, coal, iron, steel, oil, machinery, etc. They do not care half so much about the light industry, for the comfort of the people, including clothing, shoes and a hundred articles that would be considered the luxuries, necessities and even decencies of life in western countries." He adds that "they count no price too great, no sacrifice too severe to enable them to accomplish their objectives." And their objective is a revolution in every so-called capitalist country including the United States.

Mr. Eddy furnishes us some evidence that this is their objective, to obtain which they cruelly crush the people, when he cites (ibid, page 110) Article I of the Constitution of the Communist, or Third International as follows:

"The new International of Workingmen's Association is formed for the organization of joint action by the proletariat of various countries, who are struggling for the same aims: *the overthrow of capitalism, the creation of a dictatorship of the proletariat and an International Soviet Republic for the complete abolition of classes and the realization of Socialism, the first step toward a Communist society*.'" (emphasis supplied)

The statement has many times been made that there is no connection between the Third (Communist) International and the Socialist government of Russia. The evidence that they are indivisible, that they are but parts of a whole, is so overwhelming that even those who find much to favor in the Communist theory no longer undertake to make the denial. Mr. Eddy furnishes proof which, I am certain, none of those advancing Socialism will dispute. He says: (ibid, page 96)

“Through this remarkable triumvirate of the Communist party, the Soviet Government, as the first Communist world state, and the Comintern or Third International, the dictatorship of the organized proletariat, proposes to extend its widening circles from an inner, all-powerful, dominating group, to the final anticipated regime of the world communist society.”

And this “remarkable triumvirate” acting through the Third International is engaged in propaganda and agitation in all countries including the United States for “*the overthrow of capitalism*” and “*the creation of a dictatorship of the proletariat and an International Soviet Republic.*”

As I have stated, we are not interested in what this “dictatorship of the proletariat” is doing in Russia, but we are deeply interested in what it is doing in the United States where the Socialist Government of Russia has no legal standing, has no embassy, its commercial and citizens agents here only by sufferance, and where its branch known as the “Communist Party of America, Section of the Third International,” has been decreed by the courts an illegal organization.

The Special Committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Communist activities in the United States spent many months and heard a vast amount of testimony and compiled a large number of exhibits. From this mass of data, the Committee rendered a complete report which ends (page 66) with these words:

“It is self-evident that the Communists and their sympathizers have only one real object in view, not to obtain control of the Government of the United States through peaceful and legal political methods as a political party, but to establish by force and violence in the United States and in all other nations of a ‘soviet socialist republic’ to which they often refer in their literature as a ‘dictatorship of the proletariat.’ These facts have been repeatedly substantiated at the hearings of the committee.”

In previous lectures we dealt somewhat at length with the methods employed to bring about a revolution in the United States. In Lecture No. 7 we outlined the “legislative or parliamentary action” system of the Right wing of the Socialist School of Thought to weaken our form of government and to weaken or interfere with the private property right through arbitrary methods of regulation. In Lecture No. 8 we dealt with the “mass or direct

action" system of the Left wing of the same School to train men and women to engage in a revolution through strikes, riots and disturbances of all kinds.

While these methods have accomplished much in the way of disintegration and in arousing a revolutionary spirit in the minds of a large number, especially the aliens in our midst, and caused a large number of well meaning individuals to give their approval to Socialism in action as practiced in Russia today, the clever agents of the Soviet Government recently inaugurated another method which has all the potentialities of a gigantic charge of TNT. I refer to what is commonly called "trade relations."

The American press has given, and still is giving, a vast amount of space to propaganda concerning the so-called Five Year Industrialization Plan of Soviet Russia. This propaganda carries powerful suggestions to the average business man. The very word "industrialization" in the title disarms those who are thinking in terms of trade. That title is emphatically deceptive. The average American, because of clever propaganda, has drawn truly strange conclusions. Many seem to be of the belief that by applying the Socialist theory the Government of Russia in five years will be able to establish its industries as we have established ours only after toil, struggle and many disappointments in one hundred and forty years.

Every paragraph of this cleverly worded propaganda has caused our manufacturers and industrial executives to believe that here is a scheme that will materially increase their profits. Ever on the alert for added business, many of our leaders in industry, without stopping to ascertain the philosophy and theory of Socialism in action as practiced in Russia today, have listened to the glib Communist salesman and entered into certain trade relations because they believed they would profit thereby.

What concerns us in this study is not whether the Plan, in the final analysis, will benefit the people of Russia, but whether that Plan, if carried out as proposed, will injure us. In other words, is that Plan a part and parcel of the world revolutionary program? Every thoughtful person making a careful study of the situation will reach the conclusion that the so-called Five Year Industrialization Plan is designed, not to benefit the people of Russia but, on the contrary, is being operated wholly to strengthen the Socialist Government of Russia in order that it may successfully force a revolution in the United States (and other so-called capitalist countries) and compel us to bow to the dictates of Moscow.

While there is much evidence dealing with the question of Russian trade, it is more or less confusing because, as in all matters where Socialism in action is involved, it is difficult to garner the wheat from the chaff, separate the truth from the paid propaganda. It is not my purpose in this lecture to array any amount of evidence. On the contrary, I will deal with but a few phases of the subject

hoping, in so doing, that I may establish a proper basis for your individual investigation.

It is held by those who have given the subject careful study—and they are supported in their conclusions by a preponderance of evidence—that the so-called Five Year Industrial Plan has the following outstanding objectives:

First: To secure funds and technical aid in order that the Socialist Government of Russia may

- (a) establish industries that will furnish raw material and manufacture articles for export;
- (b) supply the Socialist Government with raw material and manufactured articles needed in the successful prosecution of a war at home, and to support revolutions in other countries, including the United States;
- (c) secure funds to carry on propaganda and agitational work in all so-called capitalist countries, that is, countries that recognize the private property right—including the United States—favorable to a revolution.

Second: To export to so-called capitalist countries, including the United States, raw material and manufactured articles which material and articles are to be sold below local cost of production;

Third: By this system of “dumping” create unemployment in all such countries thus establishing a fertile mental soil for Communist agitation and propaganda, as illustrated by the system now in vogue in the United States to win the sympathy and support of the unemployed; and,

Fourth: Through this system of “dumping” secure additional funds to purchase more machinery and hire additional technical experts to teach the Russian workmen, in order that the output of raw material and manufactured articles may be increased, the system of “dumping” enlarged, and Communist propaganda and agitation augmented.

In considering trade relations with the Socialist Government of Russia the first thing we must fully understand, to grasp its seriousness, is that we are dealing with a customer quite different from any with which we have ever before dealt. We are dealing with a business organization which is, at the same time, a government. All things produced, whether raw material or manufactured articles, all business, commerce, trade, including both imports and exports, are owned, controlled and directed by the Government.

This dual institution, operating as a government, exercises autocratic and supreme control over the lives and habits of all of its citizens. As a business organization these citizens become its employes. As a government it holds sway over its citizens by force, violence and acts of terrorism. As a business institution it uses the

same agencies. As the only and exclusive employer of labor of all kinds, it sets the place and nature of employment, wages to be paid, hours of work, size and location of home to be occupied, quality and quantity of food to be consumed, going even farther and directing the thought and education of these employes. This, in substance and effect, makes all citizens of the Socialist Government of Russia slaves. The person in Russia who refuses a job offered is not permitted to take any other. He is denied the right to buy food. "The most dangerous criminal in the United States, even though confined in a dark cell is fed," remarked M. J. Flynn of the American Federation of Labor before a recent meeting of the Advisory Board of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

Moreover, in dealing with the Socialist Government of Russia, we are dealing with a customer who talks in two different languages. One is for his employes who are, at the same time, citizens of the Government he controls. The other is for those who either buy from, or sell to, him. To the former this customer loudly declaims about forcing a bloody revolution in all other countries and that when this is done those who, as employes, are now suffering the pangs of hunger will be citizens of a great Utopia, the theoretical goal of all Socialists. He tells them when all so-called capitalist countries have been destroyed, human suffering will end, that those now compelled to work as slaves will be released from their bondage, and that the reward for the suffering will be great. To the latter he uses impressive language about business, commerce, trade, exports and imports, profits, trade balances and those things which have a great appeal to the average business man.

In dealing with the Socialist Government of Russia we are dealing with a customer who is not at all concerned with profits and losses. He does not keep books as others do. He has no red ink. Supply and demand are never taken into consideration. In fixing the selling price of a product the cost, in dollars, is not computed. If that article is for export the purpose of the sale is as we have already stated. All financial loss is balanced by propaganda profit. If, in such transactions, the citizens who are at the same time employes suffer it makes no difference. Capital,—the thing denounced by all Socialists,—must be secured no matter at what sacrifice of life, what misery, what degradation, in order to attain the end sought—a revolution in all countries that recognize the private property right—that Capital may be abolished.

"For the outside world it makes little difference whether the Plan is accomplished in four, five or six years," writes H. W. Knickerbocker ("The Red Trade Menace," page 274). "Its meaning in terms of trade and of world revolution remains the same. The Communist party's politics of world revolution have undergone a change. Originally the hope was that the proletariat of the 'bourgeois' countries would revolt, and help from Moscow to that end was a matter of course. Today the intention is to first build up

a powerful Soviet Union. Then, and not until then, although certainly then, the world revolution will fit into its place in the 'Fifteen-Year Plan' with the resources of an industrialized state of 150,000,000 to back it." The writer later says that the Socialist government of Russia "is bound by her own fundamental political philosophy to become a military aggressor."

The American business man approached, either to buy from or sell to the Socialist Government of Russia, is wholly unable to understand what is in the mind of the one seeking trade relations. In the first place the average American business man does not understand the philosophy of Socialism. Told that he is dealing with the Government of Russia impresses him. That word "government" means substantiability in his mind. Every form of government of which he knows anything recognizes the private property right. Every business transaction in which he has ever engaged was founded primarily on the recognition of that right. He can no more visualize a government that denies the individual this right than he can picture an armless baseball player. He has not the slightest conception of the theory upon which the Socialist Government of Russia is based. He does not know that a form of insanity guides the acts and thoughts of those in control. He resents anyone seeking to enlighten him and he simply will not make a study of the situation for himself. His whole life has been guided by one thought—making a success of his line of business.

Sir Ernest Benn in his book "About Russia" (page 15), elaborating this idea says: "The business man is the most limited of creatures, and quite properly so. If he really understands his job, if he is the master of all the intricate complications of making and selling the article in which he is concerned, whatever it may be, then it is at least unusual that he should have any brain power left for the understanding of wider and bigger questions. It may be said of the business man that the more he knows about his job, the less he knows about the world. * * *"

No one questions but that the average American executive has been successful. He knows his particular line. That, however, is all. As a matter of fact he has little conception of the fundamentals of our own form of Government. He has always possessed the property right and has profited thereby. To destroy that right appears to him so asinine that only an insane person would consider it for a minute. In an excess of altruism he has even given financial and moral support to certain so-called reforms the whole purpose of which was to destroy him and his business. But that, of course, he has failed to recognize. He has followed, not reluctantly but willingly, movements that propose to place undue and arbitrary restrictions upon an industry in which he is not interested. He has been led to believe that it would, in some manner, benefit him, or he has enjoyed seeing those injured squirm. Yet when some movement aimed an attack upon his industry he became exceedingly

angry. He has not stopped to reason that if, by restrictive legislation, the private property right of one industry is affected it is bound, in the final analysis, to affect the private property right of all. He has been perfectly willing, on the theory that it would directly benefit him, to experiment with a reformistic measure that, when in effect, would materially weaken our form of government.

And so no matter how able may be the average American business man when confronted with the clever representative of the Socialist Government of Russia, he is liable to "fall." This representative, in addition to calling attention to the fact that he is to deal with "a government" in control of over 150,000,000 people, larger than the United States, presents a mass of statistical data on the undeveloped resources and the man power of that country. Thinking not in the terms of the objectives of Communism—indeed, not having the slightest conception of what these objectives are—but thinking wholly in terms of profit, the transaction, either buying or selling, is consummated. The Socialist Government of Russia has annexed an ally.

In order to give a semblance of legitimacy to what are termed "trade relations" with the business men of the United States, the Amtorg Trading Corporation and similar companies have been formed. These are largely in the hands of men, not trained in industrial and business affairs, but instead skilled in revolutionary activities. Congressman Edward E. Eslick of Tennessee, a member of the special committee of the House of Representatives investigating Communist activities in the United States in an address to Congress, February 11, 1931, said of the Amtorg:

"I want to say something of the Amtorg Trading Corporation. It is the principal or largest Russian trading concern in the United States. It was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, but not a dollar of its stock is owned by an American citizen. It all stands of record in the name of Peter A. Bagdanov, trustee for the Bank of Foreign Trade of the Soviet Union; and this bank is owned by the State Bank of Russia, and that bank, in turn, is owned by the Soviet Government. The soviet people here never do anything directly, it is by indirection. Every director of the Amtorg Trading Corporation, with the single exception of a naturalized Russian, is a soviet citizen. Bagdanov and Ziaevkin, chairman of the board and general manager, are both Russian citizens, and were Communists and revolutionists before coming here. I fully believe this is true of them both now. And I do not believe that we have any place under our flag for them. I think they should be deported with several other Amtorg officials. * * *

"I fully believe Amtorg officials deliberately suppressed facts our committee should have had. They were not frank and candid. They evaded and tried to cover up. In my own mind, I have no doubt that Amtorg is filled with Communists. How can it be otherwise? It is the creature of a Communist country, owned body and soul by

Communists. Its highest officials were and are Communists. They hold their appointments, which are political, at the hands of Communists—once a Communist of this type, always a Communist—with the obligation on the part of every member to carry out the rules or orders of the Communist Party. Every chairman of its board has been a Communist. It is the arm of the Soviet Government in America, engaged in business when the communistic government, itself, could not come here and in its own name carry on business. ”

If a protective tariff is necessary to keep business stable in the United States by shutting out goods made where wages are less as, for instance, Great Britain, France, Germany, and other countries, how can the “dumping” of articles produced in Soviet Russia by what amounts to convict labor, produce the same results?

We state emphatically to Great Britain, France, Germany and other countries with whom we enjoy friendly relations by enacting a high tariff, that they cannot sell their goods in this country in competition with our own, then in the same breath, say to Soviet Russia with whom we do not enjoy friendly relations, “dump all the goods you want. It helps business.”

If the tariff has built American industries; if it has established a high wage scale; if it has generally increased business—and all seem to be in agreement on these points—how is the “dumping” of goods made by the Socialist government of Russia, where the property right is unknown and which insists on engaging in propaganda against us, going to build American industries, establish high wages and generally increase business? Why shut out goods from friendly nations and admit goods from an unfriendly one? The Soviet Government was formed to destroy capitalism—that is, the private property right. There is no other excuse for the existence of that government. Certainly no one will question that statement. All those in charge of it not only say that is their purpose but glory in it. Insisting, as they do in their literature designed wholly for the consumption of their own followers and yet to be purchased at almost any radical bookstore in the United States, that the world cannot exist part Communist and part Capitalist, they purpose to bring about a bloody revolution in every country in order that Capitalism may be abolished wherever it now exists. Writing of this determination, Walter Duranty in the New York Times, August 3rd, 1930, discounting the “bolshevist menace” in the United States and insisting we are making a “mountain out of a molehill” when we prevent their revolutionary program interfering with our trade, says:

“It is the whole *raison d’etre* and kernel of Marxism, Leninism and Stalinism, whichever you care to call it, that the world revolution is not only to be worked for and desired, but is inevitable.” Again, in the same article he writes:

"In practice—and I defy any Communist to prove the contrary—the program of 'hastening capitalist disintegration' is put into effect for everything the load will bear. The American Communist party is ordered to lose no chance of making political capital out of any industrial dispute, and emphasizing the 'class struggle.' It is ordered to conduct parades and demonstrations where occasion offers, to 'awake the consciousness of the colored population,' and generally to make trouble when and where it can. * * * Far from trying to deny it, the Kremlin glories in it." Then Mr. Duranty very naively writes:

"I consider that the 'Communist menace' in America, or in Britain for that matter, is preposterous nonsense and to allow it to interfere with business is well-nigh criminal imbecility."

One is forced to assume that this three-column article given prominent space on the editorial page of the New York Times had the approval of the official censors of Soviet Russia. It certainly carries a powerful suggestion to the American business man who is thinking—and cannot think otherwise—in terms of trade and profit, and does not even recognize a "lesson in revolution" when it batters down his own doors.

The logic of the writer is extremely faulty. To say that a government founded on the principles of Marx, openly engaged in creating disturbances in all so-called capitalist nations and proud of its achievements to date, is entitled to any consideration is to present an argument that is truly novel.

For a person to have any business relations of any kind or nature with one who frankly and boastingly admits the purpose of the relations is to destroy the one dealing with him, is "criminal imbecility," Walter Duranty to the contrary notwithstanding. Communism is out to destroy Capitalism and seeks Capitalism's aid in order that Communism may triumph. Every business deal whether selling an article to the Socialist Government of Russia or buying an article therefrom, is supplying a nail to fasten down the cover to the coffin in which the private property right is to be consigned.

The Permanent Bureau of the International Entente Against the Third International in a publication entitled "Trade With the Soviets" dated at Geneva, January, 1931, opens with these words:

"Purchases from the Soviets are dangerous, because a large part of the money paid serves for Communist propaganda in the country of the purchaser. The remainder is used chiefly to maintain in Russia the present regime of oppression and terror (expenditure on the Red Army and the G.P.U.).

"Purchases from the Soviets are immoral because the goods sold are derived from factories, mines, lands or forests *stolen* from their legitimate proprietors; the purchasers cannot but know this.

"In our civilized countries, whoever knowingly buys stolen goods is regarded as a dishonest person; scarcely less guilty than the thief. The fact that the thief is a government beyond reach of our laws in no way alters the immorality of buying what has been stolen.

"Purchases from the Soviets are also immoral from the fact that the goods sold are the outcome of the shameful exploitation of the Russian people, who are short of everything and suffer cruelly from these exportations.

"The Soviets have always done their utmost to hide from outsiders the poverty of their workers and the failure of the communist system. All their foreign propaganda on this subject is based on falsehood.

"Our organization has means of being well-informed as to what is happening in Russia; it considers it its duty to inform the general public.

"When the truth is known, it is to be hoped that the great mass of the proletariat will turn away, disgusted, from Communism and that public opinion will demand energetic measures against the *immoral* and *dangerous* Soviet trading." (Emphasis in original.)

The Washington Evening Star under date of December 15th, 1930, editorially said:

"* * * The people of this country are not losing sight of the fact that the prodigious five-year plan to convert Russia into a colossal productive machine is designed, primarily and eventually, to enable the Soviet to drench the 'capitalistic' world beyond its communistic borders with Russian commodities. The profits from those operations are to find their way into the Soviet national treasury, not into the hands of the people whose sweated brows and backs made the profits possible. The ultimate use of the foreign gold Russia thus plans to acquire has never been disguised. It is to be devoted to financing the 'world revolution.' Any other conception of the Soviet's economic maneuvers, on the face of its own unblushing admissions, is wholly unfounded."

The Washington Post, two days later, editorially remarked:

"* * * The volume of exports from Russia has nothing to do with the question at issue. The fact is that Russia is dumping upon the world market goods made in confiscated factories, from stolen materials and with slave labor. Proceeds from this ruthless industrial system are being used to strengthen the Soviet's grip and so promote a world revolution. Only a small quantity of goods is needed to demoralize a market, and so long as the reds are undermining the standards of civilization in the interests of their own system, the menace in their export program is real and imminent.
* * *

"Red Russia buys large quantities of machinery in the United

States to build up its own factories so that it can ruin American industry by selling at less than cost. That is what is called a 'profitable trade' with the Soviet. By accepting Communist goods the United States is helping the Communists to enslave the Russian people. At the same time it is exposing American enterprise to ruin. The menace of red competition has not yet become general, but if the United States continues to encourage the Communists in their revolutionary program the Soviet war on legitimate trade will extend to virtually all industries."

Legislation to restrict all trade relations with the Socialist Government of Russia has been proposed in the Congress. Nothing, however, of any particular value to this end, has as yet been enacted. The Treasury Department has adopted certain rulings which may, in part, prevent excessive "dumping," but the legislation proposed and the rulings now in effect are to be compared to scattering a few tacks along a well traversed highway on the theory that they will stop all motoring. We must go farther, much farther and much deeper, if we are even to halt a scheme to destroy us, a scheme that has been operating unobstructedly for more than thirteen years.

The ablest minds of the world concentrated upon this question—for all civilized countries are affected, in some of them the situation being most acute—hold that only through a world boycott of Russian products can the revolutions planned be averted. And there are those—likewise able students of the question—who hold that this will not suffice; that the Socialist Government of Russia is now too strongly entrenched; that it has established its contacts in too many countries; that the harm already done in China, India and other countries can not be repaired save after years of effort; that even should all nations refuse longer to trade with the Socialist Government of Russia, the so-called industrialization plan has so progressed that the Socialist Government of Russia can successfully resist any revolt from within, any armed intervention from without, and give the revolutionists of all countries, especially those of the Continent and Great Britain to say nothing of the Orient, aid and support that will crown their efforts with success.

While well informed persons may differ somewhat as to the present strength of Communism both in its own home and abroad, they are in perfect agreement that Socialism in action as practiced in Russia today constitutes the greatest menace that has yet confronted the world. That it is a cancer eating into the vitals of the body politic of all nations is certain. Whether major operations will be necessary in the end to cure the patients remains to be seen. This much is certain, unless we take every possible step to cure the ill as it exists in our own body politic, a premature national death will follow.

(Issued by the Educational Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, 120 West 42nd Street, New York City.)

(Copyright 1931)

LECTURE No. 15

SUMMING UP THE THEORY OF SOCIALISM

Today we come to the fifteenth and last lecture of this series. In these lectures I have sought merely to present for your careful consideration certain facts supported by documentary citations, much of which, I am sure, will not be controverted even by those who accept the theories of the Socialist School of Thought. Possibly you feel that, in some instances, sufficient evidence has not been presented to sustain my contentions. Naturally, because of lack of time, the documentary citations had to be brief and I hope all of you will pursue the study farther.

In this connection, let me suggest the careful reading—yes, studying—of the books of three writers. I commend for your consideration “A Survey of Socialism” (Macmillan) by Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw of London. This book is a complete expose of Socialism. Prof. Hearnshaw, with marked skill and in language which no one can mistake or misunderstand, piece by piece strips off the natty garments with which Socialism usually comes clothed and reveals the hideous form beneath. “The Socialism Movement” (Philip Allan & Co., London) by Prof. Arthur Shadwell, also of London, is valuable. This work in two volumes, both small, will give you a clear understanding of the growth of the movement, of the variations that marked the advent of each new exponent in the field, at the same time exposing the many fallacies found in the theories advanced by the Socialist School of Thought.

“Socialism, A Critical Analysis” by Prof. O. D. Skelton, Queen’s University, Canada (Houghton Mifflin Co.), written in 1911 and winning the Hart, Schaffner & Marx prize for that year, is especially interesting and valuable since Socialism was not then so prominent in the public eye. One point developed by Prof. Skelton which most authors have overlooked and which the average Socialist omits from the picture, is that when, under normal conditions and in a proper evolutionary way, the tendency is marked toward some social, economic or political improvement, the “re-

formers" seeking to hasten the accomplishment urge the adoption of legislation which "is always some scheme for the removal of one injustice by the infliction of a greater one," as Prof. John Rae ("Contemporary Socialism," page 9) expresses it.

Referring to the curious paradox expressed by Spencer that "the more things improve the louder becomes the exclamation about their badness," Prof. Skelton (page 17) writes:

"When women bore the heavy burdens and received what food was left after their lords and masters had eaten, there was little outcry as to the rights of women; today, when they have been given all but equal privileges"—this was written in 1911—"their grievances are proclaimed from the housetops. A century ago, when drunkenness was normal and the man who could not take his one or two bottles of wine was held a milksop, there was little agitation against the evils of drink; but today, when more exacting industrial demands and temperance propaganda has produced comparative sobriety, the prohibition movement sweeps whole states. So with the conditions of the average workingman of today as compared with that of his ancestors. It is beyond question that wages are higher, hours are shorter, housing is better, the death-rate lower. The state and private institutional philanthropy have been active to unparalleled degree in providing for him free education, free museums, free parks. Yet all these betterments have merely served to whet the appetite for more, to nourish the spirit of resistance, to foster a 'divine discontent'."

The Professor adds, "The success of the Socialist agitation depends not merely on the existence of serious industrial ills, but on the readiness of the masses to harken to the gospel of discontent."

Probably never in the history of the world, especially in the United States, have the people as a whole, enjoyed more advantages and better living conditions than today. And yet, never in the history of depressions and periods of unemployment, have we heard so much serious "howling," so many denouncing our formula of economics and our form of government, as today. Manufacturing discontent and then profiteering upon the product appears to be one of the best things the leaders of the Socialist School of Thought do.

The tendency today is to demand the Government act as a "sugar daddy" for the people. More and more do we find an ever

increasing number of our citizens turning away from the natural desire to support themselves, to the unnatural desire to have the government support them. One is impelled to ask, "If the Government is to support all the citizens who is left to support the Government? If paternalism is carried too far will not the government of necessity break down? If it breaks down may we expect a form similar to that now practiced in Russia?"

It was not the purpose of those who sponsored these lectures and who did me the honor of asking me to prepare and present them, to convert any one to a policy of sound Americanism. We assumed, in advance, that those who would hear or would read these lectures were such Americans. It must be clear to every person who stops to do a bit of thinking for himself that something is radically wrong in this land of ours. Men and women are going about denouncing the government and its institutions, demanding certain "rights" yet refusing to perform certain duties.

Arthur H. Vanderburg, editor, now United States Senator from Michigan, in 1923 brought out a book "If Hamilton Were Here Today" which I recommend most highly. Dealing with the inconsistent attitude of the radicals, Mr. Vanderburg (page 51) writes:

"How inconsistent is the attitude of the radical propagandist who, in one breath, purposes the destruction of the American form of Government, and, in the next breath, appeals to the Government and the Constitution for protection of his 'rights' when some one tries to rob him of his privilege of 'free speech'! A mass meeting in Madison Square Garden, New York City, on May 31, 1917, demanded 'that the government shall not suspend the liberties of the people as guaranteed by the Constitution', and contemporaneously resolved to deny all support to those war measures through which the preservation of the Government and the Constitution were possible! They demanded defense and voiced defiance in the same apostrophe. They sought the sanctuary and deserted it, in one single movement. How, pray, could the Constitution and the Government, unsupported by their subjects, provide their subjects with the protection which depended upon the reciprocal support which their subjects withdrew?"

First, insinuations and then open attacks are being made upon our institutions. The church is being assailed and the home demoralized. Bolder and bolder have grown those who engage in these forms of assaults. We discover that slowly but certainly a

change has come over many of the teachers in our public schools and professors in our colleges. Notwithstanding the fact that they owe all they have—their very positions—to our form of government and our institutions, they are vigorously seeking to destroy them. Why, we are all asking ourselves? Is it accidental, or, is it premeditated? What do those who engage in this sort of thing hope to gain? What is their motive?

I have tried in these lectures to show you that all this is not accidental but premeditated; that it is all part of a World Revolutionary Movement to destroy our existing government and institutions on the theory that those who thus destroy will reap a rich reward, or, as commonly believed by innocent followers, on the theory they will abolish all social, political and economic ills. If we, as a nation, are suffering from such ills, we want to apply a proper remedy. Ere we can do so, however, we must know the germ of each such ill. I have sought to uncover the germ. Let me now briefly summarize the facts we have developed which facts are supported by a mass of documentary and circumstantial evidence, far more than it has been possible here to present.

Back of, and responsible for, all that is termed radicalism in the United States whether appearing under the name of Socialism, Communism, I.W.W.-ism, Anarchism, and at times and in some quarters, as "Internationalism," "Liberalism" and "Pacifism," is just one thing—

A proposal to abolish the private property right.

Since our form of government recognizes that right and protects the individual in the exercise thereof, in order to destroy the right, it becomes necessary, first, to destroy that which makes the right effective, namely, the Government. When this has been done, in order that the right may not be recognized, it becomes necessary to set up a form of Government that refuses to protect and defend any person in the exercise thereof. Hence the many subversive movements seeking directly, or indirectly, to overthrow the Government of the United States some of these movements operating along legal and others along illegal lines.

"The Communist Manifesto" of Marx and Engels is the bible of all advancing the proposal to abolish the private property right. In that Manifesto the authors state that their theory can be "*summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.*"

Later in the same document the idea is expressed in this language:

*"You are horrified at our intending to do away with your private property. * * * Precisely so; that is just what we intend."*

As that language is altogether too harsh, too specific and too plain for our day, and particularly in the United States, and would not, if employed, gain the support of a certain rather large, so-called "liberal" element, it has been cleverly changed to read, *"Production for use and not for profit."*

The objective of the authors of the "Communist Manifesto," restated in almost the same language by many, and in a rather confused language by others, is based on the fallacious promise—

That the germ of all social, political and economic ills is the private property right.

Those who accept and advance this theory are divided into two groups, those of each being actuated by wholly different motives—one by a sense of humanitarianism and the other by greed. While, as a matter of fact, those constituting these two groups have nothing whatever in common the very nature of their false premise forces them to act harmoniously together to the one end—

The abolition of the private property right.

Those in the first named group, the majority of whom possibly can be called idealists or "dreamers," accepting the fallacious theory of Marx and Engels, take the position that before the social, political and economic ills which constantly arise to pester us can be eradicated and a "new social order" wherein none of these ills will appear can be established, not only must the private property right be destroyed but the Government that recognizes that right must likewise be destroyed.

Those in the second group are not actuated by any noble, humanitarian impulse. They adopt the false premise wholly because it serves their purpose. They cooperate with, indeed are the guiding and directing forces back of the first named group, not because they are seeking to cure any of our economic, social or political ills, but because those so desiring serve their purpose. What they are seeking is the wealth of the nation. *And they have a plan to secure it.* Their line of reasoning is much like this:

"All the wealth of the United States has been acquired by, and is now in the possession of, those who have any share in that

wealth, no matter how small, because the people possess and have exercised the private property right; the government of the United States defends those who possess this wealth in their right thereto. In other words, the *title* to all wealth (they generally use the word capital) rests in the individual primarily because of the form of government. Destroy that form and set up one which refuses to recognize the private property right principle, one that will bring to bear all its power and force to prevent any individual attempting to exercise such a right, and the title to all wealth (capital) automatically will be transferred to such a government. (Up to this point, those advancing this theory to acquire the wealth of nations have been successful in Russia.)

“When the destruction has been accomplished and they (those of the group actuated by greed) are in complete and absolute control of the new government, they will slowly and cautiously return to the private property right principle and the wealth of the nation held by the government, by a very simple process, will be transferred to them—the ones who control the government.”

“It is the lure of loot” that motivates those of this group, writes Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw of London College (England). He adds: “Their passions—cupidity, acquisitiveness, jealousy, envy, hatred, malice and malignancy—and not their intellects are their guides and their dictators.”

Those in the first named group are far more numerous and they present the greatest menace. They are too emotionally-minded to be stable or to be sound in their reasoning. They see evils and ills which greatly disturb them. They seek a quick and efficacious remedy. While these evils and ills—all due to human traits—have long afflicted mankind, the “liberals” of each succeeding generation, especially the present one, appear to think they are new and are to be easily and speedily corrected by some form of legislation. As those in this group are usually men and women of some standing and reputation—leaders in social work, ministers, teachers, etc.—they naturally gather about them a large following. Having *accepted the leadership*, those thus following *accept the remedy* without giving it the slightest consideration. The assurance of their leaders is enough for them.

Those in the second named group are comparatively few in number. Generally speaking they are oriental-minded; that is, they employ deception, fraud, intrigue, secrecy and conspiracy to

attain their ends. This makes it an easy matter for them to gain the confidence and, naturally, the aid and support of the idealists and "dreamers." They well understand that should they frankly and openly state that their purpose is to destroy the private property right of all the people of the United States in order that they might acquire this wealth for themselves, the resistance would be overwhelming. Therefore, they induce the idealist group to believe the occasion for their position is to cure certain economic, social and political ills and since this result is uppermost in the minds of those in the first named group, they become front line advocates.

Socialism is the correct name for the theory. Communist is *not* a distinct and separate theory. On the contrary, the *objectives* of those who call themselves Socialists and the *objectives* of those who call themselves Communists are precisely the same, namely—

The abolition of the private property right.

To attain this end both Socialists and Communists logically contend that the overthrow of our form of Government and the setting up of a wholly different form becomes necessary.

Communism is the name given to a specific method adopted to put Socialism into practice in the United States. The technical name applied by those who adopt the method is "mass, or direct, action." This involves the use of force, violence and acts of terrorism in order to bring about a bloody civil war or revolution—a civil war between the "classes," they call it.

Socialism is not only the name of the theory itself but it is also the name of a specific method adopted to put the theory into practice in the United States. The technical name applied by themselves is "legislative, or parliamentary, action." This involves the adoption of constitutional amendments, federal and state, or the enactment of laws, federal or state, which amendments, if and when adopted, and which laws and when enacted, will, in some form or manner, interfere with the proper exercise of the private property right, or will, in some form or manner, weaken the whole governmental structure.

In the final analysis the *method* of the Socialists to put the theory into operation here is far more to be feared than is the *method* of the Communists, because but few people grasp the true purpose of the many so-called reformistic measures, and such measures have the support of those in the first group above mentioned, although

almost invariably originally proposed by those of the last named group. Already this method has played an important part, both in weakening the private property right and preventing the proper operation of certain departments of the government as such operation is prescribed by the Constitution.

The diseases resulting from this germ are manifested in many forms—

Organizations working to destroy all forms of national defense; even to the point of complete disarmament;

Organizations working to destroy all forms of religion and establish pure atheism;

Organizations working to secure the abolition of the sacred institutions of marriage;

Organizations engaged in a persistent effort to destroy the sentiments of patriotism and national loyalty, especially in the rising generation;

Organizations working to destroy the confidence of the people in the private property right and in our form of government;

And there are many more.

The last named manifestation of the disease created by the germ called Socialism, takes diverse forms as it operates in different groups—

One form among the farmers;

One among the wage-earners;

Another among the church members;

Another among the women's clubs;

Another among those of the so-called middle class;

Another among those of the so-called "intelligentsia;"

And so on down the line.

Every social, economic and political evil, as it becomes prominent because of some passing phase of our life is, at once pounced upon as a means for propaganda and, without delay, some character of legislation is urged for the cure of the ill. Morris Hillquit, a recognized Socialist authority, ("Socialism Summed Up," page 86) referring to the many legislative proposals foisted upon the people because of the prevailing belief that they would cure some ill then prominent, writes:

"Such measures of social reform are, as a rule, originally formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thoroughgoing lines.

They become the object of a persistent and widespread propaganda, and finally they acquire the force of popular demands. At this state the 'progressive' and sometimes even the 'conservative' statesmen of the dominant political parties begin to realize the political significance of the proposed measures. The Vox Populi means many votes on election day * * * ”.

Evidence is not lacking that altogether too many of our so-called statesmen have seen the “political aspect” of these reformistic measures and too few of them the “moral aspect.”

All who accept the theory of the “abolition of the private property right” or, as some state it, “production for use and not for profit,” are followers of what we commonly term the Socialist School of Thought. The movement, as a whole, is known as the World Revolutionary Movement. This is divided into two wings, or factions, one known as the Right, the followers of which are called Socialists, and one known as the Left, the followers of which are called Communists. Each operate under the direct direction of an International.

These two Internationals are instruments erected on the surface to carry on different lines of activities, furthering the policies and purposes of the secret World Revolutionary Movement. These two Internationals lay down the programs, the aims, the methods and the activities of all subsidiary organizations affiliating with them.

These two Internationals enter into, and operate in, the United States through two organizations, one known as the Socialist Party and the other as the Communist Party each, in turn, operating through many subsidiary organizations and movements.

Now to repeat for emphasis. Socialism and Communism are one and the same thing insofar as aims, purposes and objectives are concerned. Persons following the Right, or Socialist, Wing of the movement adopt as their major activities what they term “legislative action,” and those following the Left, or Communist, Wing adopt as their major activities what they term “mass or direct action.” Each Wing, at times, accepts the major activities of the other, and both Wings solidify and present a united front when engaged in any attack upon our form of government, our institutions or our economic system.

The specific work of the Socialist Wing is to engage in activities which will weaken our form of government. The specific work of the Communist Wing is to engage in activities which will precipitate a revolution when the weakening process has progressed far enough. In order to gain the support of well-meaning but misguided individuals generally called “liberals,” the Socialist wing presents as effective cure for our economic, political and social ills, some character of legislation. Such legislation, however, in truth is proffered

not to cure the ill *per se* but to weaken our form of government and our economic system so that the day of the revolution may be hastened. The Communists are training men and women to act as commanders in such revolution through testing them by means of rioting connected with strikes, protest meetings, assaults on constituted authority, etc., which "tryouts" are called "lessons in revolution."

As a part of the weakening process both Wings are engaged in systematic assaults upon the church and the home because they are parts of our present "social order." To gain an ever increasing number of adherents, both wings are engaged in inoculating the children and the youth of today with their theories. And to make their revolution which they all insist is "just around the corner" successful, both wings unite in a common assault upon all forms of national defense being especially bitter in their attacks upon military training among youths of the land.

The argument presented for all these activities is that if the present "social order"—that is our form of government, our institutions including the church and the home and our economic system which grants the private property right—is destroyed, there will emerge from the wreckage something called the "new social order" which will be far superior to the present one.

But they advance neither evidence nor logic that this "new social order" will be an improvement.

In the above summary, I have stated the main facts. I am sure if you have followed the evidence submitted you will agree that, as I have stated it, the case has been established. Then, as you begin to array with this the evidence collected through your own reading and observation, must be forced to the conclusion that the situation is one that demands public attention.

In this series of lectures we have dealt largely with the theories of the Socialist School of Thought and the methods employed to put that theory into practice in the United States. We have said but little about the fallacies that underlie the doctrine since many able writers have handled that phase of the subject. In this connection we especially commend the book of Prof. Hearnshaw mentioned at the beginning of this lecture.

When we have turned from the theory advanced by the Socialist School of Thought to ascertain how that theory works when put into operation, we have, of necessity, referred to Socialist Russia. Until quite recently the advocates of Socialism, and its many apologists, have admitted that in Russia the entire population has been placed in the crucible of Socialism. Indeed, for several years after this "experiment" was well under way, the Socialists of the United States were loud in their praise of the system, and gave it their full support, bitterly assailing all who took an opposite position.

Until within, possibly, the last two years, all propagandists and apologists for the system denied, with great emphasis, that the people of Russia were suffering untold hardships; that all labor was forced—in effect, convict; that thousands were actually starving; that morality was at its lowest ebb, and that a campaign of force and violence was being waged to destroy every vestige of religion; that the whole system was held together by terrorism.

The facts, however, slowly but surely reached the American people. The evidence adduced to sustain the above and similar charges was so overwhelming that even the most pronounced apologists—those who have some respect for the truth—admitted them. In almost the same breath, however, they denied that the system of economics and government employed in Russia was neither Socialism nor Communism but, instead, "State Capitalism."

There are two outstanding reasons for the inauguration of a propaganda campaign to show that "State Capitalism," rather than Socialism, is being practiced in Russia. In the first place it will take the curse from Socialism and place it upon Capitalism; and in the second place, if a form of Capitalism, then a great appeal can be made to those whose financial aid is now being sought to advance the "experiment," which is to bring about a World Revolution.

Socialism in the United States now rests under a "curse" brought upon it by its followers who, when we were forced into the World War, not only refused to give the Government their aid and support, but took a most decided stand against it, thus aiding and benefiting the enemy. Apparently it was the belief of the advocates of the Socialist School of Thought that the "experiment" in Russia would prove all their claims for the theory and so make their task of inducing the people of the United States to adopt Socialism all the easier. The disappointment has been great. There seems but one way out—remove the additional curse placed upon the theory by the dismal failure in Russia.

Again, it would appear, that if the industrial leaders of the United States and other so-called Capitalist nations, can be deceived into the belief that the form in operation in Russia is Capitalistic, rather than Socialistic, they will more readily and with greater confidence, enter into trade relations. If the Socialist Government of Russia is unable to carry out its so-called "industrialization plan," if it fails to flood the markets of the world with its convict produced material, thus creating a demoralized world economic condition, and attain its ultimate aim—world revolution—it falls of its own weight. If it is Socialism on trial—and certainly it is nothing else—then Socialism has received a set-back for many generations. If it is a form of Capitalism on trial—which certainly it is not—then Capitalism has received a severe blow.

The phrase "State Capitalism" we fear, was invented, as the phrase "production for use and not for profit" was invented, wholly to deceive. Clearly the "noble experiment" on trial in Russia is not "State Capitalism" since the very essence of Capitalism is absent.

Capitalism is founded on the individual private property right: Socialism is founded on the absence of that right. Any system of economics or government that denies that right to the individual, therefore, is not related to Capitalism, but is related to Socialism. The beverage known as coffee is founded upon—its essence is—the coffee bean. The beverage known as tea is founded upon—its essence is—the leaves of the tea plant. Any beverage, therefore founded upon—the essence of which is—the coffee bean, certainly is not related to the beverage tea.

The main thing in connection with the individual property right in forming the foundation—the essence of—Capitalism is not what one may have attained because of the exercise of the right but *the possession of the right itself*. Every person in the United States—alien as well as citizen—possesses the right to own property. The mere fact that some have so exercised the right that they have attained much property and others, failing, refusing or neglecting to exercise that right, have attained no material wealth, does not affect the importance of *the right*.

Under the Constitution of the United States—and the United States is a Capitalist country—every person, aliens as well as citizens, has certain rights. These rights, belonging to the individual, can not be interfered with by the State, save by due process of law. For instance, if a citizen you have the right to vote. You may never have exercised that right but you can exercise it if you wish and the State can not interpose an objection. You have the right to maintain a home of your own. You may not have exercised it but the right is yours just the same. You have the right to travel wherever you wish. You may not have gone ten miles from your place of residence, but the State can not and does not interfere in your roaming about all you choose.

You have the right to engage in any line of business you wish, or to accept any character of employment offered you and this without the State interfering. Whether you are a success in your chosen line of business or the position accepted, is not a matter of economic system or governmental form, but remains wholly with you and your native attainments.

Now all of these rights belong to the individual under our formula of economics and our form of government. They are rights which naturally follow the keystone one—that of private property. While, theoretically, these rights, save the primary one, exist under Socialism, in practice we have found they do not in fact exist. The individual becomes a nonentity. The State becomes supreme, and these

individual rights, by the very nature of the Socialist theory, can not exist because, if they did, the whole superstructure would fall.

"The individual is never alone but is always merged in the masses," writes Arthur Feiler ("The Socialist Experiment," Eng. translation, pages 284-9). "The collective man is a public being. There exists nothing but the masses, and thought itself has become standardized."

Locating the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, hunting for the fountain of perpetual youth, seeking a system of society wherein all will be equal in every respect and wherein, with little or no effort, one can enjoy unlimited luxuries, are things that have engaged the attention of mankind from the beginning of written history. There is no pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. There is no fountain of perpetual youth. There is not, and can not be, a society such as idealists have pictured, so long as man exhibits traits of envy, jealousy, greed, avarice, lust, shiftlessness, laziness, etc. Man has learned that the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow and the fountain of perpetual youth are myths, but, unfortunately, man has not yet learned that a social and political Utopia is also a myth.

Baboeuf, I believe it was, who more than a hundred and fifty years ago said, "Let everything return to chaos and from chaos let there arise a new regenerated world." Some years before Jean Jacques Rosseau presented the foundation for Baboeuf's statement. Of Rosseau, Elpihas Levi ("The History of Magic," page 422) writes:

"Once there was a man in the world who was soured on discovering that his disposition was cowardly and vicious, and he visited the consequent disgust on society at large. He was an ill-starred lover of Nature and Nature in her wrath armed him with eloquence as a scourge. He dared to plead the cause of ignorance in the face of science, of savagery in the face of civilization, of low-lived depths in the face of all social heights. Instinctively the populace pelted his mania, yet he was welcomed by the great and lionized by the women. His success was so signal, by revulsion his hatred of humanity increased, and he ended in suicide as the final issue of rage and disgust. * * * After his death the world was shaken by its attempt to realize his dream."

About a century later there appeared another man, Marx, who sounded the cry "Workers of the World Unite!" and with that slogan sought to carry on the scheme to "return everything to chaos." In our day others have forced themselves to the front—Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and their co-workers—each seeking to wreck vengeance upon society as a whole because of their own deficiencies, or motivated in their effort to "return everything to choas" by the "lure of loot."

Then there are others, possibly best classified as idealists, who translate the words of Baboeuf, Rosseau, Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and

Stalin into "the Brotherhood of Man." Their desire is, so they say, to establish a true Heaven on earth.

A large number of books have been written detailing accounts of the many experiments to establish this Utopia. In the early days of the Socialist movement, those who dreamed they could accomplish the impossible, who dreamed they could, by a mere system of regulation, destroy certain human traits, did not predicate the success of their experiment on the destruction of governments and everything erected by governments. It was not until the advent of Karl Mordechai, better known as Karl Marx, that the dream took the form of a nightmare. It may be that with the deep cunning which marked the career of this man, back of which cunning seemed a Satanic desire to bring injury to mankind in general, Marx recognized that the society he painted to be impossible of realization, but that since the hope would fire the imagination of man, he could "return everything to chaos." He it was who predicated the success of Socialism on the destruction of all unlike Socialism.

J. H. Beadle, a very early day western newspaper man presented his experiences in a book called "Western Wilds, and the Men Who Redeemed Them." This book, copyright in 1878, was printed by a publishing house long since out of existence. In this Mr. Beadle tells of meeting one Rodney Geffroy, then an old prospector, near Georgetown, Colorado. Geffroy was the son of a Swiss mother and a French father. His father had been fired by the writings of Rousseau. When yet a young man not out of his teens, young Rodney satisfied that the wonderful Socialist society about which he dreamed, could not be found in Europe, and hearing much of the wonderful United States, migrated to this country. He visited New Harmony, a Socialist colony in Indiana.

"At New Harmony I found the short-lived experiment a failure," he said. "Communism was even less satisfactory. The religious communes I found intolerable from their plentiful lack of common sense. I turned my steps toward Nauvoo, then rising into prominence as the last and greatest attempt to establish a religious brotherhood. But there I found all the evils of the old system with few of their corresponding benefits; priestcraft without paternal care, greed without a thought of future reckoning, insuring the defeat of their own aims, and a fanaticism which scorned the commonest suggestions of prudence."

And so he traveled on, ever seeking his Utopia. But he found it not. "Practical life has taught me to dream no more of the Brotherhood of Man; that liberty and progress are to be secured by no cunningly devised schemes, but earned by slow and toilsome steps of the individual," he said. "I saw more clearly that a free republic, with all its faults, is still the best attainable government."

And so the young seeker after Utopia, this wonderful "new social order," joined a troop engaged to fight with Mexico. In a

battle, while seeking to escape, his horse jumped a cliff. He was injured. When he regained consciousness he found himself in a little hut attended by a Spanish girl. She nursed him back to something like health but knowing that, if discovered—and she lived in enemy territory,—he would be executed, she hired an Indian to take him to a Moqui Indian town in the Sierra Madre range in what is now New Mexico. After many days travel he reached the place and, when he told the chief who sent him, was graciously received. This village of primitive Indians was a pure Socialist institution. Speaking of it, Geffroy said:

“The government, if government it might be called, was a pure paternalism; but repression was unnecessary because crime could scarcely be said to exist. At last, said I, I have found the Brotherhood of Man. There is no scheming of man to supplant his fellow; here all are equal and obedience to natural law with mutual toleration, takes the place of courts and statutes.”

Here young Geffroy lived a year until his health was fully regained. Continuing his account of this Socialist experiment, he said:

“But I soon found that in parting with most of the faults of a progressive race, they had parted with many of its virtues and all of its advantages. There was no envy for there was no emulation; the weak were not trodden down by the strong in a struggle for place, for there was no struggle. There was no caste, for there was neither rank nor wealth; a dead level of social mediocrity took place of our many distinctions of birth and condition. They had not the petty vices of the trading people, as they had little intercourse with the rest of mankind; nor the faults of the manufacturing towns for every family was its own manufacturer. Political strife never disturbed them, for there was no choice as to the form of government, and no energy to change the ruler. The chief did not rob the people, for they had nothing worth his taking; the people did not envy their king, for he was poor as themselves. Luxury and its attendant vices they knew not; the land sufficed but for a bare existence; and unchastity was so rare as to be looked upon as a monstrous phenomenon. But this chastity resulted from the lack of aggressive energy. No military ambition disturbed the placid current of their lives; they scarcely knew how to defend themselves against their savage neighbors, and retiring in to these rock-defended fastnesses, had left the open country to their foes.

“Then I say that energy is evolved only in conflict; that a vigorous combat with evil develops the individual, and that a state from which ambition should be banished to leave the citizen free from conflict, would be a state in which moral vigor would in turn decay, and social stagnation as a living tomb, swallow up the proudest product of the march of minds. With these people one day passed as another. Whether they had a belief in immortality, I could not learn; but they might well ignore it since even in this world they were already dead. Beyond the narrow horizon of their hills, they saw

nothing; this basin was to them the world. Ambition had no place in their dull emotions. One year I abode with these people. It was a rest; but for a lifetime—ah, that would be consignment to a living tomb.”

Truly a state of society where all men are equal, have equal, do equal—a dead level—would be a living tomb; And yet in the face of the evidence, in the face of the horrors which have marked the advent of Socialism in Russia where the ruthlessness of one ruler has given place to far more ruthlessness on the part of another ruler, in the face of sound reason and common sense, men and women continue to join the army in search of the impossible. Far better would it be to revive the fables of old that, at the end of the rainbow was a pot of gold for whomsoever might reach it, or that somewhere on this globe was a spring the water of which would give a person eternal youth, and set bodies of men and women in pursuit of the gold or perpetual youth. Less harm to humanity, at least, would result.

Responsible for this mad desire to “return everything to chaos,” or to establish a Utopia on earth, is a *fixed belief*, that all present day social, economic and political ills are due to the private property right, and to all forms of government which recognize that right and protect and defend the individual in the exercise thereof.

This *belief* is founded wholly on a false premise followed by illogical reasoning. The germ, then, of all we term radicalism, no matter under what name it appears, is this *false belief* in the theory of Socialism. Destroy the *belief* and the diseases that result from it disappear. The germ can be destroyed by making the truth known. This can be done by a clear and dispassionate presentation of the facts, evidence and logic. Two steps are necessary:

First: Demonstrate by established and indisputable evidence and unassailable logic that the social, economic and political ills we experience are not due to the private property right, nor are they due to our form of government, but on the contrary are due to human traits, faults and frailties; and

Second: Demonstrate, in the same way, that the legislation proposed, presumably to correct some or all of these ills, instead of accomplishing the result would merely create new and more serious ills.

There is no evidence of any kind—only wild assumptions—that the remedies proposed by those who follow the Socialist School of Thought would attain the results sought. There is abundant evidence that a system of economics based upon the private property right, and a form of government which protects and defends the individual in the exercise thereof have resulted in the present advanced position of the civilized world.

(Issued by the Educational Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, 120 West 42nd Street, New York City.)