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Printed in the United States of America
Democracy Versus Dictatorship

What is the fundamental difference between democracy and dictatorship?
A democracy is based on the force of argument, while a dictatorship rests on the argument of force.

What is the greatest essential of a civilization?
The spirit of free inquiry.

Why do you consider democracy superior to dictatorship?
Because I believe in the absolute freedom of man's intellect, for only through freedom of inquiry can we hope to achieve truth and social progress, culture and dignity. Because I believe no social or political system is worth its salt unless it permits unlimited criticism. Because I believe suppressed data regarding industry, business, government and international relations eventually strangle the best in a nation. Because I believe that authority taken without the consent of the people, and exercised without answer to the wishes of the people, means the end of free judgment, and that means social decay. There is plenty of suppression in a democracy, but the cure for this evil is more democracy, not less. Democracy is still an imperfect instrument, because it is so recent in origin, but in it lies the hope of organized man.

Does our Constitution guarantee individualistic capitalism to the exclusion of Socialism?
For some decades corporation lawyers, nominating themselves as experts on the U. S. Constitution, have been arguing in favor of the viewpoint that so long as the Constitution stands Socialism cannot be legally established.

It is their contention that the Constitution is a defense of the individualistic philosophy as opposed to a cooperative economy, and that the Constitution must be abolished or changed before Socialism can be inaugurated. They base their argument on two loose, vague phrases, as follows: "due process" and "just compensation." These clauses are supposed to guarantee the right of the private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. An examination of the clauses will show anyone that these constitutional authorities are all wet. If the people, acting through Congress, decide to socialize the railroads, banks, power plants, etc., and if they pass a socialization law, isn't that in strict accord with the "due process" clause? It most certainly is.

If the people, through Congress, apply the right of eminent domain to the industries, banks, etc., doesn't that give the government the right to establish a valuation on those properties? And doesn't the government have to take into consideration only real, honest, current values? And if the government says a socialized property is worth just so many dollars and issues that much money to pay for it, doesn't that make the action in complete harmony with the "just compensation" clause of the Constitution?
After all the capitalistic ballyhoo and propaganda, we come down to the simple proposition that the people have the right, under the Constitution, to establish Socialism, or any other economy that appeals to the majority.

The Constitution is not committed to capitalism. Capitalism has grown up naturally, through the evolution of the machine and the development of scientific, mass pro-
duction. There was nothing in the Constitution to hinder its growth, which was right and proper, for it is the contention of scientific Socialists that capitalism had to develop before the social organism would be ready for socialization.

Capitalism, with all its exploitation and speculation and profiteering, has been a useful development in social history. It has applied science to industry and has taught man how to produce an abundance.

Capitalism didn’t care about distributing its products fairly to all worthy men and women workers; it was concerned only with profits. Now comes the time when, in order to meet a tremendous crisis, Americans must solve the question of wealth distribution. This can be done only through the socialization of the large-scale industries. And this socialization can be inaugurated under our Constitution, if the will of the people is expressed behind this great program.

That’s why it is foolish to talk about a revolution in America—a revolution of force and violence. There is no need for such a course. Direct action is all to the good in the lands of dictators like Hitler and Mussolini, for those governments do not allow the people an orderly means of expressing their will at the ballot box. But in the United States conditions are different. Here we have a certain amount of Democracy, and the people have the power to bring about great social changes through orderly, legal, civilized, decent means.

Not a drop of blood need be shed. Not a clause in the Constitution need be violated. We have the machinery—under the Constitution—to bring about Socialism, and when the American people see the logic of the Socialist position there’ll be no power big enough to stand in their way. Don’t scrap the Constitution, because it is still a useful document in the defense of personal rights and social policies. Socialism can be brought about by constitutional means.

* * *

Why do you continue to believe in the nonsense of democratic counting of heads?

Because it is better to count heads under democracy than to break heads under a dictatorship.

* * *

What good does democracy do the exploited wage slaves in capitalist countries?

It can’t do them a great deal of good so long as they are too dumb to see the injustice of capitalism and the advantages of socialized industry. But such boneheadedness isn’t the fault of democracy. So long as democracy gives the workers a weapon with which to change society peacefully and legally, we can’t help seeing the virtue of civil and political rights. Democracy does not prevent us from educating the workers to the benefits of Socialism.

Democracy does not deny us the right to print and distribute our opinions against capitalism and for Socialism.

Democracy protects us in the right to meet peaceably, to vote for the parties of our choice, to petition our government, to change or abolish that government if we so will it.

And despite the dumbness of the workers in their endless support to capitalistic ideas, it is pretty obvious that those who live in democratic countries are better off than those who live in lands ruled by dictators and tyrants. I’d a thousand times rather live in England or the United States, with all their faults and shortcomings, than in the land of the Hitlers, the Mus-solinis, the Dollfusses, the Pilsudskis and the Stalins. I don’t want dictators of fascism, capitalism or Communism.

Political democracy is not a cure-all, but it is a firm foundation on which to build social justice. Now that we have political democracy, let’s get to work and bring about industrial democracy. The job is only begun. Willing workers are needed.

The cause of socialized industry needs educators and agitators, and you should name yourself as a committee of one to do your share
in the great work of bringing social intelligence to your neighbors, friends and fellow workers.

You can do this great work in this country without the fear of Hitleristic concentration camps. You don't have to dread summary arrest and execution. You don't have to hide your principles and ideals. You can talk as you please, short of provoking disorder. You can circulate the kind of printed matter that promotes your philosophy of social action that will bring democracy to industry. No star chamber inquisition is threatening you. There are no headsmen waiting to destroy you because you propose social objectives unacceptable to labor's exploiters.

None of these expressions of dictatorship threaten you, and yet there is great inertia, plain laziness, and almost criminal indifference, especially at a time when conditions are rotten ripe for establishing a Cooperative Commonwealth.

The fact that we are not making rapid headway is the fault of no one but ourselves. You readers who approve of socialized industry and do nothing to propagate Socialism are the real enemies of progress. I don't blame the capitalists for exploiting you, since you are too lifeless to take your part in the great work of bringing knowledge and light to the blind victims of capitalism.

* * *

Do you believe that ours is a bogus democracy?

No. What there is of it is very real and useful. My objection is not that it is bogus but that it is all too limited. We have only begun to apply democracy to our lives, and unless we go ahead with the task and finish it we will find ourselves overwhelmed economically, industrially and culturally. We have begun to apply democracy to politics, and with success. Our Constitution (which is a democratic document) guarantees us free speech, free press, free assembly and other benefits of democracy. The Constitution does not stand in the way of an extension of political democracy, and—what is even more important—the application of democracy to industry and economics. Democracy is worth something only when there's a lot of it around. Dole out democracy with a tiny spoon and you find yourself in trouble. And that's what troubles us now—we have limited democracy instead of expanding it. The next state of society demands socialized industry, which is another way of saying industrial democracy. When we make democracy a reality—in politics, the shops, the banks, the public utilities and the large-scale industries—we will be on the road to economic emancipation, for the avenues of life will be opened for a fuller and more civilized mode of living. Man will then be able to produce in abundance—not for capitalist masters, but for the service of humanity. Such a system of society will let loose man's tremendous capacities for useful and productive labor. Given such an order of economy and we can make every dictatorship, fascist principle and class system look like a peanut stand alongside a mass production industry. No, let us quit this foolish talk about "bogus" democracy and get to work removing the limitations set on democracy by selfishly interested class exploiters.

* * *

Are we Americans ready to scrap Democracy?

Plato said that democracy is "the best form of bad government." Thomas Paine said, in Common Sense, that all government is evil. To get at something akin the truth, one should say that government, being a necessary evil, is best endured in democracy.

There have been good autocrats in the past, but the danger of their kind of a government is that there is no guarantee that the good autocrat may not be supplanted by a bad autocrat at a moment's notice. If there were some sort of assurance that all dictators would auto-
matically become good rulers, preserving peace, justice and freedom, encouraging culture, art and education, then dictators would not be amiss. But a good dictator is as hard to find as an intelligent censor, for if a censor were intelligent he wouldn’t want to be a censor.

Democracy is certainly not a perfect form of government. Sometimes it works quickly, effectively, surely. Sometimes it gets wound up in red tape and stops all activity. But that doesn’t mean that democracy should be shelved. Democracy is still the best form of government, if you believe that it is important to have the right to speak your mind, use the printing press freely, meet with your fellow citizens, control the lawmakers, select the administrators, and base the conduct of the country on law instead of the man.

I’d rather live under the worst democracy than under the best dictatorship. Democracy has made wonderful contributions to civilization, and if we were to lose democracy we should be in danger of losing civilization.

While it is true that we, in the United States, have not yet achieved pure democracy, the fact remains that we enjoy the forms of democracy and that we retain the powers that can, in time, make democracy a reality.

With all its faults, American democracy still recognizes the right to a free press. We still have the right to hold meetings, even though there are police officials here and there who seem to think otherwise. We still have the right to denounce all religion or adopt any form of worship, as suits our mind. We still have the right to vote and elect legislators, who are answerable to the people, and if they don’t get just laws the blame rests with the people and not with the theory of government, though there is always at hand the corrective power of education. America, with its imperfect democracy, has made wonderful progress. In time, without the “help” of a fascist dictator, we can make even greater headway, for we have the power, if only we use it, to change this country to a social system of peace and plenty and security.

Again, democracy is a new philosophy. It hasn’t had much of a chance, when one measures it by the long record of history’s autocrats, tyrants, dictators, czars and kaisers. Still an infant, democracy has done wonders, and it can remake the world if given half a chance.

One reads here and there that fascism is striking roots in this country and that President Roosevelt is introducing fascism in American life. Persons who make such a claim certainly lack an understanding of the meaning of fascism.

What is fascism? It is a denial of constitutional means. It is a negation of parliamentary methods. It is rulership by decree, instead of by law. It is a dictatorship of a class, instead of the rule of a people. Fascism denies the right to free thought, free press, free assembly. Fascism is authoritarian. Fascism is the rule of an individual or a bloc. Fascism takes power by violence, through illegal methods, and denies all rights to both minorities and majorities. Fascism rests its case on force. If that is fascism, and I know I have defined it accurately, then just where does fascism function in the United States?

President Roosevelt took power by the will of the people. If Roosevelt had been defeated by Hoover and if Roosevelt had gone into the White House through violence and force, then he would have been a fascist. But that didn’t happen. The people sent him to Washington.

President Roosevelt has tremendous powers. That’s true, but they were given him by the elected representatives of the people, and the power can be taken away from the President at the will of the people. If there were so much as a hint that Roosevelt would not surrender his powers at the command of the people or their elected representatives, then there would be good reason for the cry of fascism. But until that happens Roosevelt is the head of a democratic state.
No, President Roosevelt is not a fascist. Nor is there even a hint of fascism in his administration. No papers are being suppressed. No meetings are being broken up. No opposition political parties are being dissolved. No religion is being turned into an established church. No one is being punished for exercising the right of political or economic criticism. Even the Communists have the right to publish their organs and expound their doctrines. So where is the menace of fascism?

Is it fascism for the government to establish a minimum wage? No, of course not. The government, in doing this, is carrying out the wishes of the people.

Is it fascism to declare a shorter work-week by law? Of course not. The government is giving reality to the public's will.

Is it fascism to deny employers the right to employ children? Certainly not.

These, and other policies, are based on force, but that force was delegated by the people, and it may be withdrawn at the will of the citizenry.

It is true, however, that there are many persons in this country, mainly among the middle and capitalist classes, who yearn and pine for an American Eden devoid of Congress and Constitution and ruled by a benign, mighty Yankee edition of Mussolini or Hitler. Such fascists would be the first to howl if they were compelled to live under a social, political and economic dictatorship. Many of them would end up in concentration camps.

Picture for a moment what our country would be like if an American Hitler-Mussolini were to take charge of the nation. He would have a private army and police force, dressed in, let us say, Green Shirts. About 2,000,000 such hoodlums would march the streets and roads of our country, living off the people. They would confiscate the property of the labor unions, depriving them of their treasuries, insurance funds, buildings, presses, newspapers and magazines, recreation halls, meeting places, etc.

Membership in the A. F. of L. would be a penitentiary offense, with the gallows for the leaders.

Every employer would be compelled to deduct a certain percentage of each worker's pay, to be turned over to the Green Shirts for the "protection" those racketeers of Hitler-Mussolini would provide.

The Green Shirts would trump up a race issue, perhaps centering their wrath on Jews, Catholics and Negroes. New biological theories would be worked out by nit-witted professors, to give Hitler-Mussolini a reason for dispossessing millions of innocent people of their property, their jobs, their professions and of their very right to make a living. Their children would be refused the right to enter public and higher institutions of learning.

Congress would be adjourned for good, with its members thrown in jail. The Supreme Court would be closed. The Constitution would be scrapped. No one would have the right to speak, write, publish or think. The newspapers and magazines and books of the country would have to fit into the policies of the Green Shirts or go out of business. Socialists and Communists would be beheaded. Pacifists would be hanged. Freethinkers would be made to embrace a religion or go to prison.

The Green Shirts would begin a propaganda campaign to boom militarism in this country. Boys in their teens would wear uniforms and go to daily drills and marches. Every man would have to become a tool of the Green Shirts or lose the right to make a living. The official Hitler-Mussolini press, controlled from Washington, would begin to yell for bigger and better wars, the immediate objectives being the annexation of Mexico and Canada.

Citizens would be beaten, terrorized, slaughtered or maimed. Raiding Green Shirts would scour the country, searching homes for forbidden literature. The Green Shirts would forbid opposition political parties and outlaw all elections. Laws would be wiped off the statute books by the decree of Hitler-Mussolini and new "laws" would be
drummed up between days. Green Shirtsers would take charge of the courts, acting as judges, juries, prosecutors and executioners.

Yes, the United States would make a pretty picture when once it became the stamping ground of a racketeering dictator. There would be no liberty, no democratic government, no justice, no freedom of discussion, no money, no work, no business, no opportunities, no hope. We would return to the medievalism of central Europe in the darkest days of history.

Democracy, with all its faults, is better—a thousand times better—than the "best" dictatorship. The people of the United States are not going to embrace fascism under a Hitler–Mussolini, if they can be made to know the implications of such a move. They will stand by the Constitution when they realize what will be in store for them under a dictatorship.

The United States of America is not going to scrap democracy. We must stand by democracy and make it stronger.

** **

Democracies are too slow getting things done. Dictatorships or autocracies move fast. Please comment.

It is true that democratic societies are slower getting changes made, but this is because of caution, a desire for complete study, investigation and discussion. A real democracy considers every argument, pro and con, and this seems to make for slowness, but there is nothing to show that it is always better to be fast in matters of public policy. At that, democracies work up steam in times of war or emergency, so it is true that when the issues are clear the rate of travel can be accelerated. Autocratic societies move faster, but this in itself is frequently one of the most pressing causes of the failure of an autocratic society, for the dictator does not listen, know or care for the viewpoints of others, so he gets close to the danger line and frequently goes too far, ending in disaster. Given the choice between democratic "slowness" and autocratic "speed," I believe the former is safer for the greatest number.

** **

Instead of bothering with ballots and political parties, which are all too slow in getting anywhere, why shouldn't the working class ignore the state and go ahead with its industrial program?

The answer is all too simple. There is no case in the entire history of man wherein the ruling class controlled the sources of production without first getting control of the state. Without controlling a state, a ruling class would be impotent. Before the workers will be able to socialize industry and thereby become the one and only class in society, they will have to obey the mandate of history and take control of the state. In an autocracy the ruling class imposes its will through the state, without regard for the wishes or interests of any of its subjects. In a democratic state, the ruling class retains control of the productive capacities of society by virtue of the fact that the ruling class's ideas of private ownership are the accepted ideas of the masses. In an autocracy, the answer is revolution of a violent nature. In a democratic country, the answer is a change in ideas from private to socialized industry, which may then be established through orderly, constitutional means.

** **

Please list the countries (including population) now under fascist dictatorship.

Fascism, with all its reactionary barbarities, including the collaboration of the Roman Catholic Church, rules in the following countries, the figures being the latest population census: Germany, 66,000,000; Italy, 42,000,000; Poland, 32,000,000; Yugoslavia, 14,000,000; Hungary, 8,700,000; Austria, 6,750,000; Estonia, 1,115,000. Total, 170,600,000.

Turkey has a dictatorship, but it is not fascist. The country is ruled with a view to cultural, industrial and social advancement, tending slightly in the direction of Socialism, or perhaps Communism. Tur
key is Russia’s closest ally and is being modernized rapidly, with assaults on illiteracy, and, in addition, an enlightened attitude towards women.

The women of Turkey have been permitted to rid themselves of all the taboos that developed during centuries of degradation. In fact, the women of Turkey are not only permitted to remove their veils in public, but are encouraged to go into business, the professions and the industries. This country has gone far in its treatment of women, while Italy and Germany, in particular, have gone back a thousand years, denying their women the right to economic independence or any social or business activity whatsoever, the theory being (in harmony with the demands of the Roman Catholic Church) that women belong in the kitchen, the church, or in the work of breeding more cannon-fodder.

With Germany, Italy, Austria and other countries slipping back to the medievalism of the Dark Ages of Catholicism, Turkey is headed in the direction of a stimulating encouragement of the most skeptical examination of the assumptions of religion. Turkey’s dictatorship rules 14,000,000.

In addition, there is the dictatorship of the Soviet Union, which is not fascism in any sense, however one may be critical of the idea of dictatorships. Fascism is the dictatorship of an individual with a view to the “stabilization” of capitalism. The Soviet Union is a dictatorship of a party with a view to the complete elimination of capitalist economy. The Soviet Union’s population is now being placed at 168,000,000, which is 8,000,000 more than I have given in any of my previous remarks.

We see from the above that the world now has two non-fascist dictatorships, the Soviet Union and Turkey, and seven capitalistic dictatorships of fascism. I draw this distinction, because the facts point that way, and besides there is considerable authority in history for the observation that dictatorships work two ways—in support of entrenched authority or in opposition to such authority. Cromwell was a dictator, but he used his powers to crush the crown’s notion that it ruled by divine right. The dictators of the late years of the French Revolution, with Robespierre at the position of greatest power, used dictatorial methods to eradicate serfdom and the corruptions of a rotten state.

We now come to a rather delicate question. It has to do with a speech in Cincinnati, by the Soviet ambassador to this country, Alexander A. Troyanovsky, who claimed that “we believe we already have full democracy.” Democracy can mean only one thing: the right of the ruled to decide on their rulers, to have the power to recall this rulership at stated times, and the further power to be able, through properly elected representatives, to outline policies covering the state, industry, finance, etc. Can it be accepted in all sincerity that the Soviet Union is now a democracy, as claimed by the ambassador? The matter deserves some consideration.

I have already shown that the Soviet Union is not a dictatorship of the proletariat because the workers and peasants are not in control of the state. I have also shown that the dictatorship of Stalin is a myth. The real ruling power in Russia is the Communist Party, an organization of intellectuals, workers, peasants and professionals, numbering somewhere between 2,000,000 and 3,000-000 members. This small minority rules 168,000,000 Russians. Whether it is reactionary or progressive in its rulership is beside the point. That is an entirely different subject.

A dictatorship can be pro-worker today and change to anti-worker a generation hence. But there is no denying the fact that the dictatorship of the Communist Party has effectively, and perhaps permanently, eradicated the capitalist class and the aristocracy. It has done marvellous things in the way of building great industrial plants, fighting illiteracy, liberating women from the slavery of medievalism, courageously assaulting the pow-
ers of the lying clergy, and in other ways showing itself headed toward finer things, including a firm desire for peace and an equally firm war against racial hatreds and persecution. These things are plain facts and must be granted by Russia's most bitter foes.

But the fact remains that this does not imply "full democracy," as argued by Troyanovsky. The matter isn't as simple as all that. If there were full democracy in the Soviet Union, the state would be made up of men and women selected by the workers and peasants. Is such the fact? Any Russian Communist will admit it is not, if he is honest. He can, of course, point to the Constitution, which grants such selective powers to the Soviets (councils of the workers and peasants) but that right is only on paper, and has not been translated into action. So far as we can tell, there is no sentiment in the Russian State to recognize this feature of the Constitution.

The workers in the factories, mines, mills and farms do not elect their rulers in the Kremlin. That is done by the official Communist Party, headed by Stalin. It is at this point that Stalin attains his vast powers, for he is the man who heads a party of perhaps 3,000,000 members, who, in turn, run the government, and in Russia running the government means running the banks, the industries and all business.

Stalin is the big boss, because he is the go-between in the gigantic task of translating party will into government will. The Communist Party's ruling committee is called the Politbureau, and it is what we in America would call a "steering committee." It grows from the party's Central Committee, and that committee is in no way influenced directly by the will of the people. There is no point of contact between the workers in Russia and this small, powerful, keen, alert committee. So where does democracy come in? The Kremlin rules Russia, because the Communist party rules the Kremlin and knows what it wants.

The question now arises: Granted that Russia really wanted a dictatorship of the proletariat, how could it go about the job? Lenin knew the answer years before he died, but did nothing to carry it into practice. He said (and I have already quoted the remark) that an American Socialist, the late Daniel De Leon, worked out the problem perfectly. De Leon (if I may repeat myself without unduly tiring my readers) proposed that the nation's legislative body be made up of representatives of industries instead of geographical sections. The men and women in each industry would vote on their representative in Congress, with the result that the workers would register their wills directly, and that would make an actual dictatorship of the proletariat. This is a workable, orderly, civilized proposal, and yet when the Russians had the power to introduce it they failed, preferring to have Russia ruled through a party, in this case the Communist Party.

Karl Marx, who proposed the dictatorship of the proletariat in many of his writings, clearly warned his followers that such a dictatorship must not consist of an individual, a group, a clique, or even a party. It must be the direct and clear dictatorship of the proletariat, and how else could such an idea prevail except through that which De Leon worked out so scientifically? It is apparent, then, that Lenin and the other Soviet leaders did not want a real dictatorship of the proletariat. The matter is clouded in vague phrases, so it is hard to get to the reason for their actions, except the obvious one that they didn't want it. But until they do that, it is crystal clear that it is wholly inaccurate, and at times downright dishonest, to speak of a dictatorship of the proletariat, and now, as in the case of the Russian ambassador, of "full democracy."

At this point I want to dismiss the idea that a genuine dictatorship of the proletariat can never be a democracy. It sounds strange, but I believe I can prove that it can, merely by drawing on the writings of the great theoreticians of Socialism, Karl Marx and Frederick
Engels. To put it simply: when the dictatorship of the proletariat is a reality—no fake, mind you—you have a social order in which there is no ruling class. All are workers, if able to work, while those really unable to work are provided for humanely by those who can. This means you have a classless society, you have neither exploiters nor wage slaves. There being one class in society (after the liquidation of the capitalist elements), you have, for the first time in political history, a genuine democracy.

The next point that arises is the one about the way in which the workers in a classless society are to reward themselves for their labor. It is generally agreed among scientific Socialists, particularly Marx and Engels, that the rewards of labor, under at least the first stage of a dictatorship of the proletariat, cannot be on an equal basis. If one man can work harder, faster, or longer than another, it is logical and fair that he should receive more purchasing power, so that he can buy back the social value of his labor from the producers of commodities other than the one he worked at.

Marx said that if two workers under Socialism were to be given exactly the same reward, regardless of ability and productiveness, it would mean real inequality if the first workman had six children and the second workman had only two children, for regardless of the equality of reward there would be inequality in the sense that their needs were unequal. The point sounds rather fine, but it is germane to the discussion, and it leads to the conclusion that higher rewards for greater productiveness are to be expected during the formative stages of a Socialist society.

It is sometimes claimed that such inequality of reward between good and bad workers, or between unskilled and highly skilled workers, would constitute a class division and would deny the ideal of a classless society. Such an idea shows only an immature grasp of the situation. The skilled worker will not be exploiting the unskilled worker, nor will the good worker be exploiting the bad. A class society implies an order in which one class oppresses and exploits another. A higher-paid worker does not oppress a lower-paid worker, because he is not taking any of the social values created by the lower-paid worker. The lower-paid man is getting what he produced, minus definite, fixed deductions in the form of wear and tear, social insurance, capital expansions, etc. The higher-paid worker is treated the same way. In no manner does one live off the labor of the other. That being true, how can some of my readers keep writing me that Socialism must absolutely provide equality of rewards to all workers? Equality of reward would be an ideal condition if there were an ideal state, but unfortunately we are not remotely near perfection. We have, for many years, to consider the natural limitations of some and the natural endowments of others.

* * *

Please comment on this: Frank Snowden Hopkins, in the April, 1934, Harper’s, dismisses democracy and claims that “superior minorities must rule and do so with justice and wisdom.”

There is a glaring contradiction here, which I believe I can demonstrate. First of all, there is nothing undemocratic about the idea of being “ruled” by a minority. It certainly would not be possible for the job of ruling to be taken over by a majority. By “ruling,” I mean the task of directing society, industry, government and the other institutions of civilization. Management has always been a minor function, and always will be. But our friend writes that this “superior” minority “must rule with justice and wisdom.” Who is to be the judge of this justice and wisdom? A small class interested in privileges or exclusive rights? The masses who work and produce the necessary wealth of society? Here your viewpoint enters. If you have in mind the greatest good of the greatest number, then it follows logically that the majority must have democratic
control in order to determine whether or not the power delegated to our “rulers” is being used with justice and wisdom. If there is to be no democracy, then it is apparent that a minority that rules with injustice and ignorance will be permitted to hold power indefinitely. Thus do we see that Mr. Hopkins’ ideal is in itself an argument for the democratic ideal. The forces of democracy do not object to the delegation of vast powers, so long as the people most concerned have the power of review, the power to regain that delegated authority, and the power to redelegate it to others.

* * *

With fascist dictatorship growing in numbers and powers, what is the future of democracy and Socialism?

The picture is not altogether dark. Granted the seriousness of the situation in Central Europe, it is comforting, however, to see that the Socialists won the recent election in London and are now in complete control of that metropolis. Great news may be expected from that source. The same Socialists are making astonishing progress in England, so that it may be safe to predict that before long they will oust the conservatives and take power. In other countries, particularly in Sweden, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland and Spain, the Socialists, and supporters of democracy, are growing stronger, instead of weaker.

Fascism is not really threatening outside Central Europe, because supporters of democracy are refusing to be lulled into a feeling of false security. There is vigilance.

As for the fascism of the Germans, Austrians and Italians, let us not forget that those countries have had dictators before, and even though they seemed securely entrenched, they were finally ousted.

The Napoleons, Díazes, King Alfonso, Machados and the rest of the sorry tribe of dictators all cut themselves to pieces when they seemed to be at their greatest levels of power. That reminds me of a sharp comment by the foreign minister of Czechoslovakia, who said words (I am quoting from memory) to the effect that the trouble with dictators is that they never know what is going on in their own countries. “A dictator,” he said, “is powerful until the last five minutes.” There’s a lot of sound wisdom in that observation. They are so far above the people that they cannot hear the melancholy news when it is about to break.

But frankly, ousting dictators is harder today than ever before, because they control the state and through that control they master the most technical branches of military science. It has been pointedly shown that a hundred years ago a hastily formed mob, equipped only with rifles, was about equal to the soldiers of the rulers. A fight behind the street barricades usually was evenly balanced, because the arms on both sides were about even.

But the picture has changed since 1948, when the workers fought so heroically in the streets of numerous European countries, particularly in Germany. Now we see a dictator in control of machine guns, artillery, airplanes, bombs, chemicals and all the other highly complicated weapons of death and destruction. Resistance becomes more difficult. A handful of revolutionists with rifles cannot meet the onslaught of tanks, airplanes and machine guns.

But this does not mean their cause is hopeless. They can, under certain conditions, win over the soldiers of the dictators, as was done in Mexico, Cuba and Spain. Or they can take power easily after a disastrous war, as was the case in Russia at the close of the World War. Or the industrial system may be rotten to the core through the corruption and inefficiency of the dictator, as is growingly apparent in Germany, Italy and Austria today. They can steal a nation’s industries, but they can’t make them work. Bankruptcy may end them. Then again, the very complexity of military arms today makes a new condition that
is favorable to those who destroy the power of the dictator. I refer, of course, to the fact that these tremendously complicated arms of war—tanks, airplanes, machine guns, artillery, etc.—require highly skilled services from the industries, where the workers are the key figures. They have it in their power, through the proper exercise of unionism, to so cripple the complicated war machine that the dictator finds himself, in time, loaded with a mechanism that will not work.

Of course, where there is a dictatorship there is no hope for relief except through violence. The dictators stand on force, and only force can topple them over. It would be folly to suggest any other method of opposition in countries like Italy, Austria and Germany. The day of reckoning will come—when, no one knows—but when it comes it will find expression in violence.

The situation in democratic countries like the United States and England is altogether different. In such countries, as Karl Marx said, violence is not needed, since the people have political power in their hands—power which may be used to bring about the ends they have in view. They still have the friendly homage of the Goddess of Liberty. She is still welcome in various lands.

Switzerland is still a haven of refuge for the victims of dictatorship in Europe. The Goddess of Liberty still makes it possible for us to speak, print and meet, though we must be ever watchful against the conspiracies of the enemies of democracy and the friends of fascism.

Even in the United States and England, there are growing bodies of fascists who are determined to destroy our democratic institutions. The Hitlerites are conducting a great propaganda campaign in the United States, with a view to destroying our Constitution and making our country a second Germany. They are making headway in this dangerous campaign, as shown by the exposure published in Raymond Moley’s magazine, “Today.”

We must not settle back and say such things can never happen in this country. They won’t happen here, if we keep guard over the Goddess of Liberty.

Mussolini, in one of his characteristic speeches, said that “Liberty is a stinking corpse.” What he meant was that the Goddess of Liberty had been murdered by Mussolini and that she is now a stinking corpse. That is true. Liberty in Italy is dead. But Liberty in the world is not dead, and in time the Goddess of Liberty will rule in Italy as she does in other, more fortunate, lands.

The Communists in the Soviet Union say that “Liberty is a bourgeois superstition.” Liberty was a philosophy of the world’s greatest men and women long before there was such a thing as capitalism, so it is entirely un-Marxian for them to describe liberty—civilization’s most ancient ideal—as a product of capitalist economy. No. Liberty is not “bourgeois.” Liberty is civilized. Liberty has endured throughout the centuries, even though she has been fought by the world’s greatest disrupters and reactionaries.

Liberty was hated by the Roman Catholic Church, but the Goddess of Liberty endured and survived. Liberty was hated by the French aristocrats, but the French Revolution broke the power of the aristocrats and gave Liberty a new birth.

Liberty was hated by the exploiters, the slave-holders, the persecutors and the destroyers, but Liberty remained somewhere in the world, while her would-be murderers went into deserved oblivion. Hitler and Mussolini are of one mind. They want Liberty to be a stinking corpse. But it is Mussolini who will be the stinking corpse, while the Goddess of Liberty returns to Italy and brings civilization and decency to that miserable land.

Stalin and his fellow Communist dictators may slander the Goddess of Liberty, but they will learn in time that Socialism should be a home for the Goddess of Liberty and not a no-man’s land.
Liberty dies, but Liberty continues to live! By that I mean that you may kill the Goddess of Liberty in your own land today, but the spirit of Liberty will survive—she will come from other lands, she will not be denied, and in the end she will conquer. Man has gone too far forward in the march of civilization, with the tireless help of Liberty, to even try to get along without her now. She is needed. Without her a country ceases to be a nation—it becomes a prison. When Liberty dies there dies the spark of civilization. But the fire that generates the sparks continues to burn—brightly, beautifully, majestically.

The fire burns! Its sparks go flying into the heavens. And in time the sparks fall where Liberty has been slain, and there again Liberty has a rebirth. Even when that be-nighted land seems at its darkest, when its hearts are coldest, when the hand of tyranny is thick with blood, when the tollers are without hope and cheer, when it seems that eternal darkness has settled down on the earth—even at that moment one may see that deathless spark of Liberty come wandering through the skies, and, lo! all is changed. The people take on new hope. The tollers refuse to be slaves any longer. The tyrants tremble. The priests call their curses in vain. The soldiers turn from the masters and join in comradeship to help the dispossessed and tortured victims of absolutism.

Then will the Hitlers and the Mussolinis shake with fear! For Liberty will call for revenge! She will be stern, and relentless, and just! The tyrants will then learn that Liberty is not a stinking corpse. Liberty lives! And so long as Liberty lives somewhere—it matters not how far and remote she may be—so long as she finds a home in some corner of this world, so long will the war for humanity continue and so long will there be hope in the liberation war of mankind.

The finest things in civilization are built on the impulses of free men, and not on slavery. What is good and fine in society is the result of life that is in harmony with the ideals of the Goddess of Liberty. And Liberty lives! It is not she, but the Mussolinis, who stink!

My claim that freemen are more valuable socially than slaves is not a niece of poetry but a logical claim of the science of economics. I go back 158 years to the time Adam Smith wrote his great masterpiece, "The Wealth of Nations." I recall vividly how he showed that "slaves are very seldom inventive; and all the most important improvements, either in machinery or in the arrangement and distribution of work, which facilitate and abridge labor, have been the discoveries of freemen."

In several other places in this mighty book, Adam Smith showed how the labor of slaves is invariably less valuable than the labor of freemen. Important books were written before our Civil War to prove this fact and apply it to our own slavery problem, and it was shown through facts and figures that the slaves in the South were almost useless when compared to the high efficiency of the free workers of the North.

This is a lesson that humanity has learned after centuries of blood and tears. But it seems it will be a long time before the entire world grasps the simple fact that a free society is always superior to an enslaved one.

Civilization—the finest expression of the deeper nature of man—is the result of freedom—freedom to live, freedom to think, freedom to speak, freedom to dream, and freedom to dare seek the truth. Where such impulses are denied, and where the search for truth is suppressed and persecuted, there is the scene of the slow death of a civilization. I say "a civilization" advisedly, because I cannot see in history any evidence that civilization ever died. It was crushed in southern Europe more than 15 centuries ago, but civilization found a safe home in the Far East, where the Chinese and the people of India nurtured a great civilization.

During the Dark Ages in Europe, when the rotten, bloodthirsty, decadent, stinking Roman Catholic
Church was in complete mastery, civilization survived—with the Moors and the Arabs and the Jews, who together built great institutions of learning, wrote beautiful poetry, encouraged science, medicine, philosophy and all the other expressions of civilization. That's why I say that civilizations die, but civilization lives.

It will not die today, regardless of what the Roman Catholic Church and the dictators do to turn back the clock in Central Europe. I do not say this in a fatalistic sense. I do not hold to the mystic notion that some kind providence will watch over civilization. There are various reasons for the belief that civilization will endure, despite the conspiracies of the priests and the dictators.

First of all, civilization has too many worshipers today—more than ever before in man's recorded history. Learning is no longer the secret possession of a hidden, esoteric group. The printing press has deposited the intellectual wealth of the country in too many centers of civilization.

The Hitlers may burn books, but the truths written in those books cannot be lost to humanity, because the science of printing has served as a protector of culture, through its almost miraculous power to multiply the best expressions of culture so they might be deposited, not only in Berlin, where they are menaced, but in Paris, London, New York City, Washington, Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, Denver, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and a hundred other places.

In the days of old the destruction of a library might mean the destruction of a civilization. But that danger is gone for all time. The Roman Catholic Church may issue and reissue its Index of Prohibited Books, but the world shrugs its shoulders and continues on its way to greater knowledge, deeper science and a finer appreciation of philosophy's ceaseless quest for truth.

Censorship may hinder and retard, here and there, but civilization, like Liberty, goes on, ever on and ever forward. But this does not mean we are to stand by and see our precious treasure of civilization threatened by the vandals. There must be vigorous and fearless defense and counter-attack.

 Civilization is something worth fighting for.

* * *

Do you favor organizing Socialist Guards to prepare to defend liberty against fascism in the U.S.?

Why organize a military body when our government has not made the slightest attack on our constitutional rights? The Bill of Rights is still functioning. We have the right to publish books and papers, hold meetings, propagandize our principles, petition our government, name political tickets and take seats of political power wherever our people are elected. The suggestion of a military guard to defend rights that are not attacked is incurably theatrical.

* * *

What is the social-political meaning of tyranny?

The Greek word, tyranny, means the irresponsible rule of a single individual, resting only on force and not on the consent of the ruled.

* * *

Is it not a fact that dictatorships can change their policies more quickly than democracies?

No. The opposite is the truth. A dictator like Hitler cannot change his policies, for to do so would mean confession of error. The dictator must always be right. He remains chained to his notions, even after they have been disproven. A democracy, on the other hand, can change its policies and methods almost at will, as in the case of Roosevelt after he took Hoover's place.

* * *

Do you favor a dictatorship of the working class?

No. I favor a democracy of the working class.

* * *

What effect does dictatorship have on journalism?

It just about kills journalism. In Germany, during the first 12 months of Hitler's rule, 1,350
newspapers were forced out of business. Of these, 1,000 were Socialist and other radical newspapers, which were suppressed outright. The remaining 350 newspapers curled up and died, because they had nothing to say, other than the censored opinions handed down for publication by Hitler's government. The great, powerful newspapers of pre-Hitler days are gone. Opinion is taboo. All newspapers carry the same news and the same comment, often in the same words. As a result, Germans know that if you read one you know what is in all of them. Where papers did not quit, they lost circulation in great volume.

Persons who want to keep abreast of current events must read more than one newspaper, and in Germany, before Hitler's unfortunate chancellorship, hundreds of thousands of such individuals bought and read numerous newspapers. They do not buy more than one today, because there is no way of finding out what is going on in their country through the reading of their press. Thus do we see what happens when a dictator takes charge of a country. The first thing to languish and slowly die is the formerly free press.

In my own editorial work, I read a daily published in my county, the Kansas City Star, the Kansas City Times, the Kansas City Journal-Post, the New York Times, the New York Herald-Tribune, the New York Daily News, and, finally, The Daily Worker. These I read carefully, because each represents a viewpoint. From all of them I get a picture of what is going on in my own county, my state, my country, and, finally, the world. In addition, of course, I get numerous weeklies, monthlies and quarterlies from several countries. And finally, I get news service reports from semi-private sources in Washington, New York, London, Switzerland and France. I exchange publications and books with an important center in Moscow, and thereby get an insight into what is happening in the Soviet Union.

By reading all carefully and critically, I can arrive at something that approximates the truth, though one must always be on guard against propaganda and false information.

If I were writing and publishing in Berlin (granted I hadn't been put in the hoosegow months ago), I'd have only one source—the official utterances of the censors, and what could one do with such material? In Germany such reports, statements and copies of speeches are printed as handed out by the Goebbels and the other individuals in control of the press, so one could as well get along with no newspapers at all.

In Germany, a few individuals manage to get newspapers from foreign countries, but such persons are limited in number and have no means of passing on what they learn. In all, we see in Germany a tragic instance of what happens when the government is permitted to shake the press. *

What is the basic weakness of a dictatorship?

Its destruction of opposition in the end causes its own destruction. A democracy seeks and encourages a strong opposition to fall back on when the party in power fails. Such an opposition is a form of social and political insurance. But a dictatorship has nothing to fall back on, once its policies fall, because it has destroyed its opposition.

At least you'll have to admit that dictatorships get things done. They are perfect mechanisms for getting the wrong things done.

What is your reaction to the assassination of King Alexander?

Yugo-Slavia's king richly deserved what he got, though I do not accept personal violence as a means of social change. Assassinations merely remove the individual, but the system remains. Social revolution depends on mass action, not individual adventurism. But that doesn't alter the fact that Alexander was looking for what he got. He was
as brutal and heartless as Hitler. He drenched Yugo-Slavia with the blood of its best manhood. He exploited and robbed the people of his country and delivered them in bondage to the capitalists of France and Great Britain for continued exploitation. In 1929 he established a dictatorship, destroying all rights to freedom, murdering thousands of men whose sole "crime" was their belief in a social order based on justice and prosperity for the proletarians. Alexander was as bad as the late Czar, and it is interesting to note that as a youth he received his "education" in the palaces of the Czar in St. Petersburg. He learned his lessons too well and invited the bullets of assassins. No decent-minded person would waste a second mourning the loss of such inhuman trash.

* * *

What part of Europe's population is living under dictatorships?

Europe's population is 550,000,000, of which 354,000,000 are ruled by dictatorships. Such a situation can result in only one of two things—war or revolution. There is no other means. A war would most likely result in a general revolution, and that would mean the end of Fascism, Capitalism and Imperialism. A new social order would result, with the working class in control of not only the governments but the industries as well. Such a change would advance Europe a thousand years.

* * *

I have been reading about Australia, a well-advanced, democratic country, and find that something like 40 years ago this country started a program of integrating the state so that it would function in the direction of better distribution of wealth among the common people. I don't see why it is all right for a democratic state to dictate to industry and all wrong for a fascist state to do the same thing. Please comment.

There is nothing undemocratic about the policy that envisages the state being used to de-mocratize industry. The establishment of a democratic state is the first step in the direction of socialized production of wealth. Such a state can function in the direction of a planned economy, directing, controlling and finally owning industry, without violation of a single democratic principle. Such a state can go ahead with its humanitarian program and at the same time protect the rights of free speech, free press, constitutionalism and the other blood-bought rights of a free people.

The fascist state, on the other hand, begins by suppressing all civil rights. It crushes the rights to speech, thought, printing and meeting. It destroys citizenship by denying the individual a voice in the way his government is to be conducted. It persecutes groups on the pretext that they belong to an unfavored race. It takes tyrannical control of industry in a campaign to strengthen capitalism, and the first thing it does in protecting the exploiters is to destroy the labor unions.

From the above it is seen the comparison is not a sound one. Australia is an enlightened country, in which democratic rights are respected. Germany is a fascist country in which the rights of the individual and the masses are annihilated. The methods of both are fundamentally opposed; the goals are diametrically opposite.

* * *

Noting what you say about violence and direct action, are we to understand that you are opposed to the conduct of the Austrian Socialists?

The answer is a decided no. I have stated again and again that violence is an insane line of action in a country that respects civil rights, as in the United States, England and a few other lands. Where the Socialists have the right to the ballot, the right to a free press, to meet freely and petition their government, direct action becomes merely the showmanship of romanticists. But when, as in Austria, Germany, or Italy, dictatorship suppresses and destroys everything precious
in civilization, it is right and logical for the Socialists to resist tyranny and black reaction. I glory in the bravery of the Viennese Socialists. They paid a fearful price, but their defeat was an honorable one. They died in defense of their principles and ideas. Their record will, for all time, be greeted with homage by liberty-loving men and women.

In one question asking "Do you favor a working-class dictatorship?" you state no. In another column you uphold the present proctarian dictatorship of Russia.

I fail to see any inconsistency or contradiction. I do not favor a dictatorship in the United States because we have the means of bringing our philosophy into practice. At the same time I do not believe it is our business to interfere with the Russians in their vast achievements. Their dictatorship is working out, and here's hoping it will result in permanent prosperity for every willing worker in that vast land.

I uphold the Soviet Union because it is carrying out many ideas that I think essential to social well-being. I still believe in the old-fashioned ballot, the Constitution and the orthodox ideas of free speech and the like. I don't hope for the day when a Hitler or a Stalin will occupy the White House. I believe our rulers should be in positions of power with the consent of the ruled. That traditional Jeffersonianism, and I'm for it so far as the United States is concerned. We're going to save ourselves economically according to our own methods and traditions, without importing ready-cut plans from Moscow. That's why I say again and again that I am not a Communist. Socialized industry is our objective, and that's Russia's too, but what a difference there is in our notions about how to attain the goal.

Given my choice between a Stalin and a Hitler, I'd a thousand times prefer the former, because his is a class dictatorship, while Hitler's is the dictatorship of a degenerate individual. If Hitler were to establish his brand of fascism in our country half our population would be in concentration camps.

And speaking of Hitler reminds me of a front-page news article in the Kansas City Star of Feb. 12, 1934, which carries a report from New York, where Emma Goldman, anarchist, branded "Adolph Hitler as a degenerate despot. It's getting so that even the most respectable newspapers in this country are referring openly to Hitler's sexual perversions. But then, we can speak of these things openly because we still maintain democracy, still believe in freedom of expression. But where would we be if we had a dictatorship? We'd have to accept a homosexual tyrant and murderer and let on we liked it. No, thanks. With all its faults, I prefer the United States. We've got some mighty big problems to solve, but there's no room for discouragement. The work will be done in good time, for we are on our way. There's every reason for intelligent optimism.

I favor a dictator like our friend Stalin. He is our only hope—a dictator who can see to it that all share alike and not one living off the back of someone else.

Stalin fits into the Russian picture perfectly, because that country has never had even a taste of democracy. After hundreds of years of barbarous Czarism it was entirely logical for the revolution to take the form of a dictatorship. But because dictatorship works in Russia it doesn't follow that western civilization should go through the same process. Remember, we have had generations of free institutions, including freedom of the press, assemblage and the like, and it would be a serious mistake to junk over night what has taken so much sacrifice, blood and toil to bring into reality. England and the United States are different from Russia, and the sooner you believers in dictators find that out the better it will be for social progress.
These countries, trained to appreciate democratic methods, will never consent to a Stalin, a Mussolini or a Hitler. Everything seems to point in the direction of a strengthening of democratic methods, rather than a stampede in the direction of absolute bureaucrats. I may be wrong in this, but that's the way I read the times. Socialism will come in these countries in the form of an industrial democracy instead of a dictatorship of the proletariat. There are many dangers connected with the idea of a dictatorship, and an American or an Englishman should think twice before yelling for such a “blessing.” Once you get your dictator what assurance have you that he will be another Stalin? What is to prevent his being another Hitler? And when you find out that the dictator you accepted isn’t at all what you wanted him to be like, you won't be able to change him for something better, because dictators do not rule by consent; they rule by force. No, it's better to move a little slower along democratic lines than to jump into the fire of dictatorship. Democracy seems to be the slower way, but in reality it is the swifter. Better by far for the people to make mistakes while they work their way to economic salvation than to put in a dictator who will suppress and destroy everything that civilization prizes. In the case of a dictatorship, speed isn’t a virtue but another form of slavery. As for myself, you may keep your Musсолinis, Hitlers and Stalins in Europe. Give me the Constitution, the ballot, representative government, rule by law instead of decrees, the right to speak, print and meet. Time enough to talk about the failure of democratic means after the people decide they want socialization and can't get it through their parliamentary forms. For the present, let's remember that the masses are still believers in capitalism.

Mussolini and Hitler are fond of using the word “Revolution” in describing their “achievements.” Are they accurate? Neither dictator has the right to use the word “Revolution.” Revolution implies a change of social system, such as from chattel slavery to feudalism, or from feudalism to capitalism, or from capitalism to Socialism. Capitalism existed before Hitler or Mussolini took power, and capitalism is in the saddle in both countries today, so where does the revolution come in? Instead of giving the world a revolution, they took reactionary measures to strengthen the social system that prevailed before their dictatorship.

In Scribner’s for January, 1935, Ernest Boyd says: “These dogmas (medieval) are all the more dangerous to freedom of thought because of the numerous, all-pervasive methods of propaganda which modern invention has placed in the hands of those most interested in bulldozing the masses: the radio, the movies, the popular press.” He believes we are headed for a new Dark Age. Please comment.

When I first read Boyd’s brilliant article I meant to write something about it, but didn’t have the chance, so I welcome your request for comment, in that it gives me the excuse I seek. I urge all my readers to call at their public libraries and ask for this issue of Scribner’s, for the article is worthy of the widest reading. Boyd makes a splendid assault on the haters of intellectual freedom and makes an equally able defense of the principle of freedom. With Boyd, I agree that there is immediate danger of social and political medieval-
ism, but I am not entirely pessimistic. It seems to me that the supporters of democracy, liberalism and freedom in countries like the U. S., England, France, etc. will come to the rescue in time, especially if the enemies of intellectual darkness spring into the arena and fight tirelessly for their ideas. The Hearsts, Hitlers, Mussolini's, and other fascists are dangerous, but they can be beaten, if the defenders of enlightened civilization meet the issue bravely. The Catholic Church's alliance with Fascism complicates the problem, but one who knows history couldn't expect anything else from that source. The other side knows no ethics, no decency, no humanity. It is heartless and ruthless, acting like gangs of Capones. But we who still live in democratic countries (and what a lucky thing that is for those of us who dare express unpopular opinions) can still print and say what we please about these great questions of Capitalism, Socialism, Free-thought, Communism, Atheism, Peace, Imperialism, etc., and it is our duty to hold to that right. Believers in liberalism (in its best sense) should give their moral and financial support to those agencies that print and speak for freedom. Such support will help spread the message of mental freedom and strengthen our side as we continue the war on the leaders who are striving for a re-

turn to the Dark Ages. If we lose our liberties, the blame will rest with us. It will mean that we have learned no lessons from history and that we have refused to heed the warning signals that have come to us from the Vatican and Central Europe. It looks like a hard fight, but there is every reason to be optimistic and of good heart. But let's beware of that blind, dumb optimism that refuses to recognize plain facts.

* * *

Dollfuss's funeral was attended by 500,000 mourners. Doesn't that show that dictators can be loved as well as hated?

Vienna is overwhelmingly Socialist, and it is inconceivable that Socialists would pay homage to the murderer who, in alliance with the Catholic Church, turned artillery on their apartment houses and slaughtered 1,500 men, women and children. Their presence at Dollfuss's funeral reminds me of a famous story about Voltaire. It seems that this great French wit and philosopher had a pet hate for a certain Parisian. Voltaire was approached, on this gentleman's death, for a generous statement of appreciation. Drawing on my memory, Voltaire wrote something like the following: "Mr. Blank was a fine citizen, good husband, gifted writer, keen thinker and fearless friend of humanity—provided you are sure he is dead."
Socialism, Communism and Other Radical Movements

What is the official name of the Socialist Party?
Prior to the Detroit national convention, the organization was called Socialist Party of America. This was formally changed to Socialist Party of the United States. The change is in the direction of accuracy.

* * *

What is the size of the membership of the Socialist Party?
On June 1, 1934, the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party reported to its annual convention, in Detroit, Mich., that the party membership is 22,861. On January 1, 1933, it was 20,655. Two years ago it was 15,332. These figures are authentic and verifiable, which is more than can be said of the membership figures of the Communist Party. The Socialist Party is making steady, substantial progress. Its future is bright. All readers who accept the program of socialized industry are urged to join this truly American, sane, constructive, political organization.

* * *

I am 19 years old and want to join the Socialist Party. Please tell me how.
Write to Clarence Senior, executive secretary of the Socialist Party of the United States, 549 Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. The last convention of the Socialist Party voted to change the constitution with regard to the age minimum of members. Whereas before one had to be at least 21 years old to join the party, now anyone over 18 years of age may be admitted, except that persons under 21 are not allowed to have a vote when candidates are being chosen. I strongly urge all read-

ers who favor socialized industry to join this organization.

* * *

Is The American Freeman an official organ of the Socialist Party?
No. This paper is a free lance. It does not speak for any party organization. The editor alone is responsible for this publication's contents. The Freeman espouses the principle of socialized industry, but with no direct or indirect connection with any political organization.

This editor is indifferent as to whether socialization comes through official Socialist channels or through the gradual acceptance of Socialist policies by radicals of other parties. He certainly doesn't consider President Roosevelt a Socialist, but he sees unmistakable trends towards Socialism, as shown by the President's abandonment of individualistic ideas of capitalist society. Just how far he will go no one can say. Roosevelt may know, but he won't say. He may go the limit, or he may go just far enough to patch up the present system, which will mean that capitalism may recover temporarily only to dash into another debacle.

If he wants to build surely and permanently, Roosevelt will have to establish the long-time policies en-braced in the philosophy of the socialization of large-scale industries and utilities. If he fails to see the handwriting on the wall, at least he will prepare some of the ground for the harvest to come.

In this crisis it is the duty of real Socialists to encourage every move in the direction of a collective instead of an individual economy. At the same time they must watch carefully and criticize those in Washington who are standing
in the way of social progress. But the criticism must be of a constructive nature. It shouldn't be a case of criticizing just for the sake of finding fault. That will get us nowhere. With men like Hoover completely out of the picture, the way is clear for the exposition of sound methods for achieving the goal of a classless society.

Washington is still full of reactionaries and conservatives—members of both parties—and they are silent for the moment only because they feel very much out of things. But once they can see the possibility of success for the old ideas of "rugged individualism" they can be depended on to begin a reactionary movement away from governmental ownership and operation of our gigantic machines of production.

We who have been advocating progressive, socialistic policies these many decades have good reason to feel encouraged. Where we were once maligned and criticized as dangerous reds, bolsheviks and destructionists, we now see our basic policies accepted in the highest circles in Washington. We now have proof that it was we who were right in our case against Capitalism.

The press fought and abused us for many years, but now the editors of Wall Street are strangely silent. They see their power slipping. They are without real and effective leadership. They see socialistic policies in the air, and they don't know what to do about them. On the other hand, the people who live by work see a new mood coming over the land. They begin to realize that the power of capitalism is cracking under the weight of its own contradictions and that at last they are about to come into their own.

* * *

What's the use of bringing a Socialist ticket in the field without the right of control at the polls?

The Socialist party has the same right to employ watchers at the polls as is enjoyed by the other parties. Under the law, Socialists may have committees at the polls during voting hours, and watch-ers and counters when the ballots are being tabulated. The Socialists in Milwaukee carry the elections so regularly because they look after their rights at the polls. They see that their people vote and that the votes are counted. The same can be done everywhere else in our country. No one will count our votes for us. We must see that this is done. If we were to enjoy a majority vote at the next national election and were to see to it that each polling place had its committee of Socialists from the party organization, the election result would be Socialist.

* * *

What do you think of the Commonwealth Plan?

Paul Porter's Commonwealth Plan is now published in pamphlet form, at 10c each, by the Socialist Party, National Headquarters, 549 Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. I suggest that Freeman readers give careful consideration to this very American plan to change Capitalism into a cooperative commonwealth. I consider it one of the most provocative documents issued by the Party in many years. There is no doubt that Paul Porter is one of the brightest minds in the Party. This young man, who promises to become an important figure in the movement, is totally different from the type of mercenary Socialist who poses as a leader but at the same time advertises a patent medicine eczema "cure" that can get no recommendation from medical societies. Such an individual makes me heartily ashamed to be a Socialist, but when I meet the work of a fine character like Paul Porter my enthusiasm for the cause is revives.

* * *

In your writings you use the words "nationalization" and "socialization," which leads me to ask if you use them in exactly the same sense. There is a marked difference between the two. Nationalization is a socialistic measure adopted by a non-Socialist government.
Thus, under a "rugged individualist" like Hoover, who was of the very essence of Wall Street, the government, administered by capitalistic-minded politicians, still operated the postoffice department along the lines of nationalization. This was not Socialism, by any means. But it was nationalization. Socialization comes only when there is an attempt at Socialism rather than merely socialistic policies. Thus, Roosevelt wavers between nationalization and socialization, with the emphasis thus far on the former. Should he swing completely to the left and embrace the idea of a socialist state, his program would be in the direction of socialized industry.

* * *

How would a Socialist government handle a case like Barbara Hutton?

Old Woolworth left Barbara $40,000,000 and she says she and her "Prince" are going to spend their time from now on trying to get rid of it. This is going to be some job, because she also has a yearly income of $2,000,000. Under a Socialist government a creature like Barbara Hutton would be handled very easily. There just wouldn't be any such animal. She'd either go to work and earn an honest living or she'd starve. As for his nobs the "Prince" he'd do honest work for once or he'd be cut away from the meal ticket. With the large-scale industries socialized there would be no $2,-000,000 yearly incomes for parasites like Barbara and the "Prince." As for the inherited fortune of $40,000,000, a stiff inheritance tax would do away with that foolishness in just about one decade or two.

* * *

I run a little blacksmith shop. Will it be taken away from me when Socialism is put in?

No. Socialism does not aim to socialize anything but the large-scale industries, utilities, etc. Small shops, factories and businesses will not be socialized. First of all, it would be poor business economy to take them over, be-cause they are wasteful and inefficient. They serve a useful purpose in a small way, but they cannot compete with the large-scale industries that are run along mass-production lines, with the most scientific elimination of waste. We won't socialize your little blacksmith shop, but we most certainly will take over the great sources of your material, such as the United States Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Company and the other great makers of iron and steel.

Another question frequently asked is whether or not an individual will be permitted to own personal property under Socialism. Here the answer is a very emphatic affirmative. Personal property will not be touched by a Socialist economy. Your clothes, your home, your private possessions will remain as your property under the most sweeping form of Socialist society. You won't lose your toothbrush under Socialism, though the great factories that make toothbrushes will be socialized.

* * *

It is a common feeling that Socialism is a foreign system of thought that cannot take roots in America. This "argument" is a common one, but its utterance proves only a superficial knowledge of economic phenomena. Capitalism certainly is not foreign to American traditions. Capitalism is international. Futhermore, Capitalism did not begin in the United States, but in England. And it was in England that Karl Marx wrote his immortal criticism and analysis of capitalist society and presented the Socialist solution. As Socialism deals with capitalism, and as capitalism is quite at home in the United States, it follows that the Socialist philosophy is by no means foreign to American interests. Socialism will take roots in America, because capitalism is rampant in this country, and wherever capitalism is in the saddle, Socialism rises to challenge its rule of social and economic exploitation. American individualism has done great
things for the good of our country, and at the same time the expression of individualism has done great harm, now that capitalistic institutions have reached the monopoly stage. As Socialism intends to deal with the socialization of large-scale industry, it is plain therefore that there will be room for decent, intelligent, socially useful individualism in those enterprises that are not of a monopoly nature and which do not threaten the economic life of the community.

* * *

Until a few years ago I was a prosperous member of the middle class, but I have been slipping gradually, until now I am busted, yet with only middle-class contacts. What can Socialism mean to such as me?

Most of your middle-class contacts are in your economic condition, or about to fall into it. The middle class is being liquidated under capitalism, and it remains for these middle-class individuals to decide what their future social behavior is to be. As you (and so many others) are busted, you are really not middle class. You have been thrust into the ranks of the working class. You therefore must make a great choice—1. line up with the workers of farm and factory in a demand for socialized industry; or 2. permit yourself to be a tool of the capitalist class when, and if, it resorts to fascism in a war to preserve itself.

In Germany, the busted middle class went over to fascism, instead of to the support of Socialism. It will take a little more time, but they will learn their bitter lesson. Hitlerism is not a remedy for middle-class bankruptcy, because Nazi powers are being used to buttress capitalism. The middle class can be used by capitalism—if that class is going to be dumb enough to fight for its one real enemy, the Wall Street interests. Capitalism, when it decides to resort to fascist violence, can never gain its ends through its own efforts, because of its numerical insignificance. Imagine a mob made up of Wall Street capitalists! It would be a joke. But the busted middle class could, under certain conditions, be fooled into fighting the capitalists’ battle, in which case we would have the spectacle of fascism in America, with all its horrors, persecutions, bigotry, and barbarism.

The vast middle class must be taught that it can expect nothing permanent and sound from capitalistic fascism. It must not permit itself to be used as a tool in a fight that can mean nothing to it in the shape of economic security. By joining up with the militant workers and farmers, the busted middle class will be helping in the great historical process of bringing order out of industrial chaos. Where they are possessed of superior managerial or executive ability, they will find themselves far better off in a Socialist society, which will be in great and urgent need of such services.

Capitalism has ruined the middle class. The answer, therefore, is Socialism, and all that Socialism means. In your position, with all your middle-class contacts, I advise you to do everything in your individual power to show your class colleagues the real road to power and plenty—Socialism.

* * *

Oswald Spengler writes: “Socialism is nothing but the Capitalism of the lower classes.” Please comment.

This is typical of the foggy thinking of this German superman. He can write more high-sounding nonsense than anyone I know. Take the above, analyze it, and what do you mind? Merely a clever piece of rhetoric. At first glance the thing looks shrewd, but it isn’t. The thing is mere verbiage.

Socialism is not a form of Capitalism. It is a denial of Capitalism. Socialism does away with the system which establishes an owning class that employs and exploits a class that has nothing to sell but its power to work. Socialism will do away with this class division, by making all members of the community workers. There being no ex-
ploters, how can Socialism be called a form of Capitalism?
Instead of the Morgans, the Mel- lons and the Rockefellers owning the industries, they will belong to the people. What is there capital- istic about that? It is the very core of anti-Capitalism.

Under Capitalism a worker gets only a portion of the wealth he produces. He has nothing to say about the management or opera- tion of the industry he serves. He is forced to operate the owner's machines under a system that en- ables the owner to take a share of every dollar of wealth produced by the machine-tenders. Under So- cialism these machines will belong to society, with the result that the workers will receive the full social value of their labor. What is there capitalistic about that?

* * *
Would not degeneration follow a perfect, or as-near-as-possible perfect, social system?

"Perfect social system" is a little too loose to have any real mean- ing. Social philosophers do not strive for a vague, abstract state of "perfection," whatever that may mean. They seek to revolu- tionize society so that poverty will disappear, through the appli- cation of the principles of so- cialized industry, in which the working class will be in complete control of the scientific means of production, distribution and ex- change. This is not done through a poetical, idealistic desire for "perfection," but rather as a measure of materialistic, practic- able self-preservation. With this foreword, let me put the prob- lem this way: Granted a social system in which each man and woman will be entitled to em- ployment and the full social value of his labor, will it follow that such liberation from squalor, un- employment and exploitation will result in a corruption of character, mentality and phy- sique To answer the question, one must first ask another: Are the millions of unemployed under Capitalism, who are starving, or near starvation, showing improv- ed character, better health, clear- er thinking as a result of their unspeakable suffering? It would take one blind to reality to say that our victims of unemploy- ment and exploitation are not the casualties in a slow, steady process of degeneration. Under Socialism, with man's physical needs supplied scientifically— which means plentifully—man will not degenerate through in- action but will move forward to greater achievements, greater powers of thought and higher standards of social and individu- al behavior. If Socialism were to establish laziness and slothful- ness as social standards, then degeneration would result assuredly. But there is no such pur- pose. Laziness (parsitism) will be treated as a social disease.

* * *
What is the Marxian theory of the state?

Karl Marx held that the state has always been the "executive commit- tee" of the exploiters of labor, or the policeman's club, under chattel slavery, feudalism and capitalism. On this premise he and Engels reared the theory that the state would "wither away" under a classless Socialist economy, because there would be no ruling class for the state to support and protect. Such a society would be pure An- archism.

This question arises: Granting that the state has always been a tool of the ruling class, does it fol- low necessarily that the state must always serve in such a limited ca- pacity? Can't the state serve a classless society in the same way that it upheld a class economy, but with a different aim? Would not a classless, Socialist society need centralized, executive machinery to carry out, plan, guide, protect and entrench the policies of the work- ers? Wouldn't it be more reason- able to assume that only the state's power to preserve mass exploita- tion would "wither away" under Socialism? In other words, there would evolve a proletarian state instead of a capitalist one.

* * *
Why is it that scientific Socialists
of the Marxian school of thought proclaim the inevitability of Socialism through the inevitable downfall of Capitalism, and yet, at the same time, urge their followers to greater activity and forcefulness?

Your point, as I see it, is that since Socialism is inevitable why do anything about it? The answer is very simple: Granting the assumption that Capitalism is doomed to failure, it does not follow that the world will evolve into Socialism without struggle, education, organization and sacrifice. It is not written in the stars that when, and if, Capitalism fails Socialism will burst upon the world. Socialists must direct the course of events. If left to blind processes, the world might limp on for generations, and even centuries, without solving its economic and social problems. There is need for an educated rank and file, led by intelligent, well-informed masters of the problems at hand. A collapsed Capitalism without alert, scientific leadership might easily result in a social life that registers decline instead of advance.

* * *

It seems to me that American radicals should offer their criticisms and solutions in non-radical terms, in order not to frighten the average citizen, who may be friendly to socialistic ideas but would prefer to see them dressed in the language of America's greatest men. Please comment:

Listen, if Americans today used the language of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, they would be branded as something worse than radicals. Your notion about toning down our speech to the "mildness" of the founding fathers shows that you are unfamiliar with their language or you never would have said what you did. For example, consider the following, from Thomas Jefferson:

"The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants."

Again from Jefferson:

"If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union or to change its Republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

And once more from Jefferson:

"Experience declares that man is the only animal which devours his own kind; for I can apply no milder term to the governments of Europe and to the general prey of the rich on the poor."

And if Jefferson isn't quite strong enough for you, listen to this, from Abraham Lincoln:

"This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. When they shall grow weary of existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

You see, real radicalism isn't alien to American soil. It isn't an importation of long-haired anarchists and bomb-throwers. It is quite within the traditions of the best in American history. The real radical—who would go to the roots of social evils—is speaking the language of Jefferson and Lincoln.

* * *

What is the difference between a Collectivist and a Socialist?

None whatever. They mean exactly the same things—a system of socialized industry, with production for use instead of profit. The word "Collectivist" is used by the more finicky, who shudder at the word "Socialist," which isn't supposed to be quite so respectable. It's the same with Rationalist, Agnostic and Atheist—all mean the same thing, virtually. Atheists frequently prefer to call themselves Rationalists or Agnostics because they don't like the "curse" on the word "Atheist."

* * *

I notice that our conservatives greet every measure of reform with cries of "Socialism," "Communism," etc. Is this something new?

By no means. It is the same old stuff. Back in the second decade of this century, when Congress was considering the income tax law,
Senator Sherman, of Ohio, described the measure as “Socialism, communism, devilism.” The New York Sun yelled: “Socialistic revolution has gone far.” Pass the income tax law, cried the reactionaries, and we shall see the end of America, the Constitution and the flag. But the income tax went in, in 1913, and the flag still flies, the Constitution is still the basic law of the land, and Washington Monument has not been torn down. Take a dime away from a conservative who lives off unearned wealth and he sees red revolution and black infamy.

* * *

Why do you suggest that it is necessary for the radical element to gain a majority before capturing power and inaugurating Socialism? Look at Russia. Something like 50,000 Communists took over the state and brought about the Soviet Union.

Your comparison is not very convincing. When the October revolution of 1917 brought the Bolsheviks into power there was no ruling class left in Russia. The armies had been defeated, the aristocracy were scattered, the capitalists were a trifling minority, there was practically no middle class. Under such conditions it was possible for a militant minority to grasp power. But such a “stunt” is mere romanticism in a country like the United States, with its vast strength and stability. The powers that be are too strongly entrenched in the U.S. to permit a handful of revolutionists to pull off a dramatic coup. If the United States were a defeated country, without organization, without means, without an army, without functioning institutions, then there would be some logic to your position, but a child can see that such conditions do not prevail, and most likely won’t for a long, long time. This means it will be necessary to adjust action to democratic conditions and institutions, educating and organizing as rapidly as conditions will permit, with a view to obtaining a majority of the voters to support the program of socialized industry.

* * *

What is the attitude of the Social-

ist Labor Party to the Communist Party of the U. S.?

Arnold Petersen, who speaks for the Socialist Labor Party, writes of the Communist Party in a manner that might indicate that he didn’t quite approve of it. To begin with, he denies the party the right to use the word Communist. He says that they can better be described as “Anarcho-Communists.” And then he spits on his hands, grabs his bat and leads out with this characterization of the Communist Party:

“They represent a hopeless mixture of pure lunacy, almost unbelievable imbecility, unscrupulous crookedness, brazen insolence and total contempt for the intelligence of those who (presumably) they desire to reach.”

That’s packing it in tight.

* * *

Is it true that the real difference between Communists and Socialists is the fact that the former are really militant and revolutionary while the latter are mild and compromising?

The Communists in Germany numbered about 6,000,000 when Hitler put his brand of fascism into power. What happened? The Communists took it on the chin. There wasn’t a single act of militancy. The great r-r-revolutionists melted away before the Nazis. Now let us turn to Austria, where the “mild” and “compromising” Socialists had to face the fascism of the late Dollfuss. They believed in democracy, in freedom, in parliamentary methods and had always lived up to their democratic philosophy, but when denied their rights, when attacked by Austria’s fascists, when threatened with illegal extermination, what did they do? The answer is history. They fought magnificently. They paid with their blood. Thus do we see that the militants can be mild when put to the real test, while the moderates can be militant when under the guns.

* * *

Your unfriendliness to American Communism surprises me in view of the fact that it is only the Com-
munists who are fighting on such fronts as the struggle to free Tom Mooney.

Of course, it isn’t true that the Communists have monopolized the Mooney fight. Since the beginning, Socialists and liberals have fought bravely and unselfishly for California’s victim of blatant plutocracy. Since you bring up this matter, let me call your attention to the fact that Tom Mooney recently repudiated the Communists and charged them with capitalizing on his case in order to collect funds and then applying such money to their own purposes. This, of course, amounts to a charge of theft. His letter is the result of the Communist-led “Free Tom Mooney Congress,” which was held in Chicago, and regarding which no report has been sent to the person most concerned—Tom Mooney. That’s pretty strange behavior and indicates a feeling of guilt. Deceived by the sponsors of the Congress, Tom Mooney, through his Defense Committee, spent almost $2,000 on the Congress. He now complains that the Congress not only failed to repay the $2,000 but kept all other funds that were collected. What was done with this money is a mystery, as no attempt has been made to issue any kind of a report to Mooney or his Tom Mooney Molders’ Defense Committee. He states that a “tag-day drive” must have resulted in large financial returns, but not a dime of this money went to Tom Mooney’s defense. And now, when anyone mentions the scandal, the air is filled with charges of “social fascism,” “counter revolution,” “traitors,” and all the other polite lingo of the “one and only fighters for the workers.”

* * *

As a Marxian Socialist I want to ask you: How can a scientific Marxian praise a man like Roosevelt?

I don’t know just how I have praised him. It would be more accurate to say that I have evaluated him. As a Marxian, you will probably be surprised to learn that Karl Marx proposed to the General Council of the First International that a resolution be passed praising Abraham Lincoln on his election on the Republican ticket. Also, perhaps it is news to you that Karl Marx, living in London during our Civil War, was in entire sympathy with Lincoln’s cause and did a great deal to keep England, friendly to the South, from a policy of intervention. Had Karl Marx and others failed to keep England out of the Civil War, we might have lost, Lincoln would have been driven out of the White House, perhaps to imprisonment, and the slave holders would have won their war. England, by the way, was sympathetic to the South because English mills were dependent on the South for cotton, and the Civil War played havoc with the textile industry. As a scientific, Marxian Socialist you will also be surprised to learn that Karl Marx believed implicitly in such a bunkistic quackery as phrenology. These remarks do not imply that I have no respect for Karl Marx. I have the greatest admiration for that genius. But I also have respect for facts.

* * *

Why are you so out of sympathy with Communism? Are not the Socialists and Communists working for similar ideas with the differences those of means and of degrees of extent of socialization?

The above question does not put the case quite clearly. I have never written a single word that showed unfriendliness to the Soviet Union. Russian Communism is a great success, because of conditions and brilliant leadership, but this does not mean that American Communism is equally promising. Communism in America is led by inferior bigots, unfamiliar with American psychology and history. Communism in America has the notion that it can transplant Russian bolshevism to American soil, an assumption I refuse to accept. We are going to get socialized industry in this country, but through American methods and not through disruption, violence, confiscation, dictatorship, suppression, denial of free press, free speech, free assembly, destruction of democratic po-
litical methods, and the like. I am strong for socialized industry, but I don’t want it to come through bloodshed, destruction and terror. We can achieve our goal through sane, intelligent, scientific, civilized means. Socialism is destined to prevail in this country, not because of its friends but in spite of them. Socialism will come because it is the logical cure to a social disease.

I believe in free institutions—such as press, assembly, and speech—and such institutions will be crushed during the first steps of a dictatorship of the Proletariat. I hate dictatorship by Socialists just as much as I hate dictatorship by Hitler and Mussolini. The United States Constitution does not stand in the way of a socialized state. We can achieve our goal through the wise use of the ballot, through applied social and industrial democracy. That’s why I have no use for American Communism, which is nothing more than a false echo of Russian Communism. A program can be a big success in Russia and a dismal failure in the United States. The results of the campaigns conducted by U.S. Communists prove the truth of my utterance. U.S. Communists want to disrupt every other working class organization, deny the right to other opinions having a fair hearing, crush democracy, deprive citizens of the right to vote, dissolve Congress, establish a brutal dictatorship—all in the name of Socialism. I refuse to accept such a program. I believe in American Socialism.

* * *

A Communist friend of mine claims that because Socialists like Prime Minister Macdonald went over to the other side, Socialists throughout the world are not to be trusted. What about it?

Well, what about it? It’s true—Macdonald betrayed his ideas and convictions. He is Socialism’s Benedict Arnold. But that doesn’t mean Socialism is wrong. The political and social policies of Socialism are needed more than ever before, and if a Macdonald deserts on the firing line we have to turn elsewhere for leadership. By the way, why not tell that Communist friend of yours that a great many German Communists saw the “light” when Hitler took power and joined his rotten organization. When four Communists were tried on the trumped-up charge of burning the Reichstag, several witnesses against these splendid fighters were former Communists. Would one argue that because some Communists in Germany went over to Hitler’s banner it must follow that the ideal of a classless society is an impossible one? Of course not. I am not a Communist, but I certainly wouldn’t use that as an argument against the leaders of American Communism. Every movement will have its traitors, its backsliders, its opportunists, its careerists and its grafters. Even the American Communist leader, William Z. Foster, turned his back on the anti-militarists during the World War and went around boosting the sale of Liberty Bonds. And even the great Lenin himself, during Kerensky’s short regime, wrote a pamphlet telling the powers that be how they might save their political existence through a planned economy that, in many ways, resembles the Roosevelt recovery program.

* * *

Please explain what the Communists mean by a “united front”?

I wish I could, but I’m just as puzzled as you are. After denouncing the Socialists as social-fascists, they give lip service to a program of having the Socialists join with the Communists in fights against fascism and war. Surely, the Communists wouldn’t ask J.P. Morgan to join a “united front” to make war on Wall Street? Then, if the Socialists are such traitors, why want to unite with them? Here the Communists say something to the effect that they want a united front with the Socialists with the mutual understanding that each will keep to his own principles. But, what puzzles me is: If the Socialists are fascists, then why want to unite with them in a war on fascism? It is all so bewildering. Of course, underneath it all is a desire to disrupt the Socialists, out of jealousy for their better leadership and
more effective propaganda. The Communists make more noise and get more space on the front pages, but when the ballots are deposited, one finds seven or eight Socialist ballots to each Communist vote. And that galls.

* * *

Please state the essential and fundamental difference between Communism and Socialism. Between Fascism and Democracy. Between Fascism and Socialism. Between Fascism and Communism.

Communism and Socialism both envisage a worker's social order in which the capitalists will be ousted from control of the means of production, distribution and exchange. However, Socialism aims to achieve its goal through a stimulated evolution, based on education, agitation and organization. It considers parliamentary government not an end in itself but a means through which the public will may be expressed and through which social changes may be realized. In other words, Socialism prefers peaceful changes in the direction of a cooperative commonwealth. On the other hand, Communism opposes all ideas of democracy and parliaments. It would establish a ruthless dictatorship, which would take control through violent means. Communism is completely opposed to what the Socialist calls "gradualism." It seeks for an immediate, overwhelming, bloody episode that will crush capitalism and inaugurate Socialism.

The difference between Fascism and Democracy is as marked as the difference between night and day. Fascism is a dictatorship in the name of the established capitalist order. It is the organization of the extreme right wing of capitalism. Fascism rules through force, terror, brutality, persecution, suppression and torture. It gives the people no right to a voice, or a vote. The people are denied the right to a free press, the right to petition the government, the right to meet peaceably, the right to select legislators. Fascism and Democracy cannot function in the same country. The triumph of one means the death of the other.

The difference between Fascism and Socialism is also crystal clear. Socialism accepts democratic institutions, and therefore approves a free press and the other free institutions of a democracy. Socialism means democracy in industry as well as in government, so for both reasons it is diametrically opposed to Fascism. Socialism defends political democracy, intending to use it as a weapon to bring about industrial democracy. Fascism, on the other hand, crushes political democracy in order to make stronger the dictatorship of industrial plutocracy.

The difference between Fascism and Communism is also clearly marked. Both believe in dictatorships and both oppose democracy. However, the Fascist dictatorship is the final appeal of capitalism to force and terror. The Communist dictatorship is the final appeal of the proletariat to force and terror. The Socialist opposes both concepts.

* * *

If the workers of the world would suddenly unite, would you and your paper be with them?

That would all depend on what they were uniting about. If they were to unite to increase the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, or any other organization of superstition and supernaturalism, I wouldn't be so hot. If they were to unite to make stronger the chains of capitalist control, I would again be cold. But if they were to unite to bring about a system of socialized industry, in which the production of goods would be conducted for the use of the people instead of the profit of a small owning class, I'd throw my topper into the blue ether and yell a long series of hurrahs.

* * *

I am glad to see you are now making a greater distinction between Socialists (of which I am one) and Communists. When I see a man wipe his nose with his fingers and shovel food into his mouth with his knife, I know him to be a Communist.

Tut, tut, my dear friend. Let's not get personal and begin call-
ing the Communists pigs. Of course, it's true that they are pig-
gish (as shown by their brutal be-
behavior in breaking up a Socialist
meeting in Madison Square Gar-
den), but it isn't nice to call them
pigs. Besides, the Communists
have a few followers in the most
high-toned circles. For example,
Mr. Corliss Lamont, son of one of
the most important partners in the
firm of J. P. Morgan, is hot for
the Communist party. Recently,
when the Communists bought
a nation-wide hook-up to broadcast
a speech about the Soviet Union,
they used Lamont to make the
speech, and a right nice, gentle-
manly speech it was. I'm positive
Mr. Lamont does not wipe his
nose with his fingers.

** We revolutionists in Alaska wish
you would express yourself about
the following: 1. What is the dif-
ference between the Socialist Labor
Party and the Communist Party?
2. What does each stand for? 3.
Does American Socialism mean and
stand for the same thing as Ger-
man National Socialism? 4. Please
express yourself about Daniel De
Leon.

1. The S. L. P., like the Socialist
Party, believes in legal, constitu-
tional means in achieving the goal
of socialized industry, while the
Communist Party looks on political
action as only an excuse for edu-
cational work, and holds, in addi-
tion, that the social change will
have to come through a mass up-
rising and violent revolution.

2. Both stand for the socializa-
tion of capitalist property. De
Leon believed in a transition period
in which the proletariat would in-
stigate a dictatorship, but it seems
that this conception of dictator-
ship was to be limited to indus-
trial and economic liquidation of
the capitalist, without the denial
of civil rights to anyone, particu-
larly with regard to free speech,
free press, etc. It would be inter-
esting, if he were alive today, to
know what he thought about Rus-
sia's conception of a Socialist econ-
omy, based on a dictatorship of a
political party—the Communist
Party—instead of a dictatorship of
the proletariat. De Leon, as the
founder and leader of the Socialist
Labor Party, taught his theory of
an industrial dictatorship, in which
the proletariat would be in control.
But this condition does not prevail
in Russia, despite the arguments to
the contrary that are offered by
Communists. The working class of
Russia has mighty little to say
about things in the industries and
the Soviet government. De Leon's
idea of an industrial society im-
plied a social order in which the
government would consist of rep-
resentatives from the various in-
dustries, instead of a government
based on arbitrary geographical
lines. Thus an industrial govern-
ment of Socialism, according to De
Leon, would have "Congressmen"
from agriculture, mining, building,
transportation, power, communica-
tion, heavy machinery, textiles,
shoe manufacturing, etc., instead of
"Congressmen" from N. Y., Pa., Ill.,
Kans., Mo., etc. This plan was
known to Lenin, but he did not in-
troduce it, even though the con-
trary is frequently maintained. The
government of Russia is not an in-
dustrial system but rather a direct
and positive dictatorship of about
2,000,000 Communist Party mem-
bers, who, in turn, rule 160,000,000
workers, farmers, professionals,
etc.

3. German National Socialism
has nothing in common with
American Socialism. German Na-
tional Socialism means fascism,
terror, persecution, race prejudice,
anti-unionism, tyranny, suppress-
sion of free speech, press and the
right to free assembly. National
Socialism, under Hitler, is capital-
listic fascism. American Socialism
is based on Marxism, which is the
usual form of international Social-
ism, as opposed to National Social-
ism. American Socialism is strict-
ly working class, and meets better
the wishes of intelligent American
workers who envisage a change
from capitalism to socialized indus-
try. This is demonstrated along the
lines of the pragmatic theory—in
other words, only the Socialist
Party of America has succeeded
in making headway in this country,
with a vote about eight times as
large as that obtained by the Communist Party, and as for the Socialist Labor Party, it has been dead for more than a decade. I don’t suppose the S. L. P. could drum up 10,000 votes if it put out a national ticket today.

4. Your question about Daniel De Leon is a big one. De Leon was a brilliant student and a gifted writer. His scholarship brought him world recognition. At one time he worked with the leaders who later founded the Socialist Party. When they refused to accept his theory of industrial unionism, a split occurred, with the Socialist leaders withdrawing and organizing the Socialist Party of America and leaving De Leon with his Socialist Labor Party.

In short, the issue was this: De Leon insisted that the American Federation of Labor should be fought tooth and nail because of its policy of craft unionism. He wanted all the workers in each industry to be organized in an industrial union, instead of along craft lines. The Socialists replied that there was much to this argument, but as the A. F. of L. was already functioning it would be unwise to organize dual unions, which would precipitate factionalism and disorganization. The Socialists further argued that industrial unionism should be taught, if at all, by boring from within the old-line craft unions, but this was anathema to the hot-headed and impatient De Leon.

There is no doubt that industrial unionism would be superior to craft unionism, if it were a going institution, but if there was to be destruction of the old unionism there might be danger of labor being left completely unprotected, without either craft or industrial unionism. It was on this issue that the Socialist Party leaders went off by themselves, and the result was that the Socialist Party, under the leadership of Debs, went forward to great political campaigns and made the Socialist vote grow steadily and, from the capitalist viewpoint, alarmingly.

Craft Unionism served labor in by-gone days, but there are signs today that the A. F. of L. is rapidly learning the lessons of industrial unionism, and that the bigger plan of organization may prevail before long. However, it is not going to be possible to force the A. F. of L. to do this by threats of dual organizations or disruption. It will have to be an educational program, if the goal is to be achieved.

As stated above, Lenin recognized De Leon’s greatness. Lenin, according to the New York World, Feb. 8, 1919, said: “The American Daniel De Leon first formulated the idea of a Soviet Government, which grew up on his idea. Future society will be organized along Soviet lines. There will be Soviet rather than geographical boundaries for nations. Industrial unionism is the basic thing. That is what we are building.” In the New York World, Jan. 31, 1918, a dispatch from Arnold Dosch-Fleurot said, quoting Lenin: “De Leon is really the first American Socialist to affect European thought.” I do not question the accuracy of this statement. His idea of an industrial government was an original contribution, but there is no evidence that Lenin or Stalin introduced it.

The government is strictly on party lines—the Communist Party rules Russia, and that party has, as already stated, only 2,000,000 members. If there were industrial unionism and industrial government, the Soviet Union would be the expression of something like 160,000,000 people, instead of a mere handful. But that doesn’t alter the fact that Lenin was right when he said De Leon made a creative contribution to Socialist theory. De Leon was a great logician and a fearless fighter. The history of Socialist leadership—when it comes to be written—will have to pay homage to that forceful, positive, keen-minded, analytical Marxist, Daniel De Leon.

** If the Socialists hadn’t invited Matthew Woll to speak at their Madison Square rally Communists would not have broken it up. That great meeting in Madison Square Garden, attended by 20,000 protestants against the late Doll-
fuss' massacre of the Austrian Socialists, was arranged by the Socialist party, and that party had a perfect right to select its own list of speakers. Are you making the point that the Socialist officials should have presented the names of their speakers to the Communist organization, for permission to go ahead? The fact remains that there is no valid defense for the amazing conduct of the Communists in breaking up a vast demonstration. The American Civil Liberties Union has conducted an impartial inquiry and recently made its report, after listening to witnesses on both sides. The majority report said that the Communists came to the meeting with "the announced purpose of preventing two speakers from being heard and of demanding places for two of their own speakers on the program. The immediate responsibility for breaking up the meeting rests, therefore, squarely upon the Communist party leadership." That puts the case mildly.

* * *

Give your reaction to the I. W. W. philosophy of "No politics."

The Industrial Workers of the World flourished before and during a part of the World War. Its revolutionary philosophy was based on a species of Syndicalism, the basic idea being that since the class struggle is an industrial one, the war for proletarian control should be centered on the industrial field. That explained their slogan of "No politics." The notion was to ignore political action entirely. The fundamental error in this policy was ignorance of the fact that the political field is a part of the industrial struggle. Certain class struggles were carried out in the sphere of government, which the I. W. W. leaders refused to recognize. The beautiful irony of it all is that the I. W. W. was crushed through action in the political sphere. During the World War, the government instituted actions against the I. W. W., with the result that the organization was suppressed. Here was plain evidence that it is a mistake to limit activities to the industrial world. The proper thing to do is for labor to participate in all activities that can result in concessions to labor. And here it is plain that political action is as vital and productive as industrial action.

* * *

What is the People's Lobby?

This organization of liberals and radicals has headquarters in Washington, D. C. John Dewey is its president; Benjamin C. Marsh, executive secretary. The organization, which is furthering a program that will be introduced in Congress when it meets next year, has adopted the following slogan: "To balance consumption and production by eliminating profit." This is surely a socialistic slogan. The lobby's program includes: Nationalization of banking, public ownership of all large-scale, basic industries, including natural resources and transportation. Heavier taxes on those best able to pay, the owning class. Interest rates to be reduced. Socialization of ground rentals. Government corporations to further nationalized marketing and housing projects. The lobby's policy in international affairs includes cooperation through greater freedom of exchange "and allocation of natural resources and raw materials."

* * *

By what vote did the Socialists capture London?

The London County Council election was won by the London Labor Party, under the leadership of Mr. Herbert Morrison, an able Socialist. The vote: 340,000 for Labor; 300,000 for the Conservatives; 23,000 for the Liberals. This gives the Socialists a clear majority. They have three years in which to realize their great home-building program.

* * *

What is the international status of the cooperative movement?

Cooperative consumers' organizations are powerful, as shown by the fact that the International Cooperative Alliance alone contains 70,000,000 members in 43 countries. The Cooperative League of the United States is an affiliation of 6,000 organizations with a total membership of 550,000. The cooperatives are important in that they
help consumers meet the problem of getting the most out of purchasing power under Capitalism. Also, the movement prepares its membership for great cooperation, which is a step in the direction of Socialism. It also trains thousands of executives who will be ready to serve a cooperative society when Capitalism is made to give way to a socialized economy.

* * *

Please comment on Hearst's red-scare speeches.
The whole business sounds wild and wooly. There is hysteria in his newspapers and in his own radio vaporings. The best proof of Hearst's emptiness of argument is found in a simple sentence from his speech of January 5, 1935, where he asked:

"Does anybody want the bloody despotism of communism in free America except a few incurable malcontents, a few sap-headed college boys and a few unbalanced professors?"

Well, if American Communism has such insignificant support, then what's all the ranting about?

* * *

In view of the rapid progress now being made by the British Labor Party's program of Socialism, what could the House of Lords do to hinder or stop the process in case of a victory at the polls?

Your question is causing serious discussion in England today. It seems probable that the forces of Socialism, through the Labor Party, will soon come to complete power. Each election shows the trend. The County Government of London is now (1934) controlled by Socialists, who are preparing to initiate a wonderfully effective schedule of house building. Great neighborhoods of tenements and ramshackle homes will be torn down and modern, up-to-date, decent homes will be erected on a grand scale, all under the direction of Socialists who know what they want and how to achieve their ends.

As the Socialists go forward to greater acceptance among the people, the Conservatives, under the leadership of MacDonald, are losing ground rapidly. The next election may give the national government to the Socialists, which brings up the question of how the reactionary House of Lords will respond. Naturally, representing hereditary "rights," capitalists and landed interests, the House of Lords will frown on Socialism and seek means of ham-stringing the movement. What the Socialists are doing in the City of London will be only child's play when compared to what they will do nationally after they take charge of the Government. British Socialism today is led by intelligent, hard-working, practical men and women. They have their feet on the ground. They do not spout the dreamy verbiage of poets and mystics. They deal in facts, figures, balance sheets and all the other instrumentalities of economic and social advance.

British Socialism is completely committed to Democracy. It will achieve its ends by orderly, constitutional means. Its first goal is to obtain a mandate from the people. Once it wins a majority at a national election it will proceed with a clear, orderly, scientific program of socialization.

Could the House of Lords, following such a popular mandate, obstruct or halt such a movement? If the House of Lords were to use its suspensory powers, what would prevent the House of Commons from abolishing the upper house? Or, what could prevent the lower house from increasing the size of the House of Lords, appointing Socialists to the new seats? We've done that before in the matter of controlling the Supreme Court of the United States, through the appointment of new justices to bring the body up from five to nine members. Only recently there was discussion in this country of the possibility of increasing the Court from nine to perhaps 13 or 15 members in order to make sure that this body would not stand in the way of necessary changes.

A Labor victory in the House of Commons would also enjoy the legislation passed 20 years ago which provided that a bill passed
three successive times by the lower house becomes a law regardless of the attitude of the upper house. If Labor were forced to use this expedient it would mean only a small delay in getting the program started. In all, it seems as though the House of Lords, despite its prestige and power, would find it a rather difficult matter to hinder and counteract the will of the people.

* * *

What is the scope of the Socialist slum-clearance program in London, England?

The Socialists, under the leadership of the able and efficient Herbert Morrison, now control London and are at work on their five-year drive to wipe out that city's great slum areas. More than 16,000 up-to-the-minute apartment houses will be constructed by the Labor Party, which is Socialist, of course. This is the greatest municipal project ever devised for a single community. Lewis Silkin, the Socialist chairman of London's committee on Housing and Public Health, says:

"We were given a majority by the people of London to clear away the slums of London, and we intend to do it. Neither money nor any other reason shall stop us until the last slum dwelling has disappeared."

In addition to slum clearance and apartment construction, the Socialists are furthering a program of city beautification. Delightful gardens and promenades will grace the Thames.

Fourteen thousand houses have already been condemned and will be removed by 1937. New and economical methods have been devised by experts to clear away this vast aggregation of slum houses. The people of London are standing by the Socialists and will support them as the last disease-laden tenements are torn down and replaced by modern, decent dwellings.

* * *

Is Socialism making headway in Canada?

The Socialist Party of Canada has just won an important victory in Winnipeg, where John Queen was elected mayor as an out-and-out Socialist. There have been victories in smaller cities where candidates professed Socialism, but this Winnipeg election was the first clear-cut Socialist success in a large city. (Winnipeg has a population of 250,000, and is Canada's third largest city.) Queen, born in Scotland but living in Canada since 1906, is editor of The New World, a magazine published by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, a Socialist organ. During the Winnipeg general strike of 1919, Queen was arrested for his activity as a leader of that demonstration of labor strength and sentenced to a year in prison on the charge of "seditious conspiracy." But the citizens of Winnipeg showed what they thought of this abuse of the processes of justice by electing him to the Manitoba legislature, which seat he was still holding when elected mayor. For many years I have had occasion to study Canadian opinion and education through my publications, and I feel safe in saying that the finest in all Canada is that prize of communities, Winnipeg. Progressive Winnipeg would be a credit to any country in the world. Its working people are great believers in education, as shown by the manner in which they clubbed finances a few years ago and brought Joseph McCabe to their city for a 30-days' course of lectures. For an entire month, McCabe held forth each night in the labor hall, where he found, according to his report to me shortly afterwards, an audience without equal anywhere in Canada. That's the kind of a town Winnipeg is.

* * *

Is the Socialist movement strong in Spain?

The Socialist Party of Spain has 100,000 adult members; 100,000 young Socialists; 2,400,000 votes. The labor movement (Union General de Trabajadores) contains almost 1,750,000 members. The Spanish Socialist leader is Largo Caballero, who is called "the Spanish Lenin." Because of the menace of Fascism and Catholicism, Caballero is advocating revolutionary action. The Fascist movement is led by
Jesuits and others in the Catholic Church, and is strongly financed. Fascism is aching for a show-down, but it is reported that Caballero will give it the most energetic kind of resistance.

The Communist Party of Spain is very small—only 40,000 members. There are about a half million Anarchist-Syndicalists in Spain, who oppose all forms of government, but who are cooperating with the Socialists because of the common menace of Fascism. These militant Anarchists propose what they call "libertarian Communism," under which the proletarians will take over the industries and the peasants will confiscate the soil, both functioning without any governmental structure. The Spaniards are great fighters for their rights. Considering Spain's population (42,000,000), her workers are better organized and more militant than are the workers in the United States.

Fascism is expressed through an organization led by Catholics, known as Acción Popular, with a claimed membership of 200,000. What it lacks in numbers it more than makes up in money. These Fascists are terrorizing radical workers, assassinating many in cold blood and escaping in powerful motor cars. However, the militant workers of Spain are aware of their danger and are organizing to meet fire with fire. The Fascists must win over the army in order to establish their dictatorship, but it is thought by many that the Socialists stand a better chance of gaining support from the rank and file soldiers should the crisis develop and revolutionary action become imperative.

When the Nazis were fighting the Austrian government, after assassinating Dollfuss, why did not the Socialists join them and help destroy the fascist regime?

The Socialists properly refused to join the Nazis in order to fight the hated Dollfuss government. Their motto was: "Strict Neutrality; let the Fascists destroy each other." The Socialists certainly do not intend to do anything to help the Hitler crowd. They are biding their time. Let the fascists slaughter each other long enough and then, at the proper time, they will step in, finish the job and restore power to the people through an enlightened, civilized, democratic government. This will be the program for Germany and Italy, as well as Austria.

Our recently resigned ambassador to Austria, George H. Earle 3rd, returns to our country with the statement that the civil war of the Austrian Socialists was provoked by a neighboring government which shipped in arms, and that the Socialist leader, Otto Bauer, made a cowardly retreat to Czechoslovakia soon after his followers started to fight. Please comment.

Earle, who is now the Democratic candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania, has branded himself as a liar and a cad in making these two groundless charges. He has merely repeated the propaganda of the late Dollfuss and the other fascist murderers. I remember reading in the New York Times that Earle was conducting his campaign for the nomination at the time of the Austrian revolt and was ordered back to Austria by President Roosevelt, so he had no information except such as might be handed out by Dollfuss, the cardinal and other leaders of the massacre of men, women and children. The arms were not brought in. They had been in Austria since the close of the World War. Otto Bauer did not leave Austria until the close of the last fight in and near Vienna.

Are the Socialists in Austria doing anything to overthrow their fascist enemies?

According to Dr. Julius Deutsch, leader of Austrian Socialism and head of the brave Shutzbund (Republican Guards) during the uprising in February, 1934, on his arrival in the U. S. for a lecture tour under the auspices of the Socialist Party of the U. S., the militant Socialist organization has been driven underground in Austria, but that tremendous progress has been made in building up a secret body.
that will, at the proper time, overthrow the Austrian fascists and their savage government. A well-disciplined, intelligently directed organization is being spread all over that unhappy country, despite the fact that public meetings are forbidden and the Socialists are not permitted to exercise the right of a free press. However, these difficulties have not prevented a re-organized Shutzbund, which is even larger than the one that fought so bravely last February after the late Dollfuss and the Catholic hierarchy bombarded the Socialist apartment houses and murdered 1,500 men, women and children. A forbidden newspaper, The Arbeiter Zeitung, organ of Austrian Socialism, is now being published in democratic Czechoslovakia, from where it is being distributed secretly by trusted couriers in all of Austria. Dr. Deutsch reports that this paper, distributed under such difficulties, nevertheless has a circulation larger than the combined government publications. As he puts it: "We are down, but not out!" The Austrian workers, led by the Socialists, will yet give the fascists the treatment they so richly earned. These Austrian Socialists are the real McCoy.

* * *

What did the Austrian Communists do during the recent civil war?

Just about nothing. Communism has been weak in Austria. The Communists' peak vote in Vienna was 12,000, out of a total of more than 600,000. The Social Democrats, through their liberal policies with regard to free speech, etc., always made it possible for the extreme left wingers to function in their organization. When the Socialists revolted against the tyranny of the late Dollfuss, a few Communists, as individuals, joined under the Socialists and fought with great bravery, but there is no record of a single Communist leader having participated in the fighting. With typical crassness, the American Communist press—in the Daily Worker—took the position that the fighting Socialists in Austria were Communist led, though there wasn't a shred of evidence to support this wild yarn. Other stories were printed to the effect that the Socialist and Communist united front had been betrayed by the Social Democratic leadership, though reports from Austria proved that the leaders had taken their places on the firing line, with a group of them going into Czechoslovakia only after the collapse of their lines and the destruction of their organization. It is interesting to note that after congratulating the Austrian united front of Socialists and Communists (which was a fiction), the Daily Worker urged its readers to steal the New York mass meeting called by the Socialists. This meeting, in Madison Square Garden, was broken up by the Communists. The purpose of this great meeting was to protest against the late Dollfuss' tyranny and pledge support to the Austrian fighters for justice. Evidently such a meeting could not be permitted by the Communists, so they went about a systematic campaign of breaking it up in a series of disturbances and riots.

* * *

The dozen or more Socialists hanged by the late Dollfuss were guilty of being insurrectionists. Wouldn't the U. S. do the same?

The U. S. government treated the Confederate leaders with great generosity. Not a single Confederate leader was executed. Jefferson Davis, as all histories of the Civil War show, was given a prison sentence of only five years.

It might be said that there was an exception to this forbearance in the case of Captain Henry Wirz, superintendent of Andersonville prison, who was hanged, after being tried in Washington, D. C., on Nov. 10, 1865. However, an examination of the record shows that he was justly executed, the evidence proving him guilty of the most revolting and inhumane treatment of prisoners in his charge in Sumter County, Georgia.

The U. S. government properly took the position that since the rebellion was crushed, it would be better to treat the defeated forces as mistaken brothers and not as enemies who are to be extermin-
What is the strength of the Communist Party of America?

Foster's popular vote, in 1932, was 102,991, against Norman Thomas' 884,781. The 1933 meeting of the Communist International, in Moscow, showed that the American Communist party received from 10,000 to 15,000 new members each year, but that the average membership of the party is 9,000. This shows that the American Communists are not able to keep their members. In membership and vote the Communist party is pitifully small. In fact, it is not a factor. Here may be found evidence for the conclusion that American Communist leaders, through their fascist tactics, their hatred for radical movements outside the official Communist organizations, their eternal drives against democratic institutions, their adherence to the philosophy of violence in a country committed to constitutional methods, are completely alienated and will, perhaps, remain that way.

What is the membership of the Communist Party?

The Communist Party of the U.S. now claims a membership of 24,500. Its official report (1931) claimed 8,399 members. When the 1934 figure was presented to the Communist convention no evidence was offered in support of this assertion. A financial report on dues-paying would have been in order, but Secretary Earl Browder was careful to avoid this important feature. Almost three-fourths of this Communist membership is made up of the unemployed, which shows that the party has made no headway among the workers in factories, mines and mills. Considering that we have gone through almost five years of deep depression, the showing is so meager as to warrant the conclusion that the Communist Party is so alien to the traditions and mentality of American workers as to be unworthy of serious consideration as a factor in America's social and economic future. The facts speak for themselves. After 10 years of hoodlumism, showmanship and threats, American Communism is hardly more than a private sect, without the slightest contacts with American industry. This party has received tremendous publicity because of its spectacular street rowdylism, but there is nothing to indicate that the American working class considers this rowdylism as a means of achieving economic independence. The Communist leaders claim that their hooliganism is valuable in that it teaches its young members the tactics of street fighting, but the facts show that since the police win every street fight it might follow that the real lessons are being learned by the police.

Some people tell me that the regime in Russia is not Communism but State Capitalism. How do you understand it?

State Capitalism describes an economy in which the government enters business, industry and finance as an adjunct to capitalism, with an end to preserving capitalism and the exploitation of the workers. When Hoover established the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in order to lend aid to the expiring bankers, he was giving the world a demonstration of State Capitalism. To be sure, Hoover had some vague notion that the hundreds of millions of government money turned over to the bankers would in some mysterious manner seep down to the common people, little realizing that the capitalists have their position so well insulated that any golden flow that reaches their paws stays there.

The $90,000,000 that Hoover's RFC turned over to the Dawes' rotten bank, loaded with German bonds, worth next to nothing, and Insull securities, worth less than nothing, served to save a group of Dawes' financial pirates from losing millions. They claimed, of course, that
the money would be used to protect the depositors, but this case, as others, showed that the concern of the Dawes outfit and the Hoover RFC was with the capitalists and not the poor.

This can be described as State Capitalism, in its purest essence. Now, is there the slightest evidence that such a regime rules in Russia? I challenge anyone to present even a sliver of a fact to prove that the Soviet Union uses its state in order to protect bankers and other capitalists in their “right” to keep their capital intact or to preserve their profits. To begin with, the banks and the industries don’t belong to the capitalists in that country; instead, they belong to the Soviet Union. From this it may be seen that by no stretch of the imagination can Russia be tagged as an example of State Capitalism.

Communism implies a socialized society—Socialism—with the additional feature of a dictatorship of the proletariat, with its denial of all democratic ideas and institutions. Socialism is based on socialized industry, the same as Communism, with the exception that the Socialists do not believe in a dictatorship, preferring as they do to preserve democracy and its truly democratic institutions and methods. From this it becomes increasingly clear that Russia, while not completely communistic, is as near to Communism as the world has ever experienced.

* * *

What was Karl Marx’ most original contribution?
He turned social revolution from an art into a science.

* * *

When did Marx and Engels live?
Karl Marx was born in 1819 and died in 1883. Friedrich Engels, his great collaborator and thinker in his own right, was born in 1820 and died in 1895.

* * *

Did Karl Marx make any original contributions to economics?
The most important elements of Marxism were: 1. the theory of surplus value; 2. the theory of concentration of capitalistic wealth; 3. the theory of the class struggle;

4. the increasing economic misery of the workers; 5. the theory of recurrent crises; 6. the technological developments in production that add to the toiler’s insecurity and unemployment. It happens that each of these six contributions were pre-Marxian discoveries, as follows: 1. from Turgot, Godwin, Hall, Thompson; 2. from Pecqueur, Fourier and Blanc; 3. from Plato and Aristotle in ancient economics, and from moderns such as Blanc, von Stein, Thlerry and Guizot; 4. from Rodbertus; 5. from Owen, Sismondi, Fourier and Rodbertus; 6. from various social scientists over a period of almost a century before Marxism was born. But this doesn’t imply that Marx was an unimportant economist. Like a true scientist, Marx welded all of these theories into one great system of Socialist thought.

* * *

Was Marx wrong in saying that the emancipation of the workers must be the act of the workers themselves?
Yes, he said it, but he forgot to add that the theoreticians of the working class have always been non-workers. Karl Marx himself never did a day’s manual labor in his entire life. He was an intellectual, pure and simple. Nor did Frederick Engels serve society as a workingman. As for Lenin, he never saw the inside of a factory even to the last days of his life. He was a professional writer, a revolutionary editor. Trotsky was not a workingman. As for Stalin, he was a professional revolutionist. Eugene V. Debs was a workingman in his youth, but he soon became a trade union official and then devoted himself to Socialist party affairs, mainly in the capacity of educator and agitator. Not a single leader of the Communist party of America is a workingman. Browder is a professional. Minor was a cartoonist, and a very good one, but threw up this artistic endeavor when he became a social rebel. William Z. Foster may have worked in his early youth, but his mature life is one long record of professionalism in union and Com-
mnist circles. Incidentally, during the World War Foster forgot his revolutionary doctrines and became a militarist, making speeches in support of the government's Liberty Loan drives. Most leaders of the revolutionary movement are quick to attack others who lead the workers on the score of their not being workers, forgetting at the same time that they themselves are not real members of the working class. Such inconsistency does not seem to bother them, for the mutual exchange of abuse and recrimination continues. This argument does not do away with the fact that when the time comes for a change the workers will be the ones to make the revolution possible, but this does not mean that the workers will be led by workers.

* * *

What is the difference between a Communist and a Bolshevik?

A Bolshevik is merely a person who belongs to the majority. That's what the word means — majority large. A Communist, belonging to the "majority," is therefore a Bolshevik. To most English speaking persons the words are synonymous, but I prefer to use the word Communist when speaking of the present rulers of Russia.

* * *

Is it a fact that Lenin advised his followers to use the jesuitical motto, "The end justifies the means"?

You probably have in mind a pamphlet by Lenin, entitled "Should Communists Participate in Reactionary Trade Unions?" issued in 1923. In this booklet, published by the Communist Party, in New York City, Lenin told his propagandists "to practice trickery, to employ cunning, and to resort to illegal methods — to sometimes even overlook or conceal the truth." That this teaching has been accepted by the American Communists is evident from even a casual reading of The Daily Worker, probably the most despicable, lying, immoral, unethical sheet ever issued. From the quotation just given, it is plain that Lenin's dictum was even worse than that of the Jesuits, though the latter, in practice, have made use of every point in Lenin's "code" of ethics. If The Daily Worker is an example of what Leninism means when it is transplanted to American soil, the sooner we get rid of it the better for the future of the country. There is no reason why upholders of the doctrine of socialized industry should neglect honor, truth, fairness, justice and plain decency. One does not have to resort to gutter morality and hooliganism in order to further a cause that has in view the betterment of humanity.

* * *

I have come upon the statement that the Communists at times hold to the philosophies of materialism and free will. Please explain.

The statement is an accurate description of the contradictoriness of Communists. When they judge their own individual or social behavior, they resort to a realistic materialism. They hold to the pressure of economic forces and explain themselves from that basis. Thus, when a Lenin turns from collectivism to a New Economic Policy (the famous NEP), Lenin is praised for his great intelligence in recognizing material forces and making strategic retreats to fit the circumstances. But should a Socialist temporize as a matter of expediency or any other motive, the Communists become sudden converts to the Christian free will philosophy and accuse the Socialists of being willful traitors, corruptionists, weaklings, cowards and all the other favorite epithets of the school of thinkers who accept the theory that man's behavior is an expression of his own personal will. It is exactly like the argument of the Christian, which holds that man "sins" because he has a base, wicked heart and prefers sin to virtue.

* * *

What is the Comintern? Also, the Profintern?

"Comintern" is the word used to describe the Third International of Communist political parties. The "Profintern" is the Red International of Labor Unions. These two organizations were founded by the Communist Party of Russia in order to achieve a world-wide revo-
lution against imperialistic capitalism. At the time of the 1917 Russian Revolution, it was agreed among Marxians that this revolution was only a prelude to an international revolution, which Marx claimed was necessary to the establishment of Socialism. For a time it seemed as though this analysis was sound, for countries in Central Europe rang with revolutionary alarms and slogans. It was felt that the above two organizations—the Comintern and the Protintern—would take the leadership and usher in world revolution. History has, for the time being, spoken differently, so the two organizations are beginning to wither. Russia's policy is based on concentrating all efforts in Russia, instead of fomenting world-wide proletarian uprisings. It was this issue that brought about the ousting of Trotsky and the victory of Stalinism.

***

Is Max Eastman a follower of Trotsky?

W. E. Monaghan, Grantwood, N. J., calls attention to my error in describing Max Eastman as a leader of the Trotskyites in this country. "Max Eastman," he writes, "is not, and never was, a Marxist of any sort. His articles and recent pamphlet against dialectic materialism are sufficient proof of this. His controversy with Herman Simpson, a Trotskyite, in The New Republic recently, shows this some more. Also his scraps with Sidney Hook."

I based my remark on the fact that Eastman was Trotsky's official translator and warm personal admirer. However, this does not make him a Trotskyite by any stretch of the imagination. His attacks on the policies of the Stalinites in the Soviet Union place him close to Trotsky, but without making him a leader or a follower in the camp of the Trotskyites.

Mr. Monaghan has noticed that others, besides myself, have been guilty of writing of Eastman as a Trotskyite and a Marxist, mentioning specifically Herschell Brickell, in the New York Post, and G. D. H. Cole, in his book, "What Marx Really Meant." He marks a passage in Eastman's review of Cole's book, in The Nation, May 23, 1934, as follows:

"I must append a correction to Mr. Cole's allusion to my book, 'Marx and Leninism,' as giving a 'Trotskyite interpretation' of Marxism. That is an unscholarly reference to my book and a crude injustice to Trotsky, who is an orthodox Marxist, and violently opposed to my position."

What is the T. U. U. L.?

It is the Trade Union Unity League and is headed by William Z. Foster, one of the leaders of the Communist Party in the U. S. This League is a part of the Red International and its immediate purpose is to destroy the American Federation of Labor. Socialists grant readily that the A. F. of L. is often too meek and conservative, but they properly hold that its destruction might leave American labor in the position of Germany's working class today, after its labor movement was annihilated by Hitler.

***

Is there a red menace in the U. S.?

I have written many times that the Communist "menace" in this country is a creation of the newspapers, etc. There is no such thing as a "red" threat against the U. S. The membership of the Communist Party is very small—less than 25,000. The party claims about that much, but I rather believe it isn't one-third that figure. As for votes, the Communist Party polled only 100,000 votes in the last national election.

Now comes Representative Carl M. Weldeman, of Michigan, who, as a member of the Dickein Congressional Committee that was selected and empowered to investigate Communist activity in this country, reports formally that the "Red Menace" is a myth. There isn't any. It is a fabrication.

Congressman Weldeman, in Chicago, on August 24, 1934, said:

"Our investigation has disclosed that not only in Chicago but in the whole country, although huge sums are contrib-
uted for the purpose of combating Communism by well-meaning persons, the most that has been done is to hire people to act as fomenters in these organizations to lead the American people to believe that Communism, Bolshevism and Nazism are at present a menace to organized society, which we do not believe they are.

According to this authority, capitalist and fascist racketeers provoke disorders in order to frighten the rich and get money to "combat" what they stirred up. The Communists, on the other hand, gladly accept every charge of being a "menace" because they too thrive on such publicity. Communism is so puny and impotent as to be hardly more than a joke, yet big headlines scream red revolution and Bolshevism. The Communists impress their deluded followers with their "strength" and in that manner keep themselves in funds, which means that Communism, as well as anti-Communism, in the U.S., is a brazen racket.

Who are the "Secret 13"?

This is still another one of those anti-red societies run by racketeers out for easy pickings from scared, dumb businessmen. This racket is being operated in San Francisco, where the capitalists are still suffering from the jitters. Representatives of the "Secret 13" muscle in, refuse to tell anything about their organization, except that they work underground to clean the reds out of the state—and walk away with plenty of kale, if the boss is properly scared. This wave of hysteria is like manna from heaven for the shrewd boys who know their red onions. It's getting so that everything from a drought to a ship fire is blamed on the Communists. When the Morro Castle burned, with a loss of 137, the Communists were accused even before the federal government had begun its inquiry. Such hysteria is right up the alley of the racketeers who organize societies like the "Secret 13." We blame everything on the Communists. The Germans blame everything on the Jews. The Russians blame everything on the kulaks. And so on. Everybody seems to have a goat handy.

What is your opinion of "The Red Network"?

This funny book was compiled by a Chicago woman, Elizabeth Dillin. It is a Who's Who of Communists, listing 1,450 names, and is being used as a source book among those who see a Communist behind every hedge post and under every bed. One gets a hint of this woman's eccentric turn of mind when one sees listed as dangerous, terroristic, revolutionary Communists persons like Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Miss Jane Addams, William Allen White, former N.Y. Police Commissioner O'Ryan, Newton D. Baker, Mayor LaGuardia, Samuel Untermyer, Clarence Darrow and Father Ryan. One wonders why she omitted Aimee Semple McPherson, Emily Post, Eddie Guest, Will Rogers, Charlie Chaplin, Eddie Gesta, Greta Garbo and Charles Lindbergh.

What do you think about the Communist daily, The Daily Worker?

I'm sorry to have to say that I consider this organ just about the rottenest sheet published in the entire history of journalism. It has absolutely no sense of fairness, truth or honesty. To read this official organ to the exclusion of other sources of news would mean the acquirement of a distorted, untruthful picture of individuals, organizations and policies. I can't quite figure out whether the Worker's editors are fools or candidates for the booby hatch. I can't go into their numerous lies, distortions, and inconsistencies, because of space limitations, but let us consider the paper's policy with regard to one matter of public concern.

When President Roosevelt first announced the CWA employment program that aimed at giving work to 4,000,000 men, the Worker screamed its head off, yelling "forced labor," "slavery," "beginning of fascism," "further enslavement of the working class."

Then, a few days later, it charged Roosevelt with being a liar about
his promise to put 4,000,000 men on temporary work. It printed a prominently displayed article which claimed that not more than 50,000 men had been given CWA jobs. This, of course, was the sheerest rot, because here in my own county in southeast Kansas, Crawford County, with a population of only 50,000, exactly 2,900 men were working under the CWA.

Later, when it was announced that CWA workers would be given fewer working hours each week, the Worker threw a new fit, squawking about Roosevelt’s brutality in throwing millions of workingmen out of CWA jobs. It organized mass demonstrations to force the administration to continue the CWA jobs.

Now, which was right? Was the CWA fascism, forced labor and all that? Was it a fake, with only 50,000 jobs? Or was it a crime against humanity and the shades of Karl Marx and Lenin to cut down on CWA time?

Such nonsense proves one thing—The Daily Worker is edited by a bunch of goofy-minded nuts.

* * *

The Communist press refers to Upton Sinclair as a Fascist. Please comment.

It is ridiculous to use that word in describing Sinclair. I have seen The Daily Worker editorial to which you refer and find it typical of American Communism’s bankruptcy of intellect. Sinclair attacked Fascism throughout his campaign, and in a radio address the day after the primary (in which he was chosen by a vote in excess of 400,000) he denounced Hitler as “an obscene demagogue.” Of course, the word “obscene” referred to Hitler’s well-known homosexual practices. The word “demagogue” referred to his appeals to mass and race prejudice, coupled with an economic program that is shot through with insanities and contradictions. In the same address, Sinclair defined Fascism as “Capitalism plus murder,” which is a keen observation.

Sinclair does not repudiate our democratic traditions, popular education, civil liberties, free press, parliamentary methods and the right to speak one’s mind. If that is true, where does one find the grounds for calling him a Fascist?

* * *

The Communist official organ charges Mayor Hoan with crushing the recent Milwaukee car strike. What are the facts?

The Milwaukee strike was not lost. It was a great victory for labor. Every demand of the carmen’s union was granted by the street car company. So, since the strike was won, how is it possible to charge Socialist Mayor Hoan with “crushing” the strike? Here we meet again the familiar tactics of the rotten, lying Daily Worker. The Socialist administration gave every possible assistance to the strikers, even rounding up the company’s imported thugs and jailing them for vagrancy. The workers of Milwaukee know that Mayor Hoan is their friend, regardless of the lies circulated by The Daily Worker.

* * *

The Daily Worker makes a big fuss over the fact that Severing, Socialist leader, is paid a pension by the Hitler government.

From what I can learn, Severing is entitled to a pension as a result of many years’ service to the German government, all of it given before the advent of Hitler to the chancellorship. Most of these pensions have been continued by the government, the same as unemployment relief payments. It is about on a par with the case of The Daily Worker’s cartoonist, William Gropper, who draws $38.25 per week from the U. S. treasury as federal relief for an unemployed artist. If this paper were really consistent, it would bawl out its own cartoonist for working on a Communist paper and taking money from a capitalistic government.

* * *

The Daily Worker, Communist organ, charges Socialist Mayor Hoan, of Milwaukee, with using his police department to beat strikers. Please comment.

This is typical of Daily Worker lies. This thoroughly dishonest, hysterical sheet has absolutely no
conception of honor, decency, or fairness. It will resort to any kind of falsehood in order to carry out its malicious policies. In the case of Mayor Hoan, the editors of The Daily Worker are careful to avoid mentioning the well-known fact that mayors of first class Wisconsin cities have no control over the police department. The legislature, decades ago, took the police department out of the hands of the Milwaukee local officials. The chief of police in Milwaukee is appointed for life by the Governor of the state. The Milwaukee chief of police is in no way answerable to the orders of Mayor Hoan or any other Socialist official.

* * *

Please comment on the enclosed article, in The American Guardian, in which its editor, Oscar Ameringer, explains how he collected $700,000 from Oklahoma Socialists to found a daily Socialist newspaper, The Oklahoma Leader, and sent most of this money to maintain The Milwaukee Leader.

The article, written in a defensive mood, is more than puzzling. This Socialist co-worker of the famous "Dr. D." Fred D. Warren (of eczema patent medicine fame) gives the impression that his motive in collecting vast sums from the Oklahoma Socialists was purely disinterested and innocent of any thought of selfishness. However, the article does not explain how it came about that the large printing plant of The Oklahoma Leader, in Oklahoma City (paid for with the sweat and blood of the Oklahoma Socialists), became, and now is, the private property of this same Oscar Ameringer. This Oklahoma outfit is beyond me.

* * *

I am an Oklahoma Socialist, now on federal relief, who put $1,000 into Oscar Ameringer's corporation to start the Oklahoma City Leader. What became of my hard-earned money?

Ameringer ought to be able to tell you. So far as I can learn, the situation is something like this: Ameringer went around Oklahoma and collected tens of thousands of dollars from comrades like yourself. He has a genius for that sort of promotional enthusiasm. With your money he bought presses, linotypes, and other equipment needed to issue a great daily newspaper. Some issues of the paper were printed. Then followed a period of mystery, ballyhoo and hokum. At any rate, when the smoke cleared, two mighty Goss presses, eight linotype machines, a handsome building, immense stores of paper, fixtures, typewriters, adding machines and scores of other items of valuable property were—well, where were they? So far as I can discover, they became the personal property of Oscar Ameringer and his associates, mainly members of his own family. Maybe there weren't two Goss presses. There may have been three. Or one, for that matter. But there it is. Plain as day. An immense printing plant, paid for by the good comrades of Oklahoma, flipped into the hands of Ameringer, and it's been there ever since. I don't know how it was done. But it's certain that your $1,000 helped. Was it all legal? I suppose so. Such things have happened before.

* * *

As an eastern Canadian I am interested in the policies of British Columbia, which are attracting a great deal of attention in our press. Please explain.

Premier Pattullo, of British Columbia, is setting up boards under a New Deal that have the power to fix minimum wage scales. This is considered an improvement on the Rooseveltian idea of writing minimum wages into codes which the industries themselves are to control. Under Pattullo's plan the state decides the standard of living. In addition, Pattullo has also provided marketing boards which are empowered to regulate the methods and conditions of marketing, by which means he has been able to ban imports from eastern Canadian provinces which do not maintain the same minimum wages provided by British Columbia. This caused a howl in the Eastern press, but Pattullo insists that western Canada will refuse to buy their goods unless they at least
meet his province's wage conditions. His policies are greatly influenced by his fear of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, which, in his province, is advocating the clearest kind of Socialism. This Socialist opposition is so strong, and is growing so rapidly that Premier Pattullo has to meet it head-on in the legislature by making real concessions to the working masses and farmers. This goes to show how real radicalism can make political liberalism step along a little faster by the mere threat of its presence.
The Soviet Union

Are Russian newspapers like those in the U. S.?

Russian newspapers are totally unlike their American contemporaries. The first difference one notices is their small size. Even the greatest newspaper—Izvestia, official government organ, and Pravda, official Communist Party organ—contain only four pages. There are two reasons for this: 1. the paper shortage; 2. the absence of commercial advertising of the kind that is so familiar to American readers. Russian newspapers print advertisements of an announcement nature—lectures, theaters, movies, radio programs, new publications, government stores, etc.—but they carefully avoid what American newspapers thrive on—"institutional publicity"—as exemplified by Fisher Bodies, gasoline, tires, telephone companies, power combines, etc. Also, Russian newspapers are careful to avoid giving space to crime or personal scandal, two sources of profit to American circulation managers. The cheap features of American journalism are avoided—sensation—alism, sex scandals, divorce news, snappy murders, cheap features, stock exchange listings, society blah—blah, and the like. Russian newspapers deal with the everyday realities of current industrial, governmental and cultural life. Space is given to questions of great social importance. Superficial and frivolous treatment of news is frowned on. A big job finished somewhere on the industrial front—a new power plant, a great industrial establishment, a new high in gold production, an increase in wheat sowing—such matters are considered first-page news in Russia.

Has newspaper publishing grown or declined in Russia since the 1917 Revolution?

Before the Revolution, Russia had 859 newspapers; with a combined circulation of 2,700,000. In 1934 there were 5,400 newspapers, with a combined circulation of 38,000,000, according to official reports. However, this does not mean that Russia's 5,400 newspapers are all of the calibre of the metropolitan papers published in large centers like Moscow and Leningrad. Most of these 5,400 papers are about on a par with our village weeklies. But this does not alter the fact that journalism has made tremendous strides since the Revolution.

Will not the educational system the Russians have established develop a mental attitude in the rising generation that will lead to voluntary acceptance of their policies in time?

Yes. There isn't the slightest doubt that you are right. Russia's situation at home and abroad is constantly improving. Russia is gaining new friends internationally among the capitalistic powers, particularly France and the United States. And at home the people, through education and clever propaganda, have grown more and more receptive to Soviet policies. Russia feels so firm and lasting at home that she has stripped the GPU (Russian terrorist secret police) of its powers to conduct secret,
summary trials. There are no enemies to be feared in all of the Soviet Union, and the world is beginning to recognize this situation. The growing generation is entirely friendly to Russia's ideals. The only objections that one hears come from the older generation, but they are powerless to prevent Russia's steady march towards industrialization and a classless society.

Are school enrollments in Russia growing?

According to official sources, Russian elementary schools had 11,697,000 pupils in 1929, but in 1933 this number increased to 19,163,000. The middle, or what we would call the high schools, had 2,453,000 pupils in 1929; in 1933 this number grew to 6,674,000. The universities in 1929 had 207,000 students; in 1933 there there 491,000. Such figures give uncontested proof that the Soviet Union is seriously tackling the problem of mass education, and winning all along the line. The fight against illiteracy is almost won.

Are there many churches in Russia?

Emelyan Yaroslavsky, head of Russia's militant atheists, reports that there are 100,000 churches in the Soviet Union. It is well to remember that while Russia officially disapproves of religion and does not permit members of the Communist Party to be affiliated with any church organization or even to profess religion, it is a fact that religion is tolerated and churches are permitted to function. Russia does not believe in using force in defeating religion. It prefers the saner method of education. Occasionally even Communists are found (in the more backward sections) who participate in religious rites and ceremonies, but it is the usual practice to order such persons expelled. Most of the communicants are among the old. The youth of Russia is almost entirely atheistic.

What is the attitude of Russia towards the Zionist movement?

The Soviet Union considers Zionism as nothing less than a scheme of British imperialism. As England controls Palestine, the completion of a Jewish National Home in that land will strengthen British interests. The Jews are being used as though they were so many pawns.

What is the fundamental thesis of Russia's theory of criminal justice?

It is very simple. The basic assumption (soundly administered) has it that crime is a reflection of economic causes. This accounts for the lightness of sentences and absence of revengeful punishment, except, of course, criminal behavior motivated by counter-revolutionary ideas, which is met with sentences of death or exile to Siberia. Harold Laski, after a trip to Russia, reports that "it (the prison administration) deserves all the eulogies that have been heaped upon it. . . . The ordinary prisons prove that a Socialist environment has a capacity for regeneration of which it is impossible to overestimate the significance."

Why is it that not a single Jewish synagogue was destroyed during the Russian revolution?

The questioner's attitude suggests that the Russian Bolsheviks were favorable to Judaism and therefore put no restrictions on the institutions of that religion. Such a notion is without historical support. The Russian revolutionists did not go on a church-destroying spree. Many old Russian churches were preserved as historical relics, others were closed because of disuse, and those that were permitted to run (and there are many such today) had to obey certain laws regulating their method of operation. The regulations applied equally to the synagogues as to the temples and cathedrals. The Jews do not receive special consideration at the hands of the authorities when they desire to conduct services in a synagogue. Of course, the Russian government is out-and-out atheistic, so it gives no support, directly or indirectly, to any religious institution. The churches are strictly on their own, with no favoritism from the state. The
churches of all religions are getting less and less popular support as the Communists continue their intensive educational campaign against the absurdities of religion. Church-going in Russia stamps one as an inferior, with the result that the weight of public opinion helps make an active religionist something of an outcast, in the same way that non-church-going in backward American communities stamps the unbeliever as something between an idiot and a murderer. Religion is growing more unpopular every day in Russia. The process in America is slower, but that it is working will be admitted by the most fanatical supporter of the church. Anti-religious sentiment is making amazing headway in every country that permits freedom of conscience.

* * *

Are there more prisons and prisoners in Russia today compared with Czarist days?

Before the Revolution of 1917, there were more than 1,000 prisons in Czarist Russia, with 200-000 prisoners. Today there are only 60,000 prisoners in 200 prisons. Russian prisons of today are the most humanitarian in the world. It is a misnomer to call them prisons. They are more like hospitals for the treatment of persons addicted to anti-social conduct. Crimes of violence are rarities in Russia.

* * *

Do lawyers practice their profession in the Soviet Union?

Russia does not have lawyers, in the sense that we know them. A person who is arrested for a crime in Russia is defended by a pleader, who does not receive a fee from the accused, but instead receives a salary from the government. Russian law courts operate in harmony with simple formulas. Lay judges sit with the regular judges, the lay members making their living through regular industrial or agricultural vocations. The pleaders are expected to present every possible fact in favor of the accused, but cannot resort to trickery, legal red tape, and endless citations from precedent. Russian justice is simple, direct and thoroughly unlawyer-like. In crimes of passion or violence, in which the accused is not charged with counter-revolutionary activity, the penalties are remarkably light, the worst, for murder, being only 10 years in institutions of correction rather than prisons of punishment. There is very little crime in Russia. In Russia, the accused, if guilty, is punished quickly and surely, but never severely. Severity is not a deterrent, as we in America naively believe. Celerity is a greater weapon than severity.

* * *

What is the attitude of the Soviet Union towards the League of Nations?

Maxim Litvinoff, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, took the position that Russia must remain out of the League because of the unfriendliness of two of its great members, Germany and Japan. But since these two nations have withdrawn from the League, Russian policy has changed. Litvinoff now considers the League as a possible means of peace and disarmament. The powerful Russian state is able to do seemingly contradictory things: 1. Build up the world's most powerful military force. 2. Convince the world that it is really friendly to peace and security for all nations, with no desire to participate in wars of aggression, annexation or exploitation. Russia seeks friendly relations with the entire world and offers to back up this policy with genuine disarmament.

* * *

Is Russia's foreign policy based on Marxism?

Maxim Litvinoff, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, cannot go to the Marxist philosophy for guidance because Karl Marx never took up the problem of Socialist foreign policy in a capitalist world. Soviet foreign policies are therefore improvisations.

* * *

I have seen a newspaper report to the effect that Litvinoff is quite devoid of influence in Russia's internal affairs. Please comment.

I don't doubt this is true. Since
Maxim Litvinoff's job is to take care of Russia's foreign affairs, why should he be expected to butt into internal doings? I can't quite see the point of the criticism. He has a big enough task keeping Russia out of war without interfering with matters of internal policy.

* * *

What are the underlying principles of the Soviet Union's foreign policies?

Russia, before all things, wants peace. That is the crux of her foreign policy. She does not want to exploit any foreign nation or people, so war is never a part of her program. At the same time she is militant enough to want to defend what she owns. That explains why Stalin recently warned the Japanese imperialists as follows: "Let them keep their pig's snouts out of our cabbage patch." Russia lost some territory along her western border during and shortly after the World War, but herein she is unlike capitalistic countries like Germany and France in that she refuses to demand the return of this soil or to pursue a policy of seeking a war of revenge in order to regain what once belonged to her. Russia never intends to fight for what she once held, but will fight to the last breath to hold what she now controls. There is one other point of foreign policy that suggests itself at this time. Karl Radek, Russia's greatest journalist, in an article in the January, 1934, Foreign Affairs, wrote that it would be consistent for Russia to join forces with a capitalistic country that is not her enemy in order to defeat another capitalistic country that is her enemy. This means, in so many words, that if Russia and Japan were to go to war, which is an immediate likelihood, Russia would welcome a military alliance with, let us say, the United States. However, such cooperative military action would not include any agreement to dismember Japan. Russia would fight under such conditions only to protect her own land, but once she won that objective she would withdraw and make no attempt to appropri-ate land or other benefits from a beaten foe. In other words, Russia's foreign policy simmers down to this: Keep your dirty hands off us, and if you don't we'll show you we mean business by fighting to protect every square inch of our country.

* * *

What is the G. P. U.?

The Russians call it the Gay-Pay-Oo, and usually there is dread in the speaker's voice, for the G. P. U. stands for the United State Political Administration, the Soviet's secret political police. This powerful secret body has many duties, the most important being the detection and suppression of counter-revolutionary activity. The G. P. U. does espionage work at home and in foreign countries, watches the borders and maintains its own private army, probably the most disciplined military organization in all history. This secret body works under conditions that would be repugnant to Americans or other people who have learned to appreciate the value and benefit of civil rights. The G. P. U. can arrest at will, without warrants, and conducts its own trials, openly or secretly, as it chooses. It also carries out its own verdicts. There is no appeal from it decisions. It can order summary execution, banishment, imprisonment, forced labor, or, in light cases, denial of the right to leave one's city. It was organized to preserve the Revolution from the attacks or conspiracies of counter-revolutionaries. However, it is not permitted, under any conditions, to deal with ordinary crimes. There must be an element of counter-revolutionary behavior before the G. P. U. may take jurisdiction, and when it does, well, it's just too bad, because this outfit gets things done quickly and efficiently. Sabotage, in Russia, is considered as counter-revolutionary, which makes the G. P. U. active in the industries, particularly the railroads, where the G. P. U. has special details always on watch. There is no denying the fact that the Soviet Union has a right to protect itself, but its methods of secret terrorism, through the G. P.
U., outrage the sentiments of every lover of open justice, liberty and ordinary civil rights.

* * *

Could the Soviets in Russia have made the amazing progress they have made, or, in fact, any progress at all if they had not used force in the suppression of the opponents of revolution?

Russia most certainly was right in using force to crush the counter-revolutionaries, particularly the White Guards who organized military campaigns against the workers' republic. No one would dream of denying a democracy, or a proletarian state, the right to defend itself. Force is necessary when the enemies of a state act only through force. It was a case of defending the revolution or going back to Czarism. The Russians preferred to crush their enemies, and in this they were right. But this is no excuse for the denial of all civil and human rights to individuals who certainly cannot be listed as counter-revolutionaries.

Today, Russia has succeeded in crushing every semblance of White Guardism. The aristocracy is dead, perhaps for all time. There can be no return to the days before the revolution. Russia has cast the die. The thing is done, once and for all. But, in achieving this necessary end, was it necessary to persecute and exile men and women who were as revolutionary as the most zealous Bolshevik, but who differed on matters of policy? Was it necessary to mistreat Socialists who could not swallow everything that went by the name of Leninism? Was it necessary to go on heresy hunts that were intended to crush factions of the revolutionary movement itself? Was it necessary to stamp out all ideas of civil liberties? I think not. Armed White Guardism could be met only with force, but this did not mean that every form of intellectual independence should be treated in the same ruthless manner.

* * *

Is there a law in Russia against cabarets?

Moscow has dozens of cabarets, where one may dine, dance and flirt. They run legally, with even American jazz music tolerated and applauded.

* * *

What is there to these rumors of famine in Russia?

The Catholic Church, through its greatest dignitaries, has been spreading reports of vast famines in Russia. Other capitalist servants have been doing the same thing. But when one comes to investigate the "evidence" one concludes that there is being conducted a great propaganda campaign to poison the minds of the masses in capitalist nations against the progress of Socialism. The Catholic-Fascist combination, which has much bad news to cover up at home, tries to hide its shortcomings by bringing up charges of famine and cannibalism in the Soviet Union. Sherwood Eddy, who has made 12 trips to Russia, has written another book, "Russia Today," in which he tells about a rumor that all but one inhabitant of the village of Gavrillova had died of starvation. As this community had a population of 1,110, Mr. Eddy decided to go there for a personal investigation. After a thorough examination he was able to report that three persons had succumbed to typhus, public institutions had been shut tight, vaccination had been resorted to on a thorough scale, the disease was completely in hand—and not a single individual had died of starvation.

* * *

What would happen if the Soviet Union were to collapse?

I take it you merely want me to express an opinion, for it would be absurd for me to even attempt to answer your question categorically.

Let us suppose that the Soviet government were overthrown today. What would happen? There are several possibilities. First, there might be a strong enough leadership to establish a new government, though this might be unlikely. The country is so vast—one-sixth of the land area of the globe—and its population so immense—168,000,000.

Granted that the new govern-
ment could not hold its territory, there would be the threat of a break-up of the country. This would lead to the second possibility, which is as follows:

The imperialistic capitalist governments would go into a mad scramble for Russia's land. In the East, Japan would rush its soldiers westward, through Siberia, grabbing off the last possible acre of land. From the West, Germany and Poland would go into a frenzied race to see how much each country could steal from European Russia. In the race they might get into a war among themselves, and by the time they could get a good fight going, France and England would appear on the scene to demand their share of the loot. They would, in turn, get into several different kinds of wars. In short, the downfall of Russia would be the worst thing that could happen. The Soviet Union's present strong government is one of the world's few guarantees of peace.

* * *

Why is the Soviet government building so many of its plants in Western Siberia?

These great industrial and chemical plants are put there for strategic reasons. In case of war they will be safe from air attacks. If hostilities were to open, Russia's bulk of industries would be immune to attack from Europe or Japan.

* * *

In his May 16, 1934, speech in Berlin, Hitler said: "Why does not Russia create her own paradise? Then we might be able to judge the results. But to date the Communists are living off the non-Communist institutions of the world." Please comment.

When Russia decided to become industrialized some 10 years ago, she had to employ the technical skill of the outside world. There is nothing unusual about that. Capitalist countries, in the past, have always drawn on other nations for methods, supplies, technique, patents, formulas, etc. Fifty years ago Japan was backward, without industries, chemistry, engineering, and the other branches of industrialism, but she drew on countries like the United States, England and Germany for the "know-how" and today Japan is a formidable competitor in many departments of business.

Japan learned how to make electric light bulbs from the General Electric Corporation, in the U. S. A., and learned her lesson so well that she is flooding the world with 10c lights that are causing untold agony among the leaders of that industry in this country. By a process of scientific assimilation Japan has become the world's greatest imitator, and does this with such efficiency that the originals are now afraid of the imitations.

The United States, with all its greatness in the industrial world, certainly did not invent the steam engine, or the factory system, or the power loom, or mining machinery, etc. Such great improvements came from England. Germany has done wonders in chemistry, but surely Hitler would not claim that German capitalism is self-contained, self-sufficient. Germany, like every other capitalistic country, has taken whatever was worth taking wherever it was to be found.

Russia, in order to join the family of industrial giants, must frankly be an imitator for some decades, while she establishes a firm foundation for her industrial system. She will hire technicians just so long as they are necessary, while she goes ahead with the work of training her young men and women to render creative services in the industries of the future.

Russia has nothing to be ashamed of because of her willingness to learn from capitalistic countries. She is mighty careful to avoid the evils of capitalism—that is to say, private monopoly, wage slavery, unemployment, financial tyranny and profiteering. She lets Germany, England and the United States worry along with the system that makes for exploitation, the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few capitalists, mass misery through unemployment, over-production and unearned fortunes.

Russia is too smart to take ev-
everything that is capitalistic. All she wants from capitalism is the scientific method of wealth production, and capitalism certainly knows how to produce wealth. Of that there is no doubt. But capitalism makes a flop of things when it comes to the problem of distribution, and that is where Socialism will shine, after it solves its problems of production through the application of science to industry.

*

Please describe Russia's Iron Mountain.

"Iron Mountain" is at Magnitogorsk, in the Soviet Union. It is literally a hill of iron ore, in the Ural mountains. It is estimated by engineers that this mountain can yield 10,000 tons of ore per day for a century. This "Iron Mountain" is by no means a recent discovery. It was known in the days of the czar, but little effort was made to exploit it. Some of the ore was mined and hauled by horse-drawn carts to a mill 50 miles distant, but naturally, under such conditions, production had to be meager. Now all is changed. Beginning in 1928, the Russians got busy, and now greets a city of 300,000, with an up-to-date steel mill operating every hour of the day. At present, there is a daily output of 3,500 tons of pig iron, and steel is produced daily to the extent of 1,500 tons. It is a gigantic enterprise and promises to grow even larger. Those Russians are stepping along at a real pace. And remember, all this is being done under a social order which does not function under the profit motive. It is Socialism at work—producing steel.

*

Recently, in a newsreel, I saw an amazing picture showing hundreds of Russian men and women doing parachute jumps from an immense number of airplanes. Has this any new military significance?

I saw the same sensational picture. It looked like a mere stunt, but later I learned that the Soviet Union is training hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of parachute jumpers. An official report says this work will continue until the entire nation becomes air minded. Now comes a later report, which claims that a new theory of military strategy may result from this movement, the ultimate idea being to drop entire armies behind an enemy's line. The whole scheme sounds screwy, and yet who can deny that there may be something to it?

*

Why do you favor gigantic trade with Russia when you know how practically every other nation repudiated its legitimate obligations?

Do you know how much Russia actually owes the world? Less than a half billion dollars! With 160,000—000 people and one-sixth of the land area of the globe, such a debt is insignificant. Russia's strict policy is to pay as it goes, though it finds it necessary to get two, three and five years' time on large orders placed in foreign countries. Thus far it has met every obligation to the penny, when the items fell due.

Naturally, our next argument would run something like this: Granted that it has done well thus far, but couldn't this mean that they haven't been able to get more than they did, and if they were to pile up billions and billions of dollars of obligations wouldn't they repudiate the entire debt and calmly start at scratch again?

The answer is really simple. Russia would far prefer to sell its goods to foreign nations in exchange for machinery, metals, services, etc. While on this point, let me call attention to the speech of our ambassador to Russia, William C. Bullitt, addressing an organization of Philadelphia business men. Remember, Bullitt is a great friend of Russia's and has always been that way since the days of Lenin and the Peace Conference. And when Bullitt speaks about Russia, it is pretty wise to listen carefully, for there is a man who knows what he is talking about.

How would Bullitt handle Russia? Would he pour billions of dollars of credit into a fund to finance sales to the Soviet Union? By no means. He favors reasonable credits, at once, in order to expedite the movement of goods and services,
but his proposal is much sounder than that. In his speech he proposed that Russia be encouraged in its desire to sell its goods to us—goods that are non-competitive with American labor and business. There are many articles that we could buy from Russia, without injury to our own industries.

By buying liberally from Russia, we enable Russia to buy from us. That's the best way to promote the gigantic enterprise of rebuilding our foreign trade. I agree entirely with Mr. Bullitt. Do not hesitate over lending a few hundred millions of dollars to Russia, for the risk is good, especially in view of the fact that every dollar will be spent here. At the same time lay plans to buy hundreds of millions of dollars of Russian goods, with the strict understanding that not an American dollar is to leave the United States headed for Moscow.

Keep the money here, but organize a trade commission that will see to it that the money is used up to the last penny for the purchase of Russian goods. Do that and both countries will prosper. We are in desperate need of big orders from foreign countries, particularly Russia, our most promising customer. But don't finance such a program by American dollars being turned over to Russia so that country can buy our goods. No, that will only delay the agony.

No country can go right ahead, year after year, buying more than it sells. If Russia doesn't sell goods to us, our foreign trade with Russia will be lopsided and in time will collapse, but if we approach the problem intelligently and buy from Russia to the same extent that Russia buys from us, we'll soon be on the road to a real, sound boom.

What is your position with regard to the Kerensky debts? Was our Attorney General justified in declaring the Soviet Union in default under the Johnson Bill?

The United States government advanced $187,000,000 to the Kerensky provisional government, prior to Nov. 7, 1917, when the present Soviet government was established. This money was intended by President Wilson to finance war supplies for Kerensky to be used for two purposes: 1. Continue the war against the Central Powers; 2. crush the uprising of the workers in Russia.

The Soviet Union claims that not a penny of this money reached Russia. The money went to J. P. Morgan and Co., the U. S. Steel Corporation and other American interests associated with the munitions trust. When Kerensky fell, the Soviet Union took the position that all Czarist and Kerensky debts were in no manner the concern of the present government and would not be honored. This attitude has been accepted by the entire world, and when Roosevelt recognized Russia not a word was said about the Soviet Union paying the debts of the Czar or Kerensky.

It appears to be a case of powerful capitalist interests in America forcing Roosevelt's administration to step back a little from its position of full cooperation with Russia. The Export-Import Bank, organized by the United States government to finance trade with Russia, is now at a stalemate, after both sides were given to understand that the door had been opened for a vast increase in business with the Soviet Union. The Cummings decision comes at a time when one feels that the new policy was political, and nothing but that. The Johnson Bill, passed by Congress on April 14, 1934, was not intended to cover defaults on debts from non-existent governments.

By the same logic, if Attorney General Cummings is right, the British citizens who are holding scores of millions of bonds issued by our Confederate States during the Civil War could ask their government to turn to Washington for payment of these repudiated bonds. States like Mississippi, Alabama and other Southern states issued bonds which never were paid. Were they obligations of the United States? Of course not. The federal government has maintained, and properly, that these obligations are not commitments of the U. S. treasury. They have never been
acknowledged, and never will be. If the Soviet Union should be made to pay us debts it never contracted, then we ought to pay England the debts contracted by the Confederate states. We won't, and Russia won't. Let there be no doubt on that score.

The Soviet Union has never repudiated a dollar of its obligations since Nov. 7, 1917, when it took power. It pays every creditor promptly and willingly. But it will never pay a penny that went to the Czar or to Kerensky.

* * *

Do the Russian Communists expect a revolution in the United States?

On a recent visit to Moscow (November, 1934), Alexander A. Troyanovsky, Soviet ambassador to the U. S., advised his immediate superior, Litvinoff, and Stalin, that the possibility of a revolution in the U. S. belonged in the remote future, that despite the seriousness of the long-continued depression there isn't a sign of revolutionary action anywhere in the republic.

* * *

What is the status of the Kerensky loan since you last wrote about it?

The U. S. State Department is claiming $187,000,000, which the Wilson administration loaned the Kerensky provisional government. This loan the Soviet Government refused to recognize because it was an obligation made by a non-existent government and, furthermore, because it was used mainly to finance counter-revolutionary activities. The present discussions seem to indicate something of a solution. The Soviet ambassador to the U. S., Mr. A. A. Troyanovsky, has entered a counter-claim against the U. S. for damages our troops did when they entered Siberia in 1918 without even the formality of a declaration of war. It seems likely that the U. S. government will allow these claims and cancel them with the loans made to Kerensky, the result being that both items will be wiped out, or at least nearly so. My guess is that it will end with the Soviet Government paying a few million dollars and getting the mess cleaned up. There will still remain the much more difficult matter of private claims of Americans against Russia.

* * *

In one place you speak of Russia's dictatorship of the proletariat and in another you describe Stalin as Russia's dictator. Both can't be right.

I confess to carelessness in describing this feature of the Russian scene. It is inaccurate to speak of the Soviet Union as a dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship consists of the Communist Party, with the Russian proletariat subjected to this dictatorship. Stalin is the head of the Communist Party, and as such carries out the policies of the party's dictatorship. As the Communist Party has the power to remove him, he is not actually a dictator, along the lines of a Hitler or a Mussolini. The dictatorship rests with about 2,000,000 Communist Party members, who rule 188,000,000 people.

* * *

How can one refer to Stalin as a dictator when he doesn't hold any kind of office in the Soviet government?

While it is true that Stalin is not a member of the Russian government, he is nevertheless the big boss. He does this through his chairmanship of the Communist Party, which is in complete control of the policies of the Soviet Union. To make the situation clear to an American, picture a vast government run by members of Tammany Hall. It would follow that the head of Tammany Hall would be the boss of the entire government, even though he himself did not hold a political job.

* * *

What was the cause of the Stalin-Trotsky split?

The schism was both personal and programmatic. It was personal because these two giants—both close to the great Lenin himself—were mortal personal enemies who loathed each other implacably and irrevocably. It was also a feud based on Soviet policy. Stalin wanted to make peace with the capitalist world and settle down to the gigantic job of industrializing Rus-
Sia. Trotsky wanted to commit Russia to his theory of the perpetual revolution that was to bring world capitalism down in ruins and place Communists in control of every great capitalistic nation. Trotsky's scheme was grandiose; Stalin's was practicable and homely. There we have the difference between the two men—one is a great theatrical star, a poet in action, an incorrigible romanticist, with the mind of a scholar and the speech of an orator. The other is a slow, plodding, quiet, almost shy, retiring, publicity-hating, selfless toiler, who knows the tremendous power one has who can work behind the scenes, a sawer of wood, a revolutionary with the nature of a shopkeeper, colorless, almost drab, stubborn, relentlessly patient, with the speed and strength of an iceberg. Of course, Stalin won. The iceberg usually crushes the shiny, brittle house of glass. Trotsky was in Stalin's way, so he had him exiled. The charge that Trotsky is a counter-revolutionist and an enemy of the Soviet Union is Stalin at his lowest depths of character, at his crassest. Trotsky's theory of an endless world revolution may be sheer poetry, but there is nothing about it that is against revolutionary philosophy. Trotsky is just as good a Communist as Stalin, but he had the bad breaks because his fine, sharp lance couldn't make a hole in a stone wall.

* * *

**How does Russia handle the money question?**

Russia circulates money for domestic use. However, such money never has any gold or silver behind it. The government has over $700,000,000 of gold in its treasury, but this can be used only to pay foreign debts contracted to supply the Soviet Union with its needed services, heavy machinery, copper, etc.

The question now arises: What establishes the value of the paper rubles used by the Russian proletariat? The Soviet Union answers that since all business and industry and transportation are state monopolies, money is merely used as a receipt for services rendered. If A works in a shoe factory, he receives his pay in rubles—those rubles are nothing more than a receipt from the government for the services he has rendered and the declaration that that receipt (paper money) may be used in government stores, restaurants, etc., to pay for the things A wishes to purchase. His being a worker entitles A to get a card which gives him the right to make purchases at government stores, where articles made by the government, or imported by that same body, are offered for sale. For this reason, Russia claims it is not necessary for its money to be backed by anything except the agreement that the government will reward each worker according to the work he has done.

In this case, the government establishes the amount of rubles the worker is to receive, and when the worker goes to buy at the government stores, the government sets the price at which the worker is to pay. There is in this arrangement a power in the hands of the government to control to the last penny just how much, or how little, a worker is to receive.

In addition, it frequently happens that a worker has his pockets full of rubles but cannot buy very much, other than stark necessities, because the stores may not have much of a stock on hand. This is one of the most serious sources of dissatisfaction with the Soviet system. As the industries become more productive, it is expected that this condition will be remedied, though there is great cause for the complaint that the government is so interested in building vast public enterprises that it thinks the workers should get along with as little as possible.

The workers, if they are not strict, disciplined Communists, do not like this attitude very much, because it is felt that many great officials in the government, while not grafters or exploiters, have an ordinary fondness for power and look on these great power sites, buildings, dams, etc., as monuments to themselves.

After all, the average worker has
only one life to live, and this life, at best, is all too short, so there is constant grumbling over the paucity of goods even for those who have done their share of productive work.

To return to Russian money, it is illegal to send this Russian paper money out of the country or to import it once it has left Russia by illegal means. The reason for this is that the Russian authorities do not want their paper money to fall into the hands of tourists, who may be able to obtain great quantities of such money at bargain prices and then go into Russia and spend it. The idea is to make the tourists bring foreign money into Russia, and as this foreign money is spent with government institutions, such money soon reaches the State Bank, where it is applied to pressing foreign obligations.

* * *

Where does Russia stand with regard to gold?
The Soviet Union is now a great gold-producing country. It is reported that her gold production is worth $100,000,000 per year, valued at $35 per ounce, and that it will soon be possible to step this up another $50,000,000. During the past three years, Russia shipped to Germany, in payment for supplies and services, $243,445,920 in gold. The Soviet State Bank (a state monopoly) had a gold reserve of $703,647,000, as of January 1, 1934, despite enormous gold shipments to Germany. It is expected that Russia's gold will now flow to the U.S. instead of Germany, as soon as it pays the latter country its current obligations.

* * *

How strong is the cooperative movement in Russia?
Delegates from the U.S.S.R., attending the recent convention of the International Cooperative Alliance Congress, in London, England, reported that consumers' cooperatives have 73,000,000 members in the Soviet Union. They now operate 178,000 stores, which is an increase of 60,000 in the last three years. Cooperatives now run 1,400 modern bakeries, which are claimed, in many instances, to use the most advanced methods and equipment. The cooperatives also run a great many restaurants, factory dining rooms and lunchrooms, the last figures, for 1932, being 24,000, as against 10,800 in 1930. Daily lunches are fed to 2,850,000 school children in cooperative dining rooms.

* * *

Does Russia tolerate private business?
What there is of private enterprise is insignificant in volume. Stalin has reported that the state runs 99 percent of the industries and 84.5 percent of agriculture.

* * *

In Russia, where all business belongs to the government, how does a factory get the supplies or raw materials that it doesn't make itself?
The method used is very complicated, but I'll try my best to explain it. Remember, it isn't as simple as I put it, for so many things in that country are run inefficiently, bureaucracy rules, and red tape is wound around everything. But here's the general plan.

Let us say that a clothing factory needs a car of coal. It sends an order to the coal trust (a government monopoly) and delivers a certificate to the value of a carload of coal. The coal trust delivers the needed coal and uses that certificate as we would use money, except that it is recognized only in government transactions within the industries. The certificate is proof of so much value, said value being based on a price schedule made permanent in 1928.

As the certificates pile up, there is proof that the coal trust is productive, and it, in turn, is in a position to issue certificates to other government trusts. This method is supposed to prevent an industry or a factory from ordering what it is not in reasonable need of. Thus, if there were no limit, the clothing factory mentioned above might order 20 carloads of coal when it has need for only one car during the next few months.

That's the system, but it isn't as simple as it sounds. There is endless confusion and inefficiency, and
many factories and other industries find themselves hamstrung by their inability to get an even flow of the raw materials and supplies so urgently needed for straight-line production. However, such problems can be solved in time, when there is a real desire for improvement, and it is noticed that sentiment in the Soviet Union is growing for better and simpler methods of doing business.

* * *

Is agriculture Russia’s biggest industry?

It was, but now industry is greater than agriculture in the Soviet Union. Of the total wealth produced in Russia in 1933, 70.4 percent came from industry and 29.6 percent from agriculture. This is proof of amazing progress in the direction of industrialization, but it would be well to correct those who say that Russia has caught up or passed the United States in industrial production. There isn’t a scrap of evidence to support that view.

* * *

What is the present membership of the Communist Party of Russia?

Official figures are now available, as follows: real members, 1,872,488; applicant-members, who are in the party under probation, 935,298. This membership is in complete control of the party, and as no other political body is tolerated, it is in absolute command of all Russia. In addition to the regular Communist Party, there is the organization of Young Communists, young men and women between the ages of 16 and 23, numbering 4,500,000. The Young Pioneers, children under 16 years of age, number 6,000,000. It is a commonplace that the Communist Party of Russia is an organization hard to get into and easy to get out of. The entrance requirements are very strict. The reasons for expulsion are numerous.

* * *

Which Russian city has the largest population?

Moscow has a population of 3,500,000, as against 1,600,000 20 years ago.

* * *

How large is Russia’s land area?

Russia is 5,000 miles wide and almost 3,000 miles long, which makes it the largest country in the world. It covers between one-sixth and one-seventh of the land area of the globe.

* * *

What is the Biro-Bidjan Project?

Soviet Russia has offered the Jews of the world, through a decree of May 6, 1934, a Jewish autonomous region or republic, in the Far East, known as the Biro-Bidjan district. About 12,000 Jews have already gone there. It is claimed by Soviet authorities that millions could be accommodated in this district, with its 7,000,000 acres. This land, which is about twice the size of Palestine, is rich in timber, farm land, coal, iron, magnesium, etc. Its climate is somewhat mild. The main objection is its location—in southeastern Siberia, near the Japanese frontier. In the event of war, this section would be a cockpit. Another objection is its great distance from European civilization. The Soviet government offers to pay Jews their transportation costs, present them with arable land, free of taxes for a number of years, and food supplies until they are able to raise their own. Even wages are guaranteed for a stated period, in some instances. Efforts are being made by the Soviet Union to get Jews in France, Poland, Germany and other European countries to go to this district. Zionists object to this because they have their hearts set on building their national home in Palestine, but the reply is made that such a small country could not support more than a fraction of the world’s 15,000,000 Jews. There is no denying that Biro-Bidjan would entail great pioneering hardships on its inhabitants, but in time the people there could become self-supporting, with ample guarantees of cultural, religious, educational and lingual freedom. There is no escaping the fact that Russia today is Europe’s best friend to the Jews. And this was a country, only a few years ago, that was the main source of persecution and pogroms.

* * *

I notice the phrase “Socialist competition” in radical newspapers and
periodicals, especially when dealing with the Russian situation. What does it mean?

"Socialist competition" is unlike "Capitalist competition" in that it describes activities of the workers for the good of society instead of for an individual or a parasitic class. Under Capitalism, competition is destructive and wasteful. It is one of the evils that will make for the system's final defeat. Under a Socialist economy there is a form of competition that is entirely unlike that which prevails under Capitalism. "Emulation" would be a more accurate word. When, let us say, the workers in one shoe factory, try to produce more better shoes than the workers in another factory, such activity is called "Socialist competition" when both are stepping up production for the good of the Socialist order. Competition, under Capitalism, is a cut-throat process, in which workers undersell one another, or capitalists follow a policy of competition that injures the industry and in the end causes economic misery. "Socialist competition" is something like the sportsmanship shown in clean games, with each team trying to win an honest victory.

* * *

When you hold up Russia as the ultimate aim for this country, I can only hope that your views do not prevail.

Again and again I have gone to great pains to explain that even though I am in complete sympathy with the main policies of the Soviet Union, I do not hold the position that we in the United States should take Russia as our model. I say we should let Russia alone to work out her economic salvation, as she is most certainly doing, but at the same time we must remember that our opportunities and problems are different and our remedies must be applied through the use of American methods. I hope to see America adopt the principle of socialized industry, but it can, and must, be done through constitutional means, through the protection rather than the destruction of democratic institutions, through social democracy instead of dictatorship, through freedom of discussion, through education and legalistic measures. Russia and the United States are the world's two greatest countries today, because both countries are awake to their duties, and both countries will work out their economic reconstruction along lines natural to their traditions and psychology. Help Russia build her industries, but don't try to transplant Russian Communism to American soil, because that plant won't flourish over here. We can attain Socialism through our own political philosophy, with what has properly been called a revolution by consent. I don't believe that Russia is going to outstrip us in any activity of economic or political life. I'm just not enough for my own country to believe that, though I may be wrong. I hope not. The United States will go forward to greater and greater industrial achievements. We will solve our vast economic problems. We will bring justice to the workers, who are the real creators of wealth. Unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, student stipends, union wages to prisoners, elimination of child labor, a legal right to a job—all will come in the United States, and not in the remote future either. I believe great changes are around the corner. We are building a new civilization, and the future is bright. And when we reach our goal of the Cooperative Commonwealth, we will be able to look back and say we did it without bloodshed, without persecution, without violence, without scrapping our Constitution.

* * *

Has Soviet industrial production increased?

The official reports are impressive. The figures below give the tonnage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1927–28</th>
<th>1932</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>35,400,000</td>
<td>64,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>11,600,000</td>
<td>21,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig iron</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>6,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
<td>5,890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Russia is moving forward rapidly as an industrial nation, in the face of a world-wide depression. With unemployment rampant every-
where, Russia is able to boast that every willing worker has a job. Living standards are still very low, but there is no doubt that they will be raised soon after Russia gets her industrial house in order. One already sees signs of growing supplies of clothes, furniture, food, housing and even certain luxuries.

* * *

When and how did Lenin die?
He died on January 21, 1924, as the result of his fourth paralytic stroke.

* * *

I am duly impressed by your accurate array of facts and figures proving Russia's great economic advances, but wish you would make direct answer to the following: Are the Russian workers enjoying genuine economic independence?

I have shown, again and again, that despite great progress (compared to czaristic times) the Russian people are still in a most deplorable condition, despite all propaganda to the contrary. Harold J. Laski, professor of political science at London University, an able and fair commentator, writes from Moscow, in The Nation, July 18, 1934, as follows "Judged by the ordinary standards of Great Britain or the United States the standard of living is low. The people on the streets are shabby, and the furniture—most of the houses I saw was poor. Overcrowding in Moscow and Leningrad is great, and a large part of the people there still live in slum conditions... I doubt whether an unemployed English worker on the dole has a standard of life as low as the lower-paid categories of Russian workmen in full employment."

At the same time, it must be added that conditions are better than they have been in 17 years and that further improvement is in sight. The masses in Russia are making prodigious sacrifices, and it seems more than likely that the heavy industries will soon make possible the most generous production of consumers' goods. When this is achieved, Russia's workers will receive their "dividends" in the shape of better living conditions, decent housing, sufficient food and attractive clothes, in addition to more effective social insurance, entertainment, education and security.

As Laski says, Russia is still "the land of hope," from the viewpoint of the workers. He adds: "The revolution has brought to the common man opportunities he has never before possessed in history."

* * *

What chance is there for a foreigner to get a job in Russia?
I receive numerous requests from my readers for information on how one might obtain employment in the Soviet Union. Usually I refer the inquirer to the Amtorg Corporation, New York City, but I don't consider this quite fair because I honestly believe the chances for obtaining employment in Russia are remote. I would advise my readers to adjust themselves to the condition that they are going to remain in the United States and fight out their economic battles on the home front. The solution is not the easy one of running to Russia, "where there are no unemployed," and working for the Soviets. The solution won't work because the notion is a delusion. It is a fact that thousands of American tourists, while in Russia, decide to "stay on for a while" by obtaining employment in one of Russia's numerous industries. They learn, to their regret, that Russia has a strict law against the employment of foreign tourists. They are expected to tour and gape, spend and observe, and when through they are expected to pack up and leave for home. Thousands of requests are being received by different government departments, and the invariable answer is that there is absolutely no chance for a job. Of course, there are exceptions—very rare exceptions, as in the case of a subway engineer, and these exceptions merely prove the rule that the chances for getting a job in Russia are just about nil. Tourists seeking work are advised, under the law, to leave Russia for one of the cities in neighboring countries, where they are told to make application for reentry and employment, but here again they usually
find that once out of the country they stay out. Russia is now so well supplied with home-grown technical talent that it is only a question of time before she will dispense with all foreign technicians. As for workers in the trades, they waste their time trying to get jobs. They are not wanted for more reasons than one. The commonest reason is the fact that they do not fit in very well when called upon to endure the hardships of Soviet life in this period of industrialization. They expect too much and are found to be sources of annoyance rather than forces of construction. My readers would do well to bear this situation in mind and forget the idea of going to Russia for a job. Better settle down at home and work for a system of socialized industry, wherein you will become a part of a social order in which the workers of brain and brawn will be the owners of the industries. Under such a system they will have plenty of work, and, because of the country's highly industrialized condition, will enjoy the full fruits of their toil. A social transformation in the United States will automatically do away with economic distress and bring each worker more than enough for decent living.

** * * *

What is the attitude of Russia towards birth control?

The Soviet Union approaches the question of birth control from two angles. First, as a matter of general principle, it holds that the land could maintain an even larger population than its 166,000,000 inhabitants, if industrial science and general efficiency were to be used to the limit. It rightly says that more people would mean more workers, and more workers would mean more wealth. With exploitation by capitalists done away with, it would be possible for the proletarian economy to provide for millions of additional children. This is the first phase, but there is an immediate policy that recognizes conditions as they are. It knows that Russia, despite great progress, is still backward industrially, and that general conditions of labor and supplies are not ideal, by any means. It therefore accepts the current necessity of birth control and operates numerous birth control clinics throughout the Soviet Union, where information, devices and chemicals are given to those who are entitled to the knowledge. In certain cases, even abortions are legalized, though these are rather difficult to get done. Only in cases of physical necessity (and where the prospective mother is less than two months along in pregnancy) will abortion be permitted. As they are done under scientific, sanitary conditions, by the best specialists in this branch of surgery, the death rate from abortions is extremely low, while in the United States (because of our puritanical, church-ridden attitude) we have something like 30,000 women die yearly as a result of illegal abortions. Think of it! Almost a hundred women die each day in the United States because they cannot get birth control service after conception! Of the two attitudes, which do you prefer? * * *

What is a Kulak?

A Kulak is a Russian peasant proprietor, who farmed his own land, sometimes with the aid of hired labor. He was, according to Russian standards, well off. This class of well-to-do peasants resisted the Soviet government's program to collectivize the farms, and for that reason were made the objects of an almost merciless campaign of extermination. Russia still permits individualistic farming, but the rich kulaks are out of the picture. Hundreds of thousands of them, perhaps millions, were compelled to join forced-labor camps, mainly in Siberia. It is admitted by Soviet authorities, at this late date, that the method used in liquidating the kulaks was too severe.
Anti-Semitism, Lynching and Racial Intolerance

How can we stamp out the crime of lynching?

While it is true that a new wave of lynching has struck our country, it is nevertheless a fact that during the past decade lynching gradually has been declining. This does not mean that lynching may not become more serious than at any time since the Civil War, for we have witnessed the amazing spectacle of a Governor of a state plainly telling the mobsters that they were "true patriots." Such official sanction was largely responsible for the brutal lynching at St. Joseph, Mo., which closely followed the late Governor Rolph's pronouncement.

As terrible as lynchings are, it should be a simple matter to stop them. The requirements for such a result are not difficult of attainment.

First, it is absolutely essential for the state officials to take the side of law and order. They must oppose lynching with all their strength, or take the consequences of disgrace and impeachment. A mob is a band of criminals and should be treated as such. Tear gas, used with complete sincerity, could handle the ordinary mob, and where stronger methods are needed they should be used without mercy.

Second, a great effort should be made to have Congress pass an anti-lynching law. Such a law—making the federal government responsible for the safety of all prisoners—would end lynching in a few months.

The federal government has the strength and the power to stop lynching. If the federal government were to use its troops to fight mobs and then use its courts to punish leaders and members of mobs, lynching would soon go the way of witch burning.

Mobs are not afraid of state and county officials, because they know they will not be resisted seriously. Sheriffs and deputies will go through the motions of a spiritless resistance, only to give in without firing a shot. And after the lynching, the governors may be expected to "deplore" the incident—and then forget about it. Grand juries turn to other business. And so goes the tragic farce.

But once let the federal government say there will be no more lynchings without the combined opposition of every proper department of the government, and the lynchers will learn to let the law take its course.

Lynching—the "sport" of cowards—can be ended in short order. The disgrace need not continue to blacken our country's record.

Give your support to a federal anti-lynching law. Write to your senators and congressman. Tell them why you favor such a federal law. And then, if your efforts are crowned with success, you will see the end of this exhibition of savagery.

* * *

It's one thing to denounce lynching and another thing to stop it. How would you go about it?

During 1933, 28 persons were lynched in the U. S. A. This is an increase of 20 over the record for 1932. Lynching, however, is not as bad as it was some 25 years ago, when as many as 200 men, women and children were lynched each year. However, even one lynching is too much, and it is one of our jobs to wipe out this shameful evil. Lynching can be eliminated. In
fact, the bill introduced in the Senate by Senators Costigan and Wagner will just about put the finish to this disgraceful problem. We are strongly in favor of a federal anti-lynching law, because that is the only way to handle the situation. Under this proposed law, lynching will be fought by the federal government, as follows:

1. A federal penalty not exceeding five years' imprisonment or $5,000 fine or both to be placed on any State officer who failed to exercise diligence in protecting those in his charge from mob assaults.

2. The same penalties as above to those who failed to do their part in apprehending and convicting those who, in passion and prejudice and without the safeguards of fair trial, undertook to act as prosecutors, judges and executioners.

3. Imprisonment of from five years to life for any State officer who countenanced such crimes affirmatively.

4. Where the State instrumentalities of justice give ample evidence of inability or unwillingness to enforce their own law, the Federal courts are to have jurisdiction to try and punish, in accordance with the law of the State where the lynching took place.

5. The family or dependent parents of a victim of mob law will have the right to sue any county for $10,000 where a person was put to death by a mob. Such an indemnity would be recovered in the name of the United States.

6. Where a victim is dragged from one county to another in order to evade the federal anti-lynching law, the forfeiture of $10,000 claimed would be held against the county in which the victim was seized and that in which he was killed, both being jointly and individually liable.

Pass that law and you will see lynching disappear. It is my hope that Freeman readers will do their share in informing Congressmen and Senators that they want to see the law put into force. At this point I want to add that it is a mistake to assume that this federal campaign against lynching is just an-

other Northern notion. The best sentiment of the South is also in favor of putting a stop to lynching. According to an Associated Press report, on January 9, 1934, a conference of southern white women met in Atlanta, Ga., and adopted a stirring resolution requesting President Roosevelt, Congress and the various Governors of the States to work out a cooperative plan between the federal and state governments to eradicate this evil. This stand was taken after it was declared that "past experience has demonstrated that state and local authorities and public opinion, on which they depend, have failed to bring to justice members of lynching mobs, in spite of the fact that their identity was well known."

Lynching can be stopped. All we need is a mind to do it.

* * *

How many lynchings have there been in this country since records were begun?

According to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, there have been 3,686 lynchings from 1889 up to January 1, 1934. 1892 was the year of the most lynchings—226; 1932 was the year of the least lynchings—10. During 1933 there were 28. The same reader asks me for the number of convictions of Lynchers in these cases. I have no records, but feel safe in estimating that not more than a handful were made to pay some sort of a penalty for their barbarous behavior.

* * *

Do you think a federal anti-lynching law will work?

I have, for many years, advocated such a law. It is interesting to note that during the months such a bill was before the last Congress not a single lynching took place throughout the country. But when Congress adjourned without passing the bill (mainly because of the filibustering tactics of southern Senators), lynchings began to reappear at the rate of about one each week. Lynchers are gangsters and should be treated as such. Banditry and piracy have always been capital offenses, and lynching should be
placed in the same category. The full powers of a government should always be ready to pounce on those massed criminals who take the law in their own hands and disgrace the nation.

* * *

J. A. Rogers, writing in the Pittsburgh Courier, August 11, 1934, attacks you for your answer to the question dealing with German treatment of Jews as compared with American treatment of Negroes. Please comment.

I have the clipping and believe Mr. Rogers is wrong when he says Hitler's treatment of the Jews was not as bad as that accorded American Negroes. I have already shown that 3,686 Negroes were lynched between 1889 and 1933, inclusive, or 44 years. The Brown Book of Hitler Terror, carefully and authoritatively compiled, claims that between 3,500 and 4,000 Jews were slaughtered during the few days before and after April 1, 1933, when the Hitlerites conducted their mass terrorism on German Jews. This means that Germany's record for only a week was worse than America's record for 44 years. I leave these figures to speak for me.

Mr. Rogers remarks that Germany's treatment of Jews "has been greatly exaggerated by certain Jewish editors and leaders on this side with an eye to circulation and the collection plate." This is a cowardly accusation. One might as well charge Mr. Rogers and other Negro journalists with exaggeration in order to increase their own circulation and collection plate. If anything, reports of German atrocities have been understated. The fact that Jews and other decent persons have protested should draw no expressions from another persecuted race on the score of self-interest. Of course, I realize that Mr. Rogers is not defending Hitler's savagery.

Mr. Rogers challenges my opinion that American lynchings are usually expressions of the worst elements in the backward sections of the South. I did not say they were entirely rural. I did say that they rarely occur in cities, either in the North or the South. Mr. Rogers calls attention to lynchings in Omaha, Duluth, Springfield, Ill., Chicago and Atlanta. I readily grant Mr. Rogers' point, but I want to add that these lynchings are not representative. I haven't the exact information at hand, but I feel safe in estimating that not more than 5 percent of our 3,686 lynchings, during the past 44 years, took place in the cities.

Germany's persecution of the Jews is a settled policy, with no machinery for relief so long as the dictator maintains his position of hostility. We, on the other hand, have facilities that can, in time, wipe out the lynching scourge. In fact, considerable headway has already been made, as statistics show. Compare 1932 (with 226 lynchings) to 1933 (with 10 lynchings) and one is compelled to admit headway in the direction of decency. Also, we have democratic political institutions that can be used to finally outlaw this evil through a federal anti-lynching law. I have advocated such a law during many years of editorial work, as my files will prove. We have not yet succeeded in winning such a humane law, but that doesn't mean the cause is hopeless.

* * *

Is it true that the world-famous sociologist, Lester F. Ward, wrote in defense of racial persecution?

I have seen the charge in a Negro publication, but I have not been able to locate the quotation, though I have many of his works in my library. Perhaps my readers can help me nail down the exact quotation, giving title of book or article and the page or pages on which it appears.

* * *

What is the meaning of "xenophobia"?

Hatred of foreigners.

* * *

Tell me a little about the recent K. K. movement.

The Ku Klux Klan was one of the usual run of fear-hate racket. It was started in 1915, but made no headway for years. In 1919 it
is estimated it had a membership of 5,000, all in the South. From 1919 to 1925 the K.K.K. made rapid progress in membership and finances, reaching a peak membership of about 3,000,000, scattered in all sections of the country. It was, in the main, a salesman’s racket. There was big money in the game of frightening the people along theological and racial lines.

In his book, “The Ku Klux Klan,” J. M. Mecklin says that the K.K.K. was a clever commercial racket that made fortunes for the men on the inside. Each new member paid $10 to join, of which $4.50 was retained by the local racketeer. A man who could line up something like 200 members each week (and many did more than that) could clear a lot of money in a short time and with very little effort. The hate racket pays, as shown by the Black-Brown-Silver Shirt movements today. The national organizers of the K.K.K. drew enormous personal profits from the treasury. In time the racket palled and the organization dwindled when it was found that no more suckers were in sight.

What’s the solution of the race antagonism problems? Miscegenation, eventually? What country’s policy is the most rational in regard to racial prejudice?

The problem of racial antagonism seems complicated, but on examination is found to be simple. Look carefully into racial animosities and you will find economic interests at work. The white exploiters provoke white wage slaves to hate the black workers, so that the white boss can exploit both.

The Russian Czar employed black hundreds, inspired pogroms against the Jews and made them the objects of a cruel anti-Semitic drive, because the Czar and his henchmen figured that if the Russian slaves could be made to hate the Jews hard enough they might forget about the evils of Czarism and thereby help keep the Russian aristocrats in power.

Race hatreds are usually the expression of class or social hatreds. These class hatreds are the result of differences of economic interest. If you could remove those economic interests you would make racial antipathies a thing of the past.

Of course, miscegenation is a complete solution, because it wipes out all signs of “foreignness.” Thus, miscegenation in the United States—and there is a great deal of it going on all the time—has enabled hundreds of thousands of part blacks to “pass” as whites. But racial prejudices work steadily and keep down a certain amount of this miscegenation, so that the prospects for immediate relief become dim.

The thing to do is to cut under the economic motives for race wars. This can be done best of all by the establishment of a classless society, in which all individuals, regardless of race, will be given the same economic opportunities to earn a livelihood. That is why race prejudice is a thing of the past in the Soviet Union. Any act of racial chauvinism is punishable in Russia by a term in prison. When members of all races are given the same rights, the same privileges and the same line of duties, the sources of race hatred dry up rapidly. That’s why being a Socialist means that one is an enemy of race hatred. It is the solution.

What do you know about Glenn Winrod?

This Baptist Fundamentalist edits and publishes a magazine in Wichita, Kansas, devoted to slandering the Jews. He is about the worst and most bigoted anti-Semite in the U. S. His magazine is supposed to have a fairly large circulation—perhaps 50,000—and is devoted mainly to assuring his Christian followers that the Protocols of the Elders of Zion (proven to be forgeries) are as true as anything to be found in the Bible, which is a statement subject to several interpretations. This preacher also circulates Henry Ford’s repudiated book, “The International Jew,” a book so full of lies that Flivver Henry himself was forced to re-
tract his libels. Winrod is an example of church leaders in action. When given their opportunity they lend themselves to the shadiest of causes, with only mutters of protest from almost insignificant minorities in their own ranks.

* * *

Your comments on Hitler's Jew-baiting would be more convincing if you added that Joseph Stalin also is an anti-Semite, as attested by the fact that he drove Leon Trotsky into exile.

Stalin is not an anti-Semite. He fought Trotsky because he differed with him over Soviet policies and not because Trotsky happened to be a Jew. Two important Jewish figures in the Soviet Union are Foreign Commissar Litvinoff and Kaganovich, second in importance to Stalin in official party circles. Their being Jews did not hurt them in the slightest. In fact, Russia is the only country in the world where any act of race prejudice is a penitentiary offense. If the whole world treated the Jews as well as Russia does, there would be no cause for complaint from the most race-conscious Jew.

* * *

You roast Hitler's anti-Semitism, but you say nothing about the anti-Semitism of your greatest admiration, Shakespeare.

It is not true that Shakespeare was a Jew-hater. I have read and studied his "Merchant of Venice" carefully and I cannot accept the usual interpretation. As I see it, this great drama is a realistic portrait of two characters—Shylock, the bigoted Jew, and Antonio, the bigoted Christian. Antonio is a splendid person when he deals with his own kind, but once he meets Shylock the Jew, everything ugly and vicious comes out of him and he ceases to be a civilized human being. Shylock, on the other hand, is equally bad when dealing with Christians. When in contact with his own people, he is above reproach, but when he meets an Antonio or a Bassanio, he mutters: "I hate him for he is a Christian. . . . I will feed fat the ancient grudge I bear him." And when Shylock is asked why he insists on Antonio's pound of flesh, he answers brutally: "To bait fish withal: if it will feed nothing else, it will feed my revenge." Antonio is equally vile. As I see it, this drama is not anti-Semitic. It is anti-religious. In this work we find Shakespeare as a great Freethinker who would show the world how degrading religion is when applied to everyday life. He places before us fine types of Christian and Jew, but once their religions meet there is reaction, superstition, inhumanity and barbarism. Why? Because religion is a dividing, corrupting, degrading, destructive force. If Shylock and Antonio hadn't been cursed with severe doses of Judaism and Catholicism they would, most likely, have met as human beings and treated each other with common decency. To me, "The Merchant of Venice" is a great lesson on the curse of religion. Shakespeare shows both sides equally bad, so we conclude that the cause of their viciousness is their mutual regard for religion, the great cause of division and disension. In this drama we get a master's lesson—which some day we shall take to heart—that Freethought moves man forward, while religion holds him back in the darkness of cruelty and hate.

* * *

Is there any country in the world today that forces Jews to live in ghettos?

Defining a ghetto as a section of a city in which Jews are legally segregated, there is only one such place remaining—in Morocco.

* * *

By what means was the Jew in Europe forced to accept compulsory residence in walled ghettos?

Since early medieval days, European Jews had a tendency to congregate in certain sections of the towns, and this at first was voluntary. Later, however, a number of cities veered in the direction of making this ghetto life legal and compulsory. It was not until 1555 that the Catholic Church sent orders to every community in the Papal States to compel universal
Jewish segregation. This was the fa-
mous bull Cum nimis absurdum, is-
sued by Pope Paul IV. From then
on Jews became the objects of cold-
blooded, organized, general perse-
ecution, humiliation, extortion and
exploitation. The Roman Catholic
Church turned Anti-Judaism into
a science.

The papal bull compelled all Jews
to wear identification marks, and
prohibited them from owning
houses and other real estate. The
ghetto established by papal bull in
the worst section of Rome, lasted
until 1870, when its gates were
forced open by the heroic work of
Radicals, Liberals, Republicans,
Socialists and Freethinkers. In this
we have only one more illustration
among tens of thousands of how
anti-clericalism and freethought
make for humanitarian reforms.

* * *

Streicher claims America is being
turned toward Bolshevism as a re-
result of a conspiracy instituted by
Jews. Please comment.

Julius Streicher is the editor of
that disreputable anti-Semitic
weekly, Der Stuerner, published in
Nuremberg, Germany. I have ex-
amined his "evidence" and find
that the "conspiracy" is being ad-
vanced by LaGuardia, New York's
independent mayor, Rabbi Stephen
S. Wise, a Democrat, and Otto
Kahn, who is dead.

* * *

George Sylvester Viereck, official
Hitler propagandist in this coun-
try, says we have no right to com-
plain about Nazi persecution of
Jews, liberals and radicals, in view
of the fact that the U. S. lynch
Negroes. Please comment.

The cases are not similar at all.
Lynchings in the United States are
committed by the lowest elements
of our inhabitants in sections that
are notoriously backward. Most
lynchings take place in the rural
sections of the South. The cities of
the south rarely have lynching
bees.

These lynchings are not provok-
ed by our Federal or State govern-
ments. The White House does not
conduct a lynch propaganda. Con-
gress has passed no laws authoriz-
ing the lynching of Negroes. The
Supreme Court has never said that
lynchings are legal. Our philosop-
hiers have never outlined a theory
justifying racial persecution. In
short, lynching is an expression of
social outlaws.

It is true that, in the rural sec-
tions of the South, little is done
to prevent lynchings, and nothing
is done to punish lynchings, but
we must remember that the law-
enforcers in these backward sec-
tions are no better than the hill-
billies and others who string up or
burn Negroes.

In Germany, on the other hand,
racial persecution is a part of the
nation's law. Hitler has made racial
persecution a perfectly legal pro-
cedure. The courts defend such be-
behavior. The professors write
"learned" books on the necessity
for racial persecution. The powers
of the State are used to provoke
acts of discrimination and violence
against racial minorities.

* * *

It is claimed that a Catholic Car-
dinal in Germany has openly de-
filed Hitler and voiced clear-cut de-
fenses of the Jews. Please comment.

You refer, of course, to Cardinal
Faulhaber, archbishop of Munich,
who delivered five sermons in 1933
(during the Advent season), pub-
lished in this country by Macmil-
an Co., under the title of "Judaism,
Christianity and Germany." I have
read this book and numerous ar-
ticles of praise for the Cardinal,
from Catholics and Protestants.
I can state, without fear of contra-
diction, that the claim is pure
fraud. The Cardinal did not attack
anti-Semitism. In fact, the book
defends persecution. The whole
point of the Faulhaber book is to
plead with the Nazis not to force
the church (presumably either
Catholic or Protestant) to give up
all attachment to the Old Testa-
ment. It is the notion of the Nazis
that since they are to be persecut-
ors of the Jews they must cut them-
selves away from Jewish religious
influences, which means that no
believing Nazi can have anything
to do with the Old Testament. Per-
sonally, I don't care a dime wheth-
er or not the Nazis accept or reject the Old Testament. To quote Cardinal Faulhaber (who is supposed to be a hero in his attacks on the Nazis):

"Antagonism to the Jews of today must not be extended to the books of pre-Christian Judaism."

There you have the case in a sentence. What it means is this: Go ahead and persecute the Jews, but don't, for God's sake, force us to throw overboard the Old Testament, on which so much of our profitable hokum is based. Instead of being a defense of the Jews, this book is an attempt to tell the Nazis that anti-Semitism is all right, so long as the Old Testament is permitted to remain as a part of the Church's documents.

* * *

Hitler's propagandists say that Germany's Jews can never be patriots. Please comment.

Alas, the record shows that German Jews were all too patriotic, for they gave 100,000 sons to the Kaiser's armies and suffered thousands of casualties. History supports the contention that the Jews did more than their share. They would have been better off if they had refused to fight the battles of the Kaiser and the other imperialists. In Germany, instead of getting thanks they are suffering the worst kind of persecution.

* * *

It is claimed that Hitler had nothing to do with the April 1, 1933, boycott of the Jews in Germany. Please comment.

There is no authority for the statement that the brutal persecution of German Jews was not the work of Hitler. In fact, the evidence proves conclusively that the whole plan was his pet idea. Goebbels, Hitler's Minister of Propaganda, has published his diary describing activities in March and April, 1933, and other blood-marked months in Germany's shameful history. In his diary, this high official of the Nazi government says he visited Adolph Hitler at his Bavarian mountain retreat, where plans were discussed. At this time Hitler outlined the scheme for a nation-wide boycott of the Jews and commanded Goebbels to carry it out. This happened on March 26, 1933. A few days later the campaign of terror was put into action. The blame therefore rests on Hitler.

* * *

Would not the Jewish question have solved itself if the Polish Jews had not emigrated to Germany?

This is one of the favorite arguments of the German anti-Semites. The Polish Jews went into Germany during the World War, by express invitation from the Kaiser and his government. They were needed because of Germany's great labor shortage during the war. They could not have entered Germany without permission. Since they were invited, why persecute them for accepting the invitation? When Hitler began murdering, persecuting, robbing and torturing Germany's 600,000 Jews, he made no effort to discriminate, so the argument about Polish Jews falls of its own weight. Hitler's club struck at German Jews who had lived in the country for generations and even centuries, there being records of Jewish activities in Germany for 1,000 years.

* * *

Germany is circulating a pamphlet charging Otto Kahn with having financed the Russian revolution. Please comment.

The pamphlet is entitled "Jews, Look at You." It contains a picture of Otto Kahn, who died recently. The Nazi hate-monger charges that Kahn, through his firm, Kuhn, Loeb and Company, in partnership with the Warburg interests, put up the money for the 1917 Russian revolution. There is not a scrap of evidence to support this charge. Otto Kahn was first and always a banker, and as such had no interest in financing a Communist uprising. The Russian revolution was not financed, directly or indirectly, by Kahn, Warburg or any other banker, Jew or gentile. The Russian revolution was the spontaneous uprising of the masses of workers and peasants against the tyrannies of Czarism, the evils of imperialism, the terrors of militar-
ism and the injustices of capitalism. Otto Kahn financed plays, operas, concerts and other forms of artistic expression, and that was all.

* * *

Reports from Berlin say that Goebbels and other Nazi propagandists are placing extra emphasis on the “ritual murder” charge against the Jews. Has there ever been anything done in Germany to counteract this absurd charge?

The charge that Jews commit “ritual murder” is being pushed now by the Nazis in an effort to divert public attention from serious economic conditions. The intelligent people in Germany never believed this nonsense. On March 19, 1912, at a time when Czarist Russia was persecuting the Jews with the legal charge of “ritual murder,” a statement was signed by 215 celebrated German non-Jews, including leaders in public life, the universities, science, art, religion, etc. The following paragraph is quoted from this statement, showing what civilized Germany felt at the time:

“This unscrupulous fiction, spread among the people, has from the Middle Ages until recent times led to terrible consequences. It has incited the ignorant masses to outrage and massacres, and has driven misguided crowds to pollute themselves with the innocent blood of their fellow-men. And yet not a shadow of proof has ever been adduced to justify the crazy belief.”

If the Germany of 1934 were to listen to the educated Germany of 1912, one would be spared the pain of seeing a nation’s leaders go insane.

* * *

What is the meaning of the charge of “ritual murder” against the Jews?

This superstition had its beginning in the 11th Century, when the Catholic priests began charging Jews with slaughtering Christian children and using their blood in certain rituals. The belief, based on the most appalling ignorance, has persisted, and even as late as 1912 Mendel Beiliss was put on trial in czaristic Russia on the charge of ritual murder, though he was found innocent. It is interesting to note that the early Christians were charged with ritual murder by the Romans. And in China, today, it is a common superstition that children who disappear have been spirited away by missionaries, murdered, and their eyes torn out for use in Christian ceremonies.

* * *

I understand the Protocols of the Elders of Zion are a forgery. What is the evidence?

The forgery was exposed with admirable thoroughness by the London Times, in 1921. The protocols were published in 1905, in Russia, by Sergey Nilus. He wrote that they were stolen by a woman at a “recent meeting” of the “initiated” in France. In 1917 Nilus alleged the manuscript had come from a high Russian official (Sukhnotin), who claimed they were a plan considered by the “Council of Elders,” in 1897, at the First Zionist Congress, in Basel. The plan is supposed to have been submitted by Theodore Herzl. In short, it outlined a vast conspiracy by which the Jews were to gain control of the world. The protocols themselves bore evidence of their fabrication, but it remained for the London Times to do the job of exposure in such a complete manner as to brand the so-called documents as brazen forgeries. The Times proved finally that most of the text was lifted from a political pamphlet issued in France in 1865 and 1868. This booklet was intended to injure Napoleon III and was concocted by a French Republican, who later was jailed. The forger took this text and added Jewish and radical words here and there. The protocols are still circulated and believed by many uninformed gullibles.

* * *

It is claimed that 13th Century Popes befriended the Jews. Please comment.

The whole record of the Catholic Church has been one of studied, brutal Anti-Semitism, though it is
possible to get a phrase, here and there, of “protest.” It is the same in the South today when a Negro is lynched. Usually the official in charge says something about “investigating the outrage,” but everyone knows that it is intended to keep the record clear. Thus, Gregory IX wrote that French crusaders had “slaughtered 2,500 of them (Jews), old and young, as well as pregnant women.” What does he say to his bishops? They are told to “bring to proper satisfaction” those guilty of such “excesses.” As no one knew what “proper satisfaction” meant, nothing was done, as the Pope intended that nothing be done. Honorius III wrote that Jews “dared to build” new synagogues, which he ordered destroyed. Under the Pope’s nose went on a degrading series of persecutions, and the record shows that the Big Boss (the Pope) permitted his councils to do unspeakable things with only an occasional murmur of “protest.” The Popes whispered, but the councils thundered. The fact of the matter is that the Catholic Church can never get around its despicable history. It is history which condemns the Catholic Church, and when it becomes known the Church will be unable to hold its place among decent people.

* * *

What’s all this racket the Catholic Church is raising in this country about “clean” movies, etc.?

“Racket” is the precise word. The Catholic Church has started a drive against moving pictures, on the pretense of “morality” and “virtue.” There are several motives, as follows:

1. A boycott campaign in this country serves to blind the people against the barbarous behavior of the Catholic Church in Italy, Austria, Poland and other Fascist cesspools. This drive is supposed to conceal the bloody record of the Catholics in their campaign of extermination against liberalism, radicalism, democracy, republicanism, freethought, anti-clericalism, etc. It is a little embarrassing to have the world learn how the Catholic Cardinal in Vienna joined in the conspiracy to murder about 1,500 Socialists in their apartment houses.

2. Catholic anti-Semitism is open in Central Europe, and will be open in this country when the Church is strong enough to command the situation. Until then its anti-Semitism in this country must be concealed, though demagogues like Father Coughlin come out in the open from time to time in their attacks on the Jews. The movies are, of course, almost 100 percent controlled by Jews, so this “purity” campaign is a powerful weapon in the Catholic Church’s attack on Jews. When they finish with the movies, they will turn to the stage and other mediums controlled by Jews. Then, as the Church grows more powerful, it will throw off its mask and come out for the end of all democratic rights, free speech, free press, etc.

I am something of a movie fan myself, and I’d be the last person in the world to defend them on the grounds of art or intelligence. I have seen thousands of pictures, but am yet to see an “indecent” one. I have seen many stupid pictures, many dumb ones, many insipid ones, but never an obscene one. In fact, I wouldn’t mind seeing such a picture, if I had a chance, but I feel old enough to look on “sin” and “evil” without wanting to rush out and threaten the virtue of some peaceful grandmother.

The signs all point to anti-Semitism as the first reason for the Catholic drive. In the states which have censorship (and they cover about 40 percent of the American trade territory for movies) not a single protest was registered by the Catholic Church. They did not ask for more rigid censorship before ordering their unreasonable boycott. They waited until Congress adjourned before beginning the drive, so we are to conclude that they have in mind no federal censorship at this time. The thing all shows one motive—commercial injury to the movie barons because they are Jews.
I don't believe the movies will be done lasting harm by this Catholic agitation, even though the priests have been joined by some preachers from Protestant and other churches. The average person who patronizes the movies knows that the movies are fair entertainment with an occasional uncled lady or a stupid joke that is supposed to have some sort of a sexual point. In fact, it is the extra "hot" picture which attracts the crowds, so it follows that the Hollywood producers know their customers. It's the Mae Wests who pull the crowds into the cinema. If people were let alone they'd take their movies rawer than they are. As for myself, my objection to the movies, in addition to the point of stupidity, is their tiresome morality. They are, if anything, too virtuous. What they need is a little more of Ibsen and the masters of the stage, who faced life realistically and candidly, and a whole lot less of the respectable Zane Greys, Willard Macks and the other defenders of purity and righteousness.

* * *

I notice that many people readily grant the Jew's intellectual, scientific and cultural abilities, but in matters of physical prowess they incline to the view that the Jews are weaklings and cowards. Please comment.

This is just one more of those persistent, but empty, myths. These persons who insist on the Jew's lack of physical powers should consider the fact that in the world's most spectacular sport—pugilism—the Jews have run away with three championships, as follows: heavyweight, Max Baer; light heavyweight, "Slapsie" Maxie Rosenbloom; both lightweight and welterweight, Barney Ross, the snappy kid from Chicago. It happens that the Jews are the only race to be able to boast of three current champions in fistiana. That this is not just one more coincidence is proven by the history of Jews in the manly art of self-defense. More than a century ago, Daniel Mendoza (in the days when fighters didn't wear sissy gloves but fought with bare knuckles until there was a knock-out) was a real champion who kept fighting until he was 55 years old, when he grabbed his last victory. Since then, Jewish names in boxing included such stars as Joe Choyinski, a truly great fighter; Benny Leonard, Lou Tendler, Singer, Kaplan and dozens of other able and worthy maulers. When the record is so crowded with Jewish names, what becomes of the silly argument that Jews are not able to assume he-man jobs? Max Baer, more than 50 pounds lighter and 3½ inches shorter than Primo Carnera, showed himself to be a real guy when he quit his clowning and settled down to the terrific job of beating that giant to a knock-out. I saw the movies of the fight and was impressed with Baer's superb sportsmanship. He had the mighty fascist down 11 or 12 times while Maxie himself never touched the rosin, except when he knocked Carnera down and was dragged down on him. In Germany today one of the favorite anti-Semitic slanders derides the Jews as puny weaklings, but when the Nazis brought out their heavy champion, Max Schmeling—the pride of the Brown Shirts and himself a follower of Hitler—Max Baer did him up brown.

* * *

What is the extent of "Jewish influence" in Washington.

Here we bump into another myth. "Jewish influence" in Washington doesn't exist. There is only one Jew who is a member of the President's cabinet, and not a single Jew who belongs to the "Little Cabinet," which numbers 25. There are two Jews on the Supreme Court bench, but none in the Federal Trade Commission, U. S. Tariff Commission, Federal Reserve Board, Board of Tax Appeals, or the RFC. In all, less than 30 Jews are in public life in Washington. There is not a single Jewish Senator. Only 10 Jews are Congressmen, out of 435. With 30 Jews accounted for, and figuring a total population of 130,000,000 and only 4,500,000 Jews in the entire country, you can see readily enough that in proportion to population
there is no "Jewish influence" in the federal government. Our diplomatic corps consists of 59 envoys, of whom only one Jew is an ambassador and only two Jews are envoys. The facts prove definitely that current anti-Semitic propaganda about "Jewish influence" in Washington is nothing more than Hitleristic propaganda. These elements have to drum up scapegoats and erect strawmen in order to "sell" their racial racketeering to the yokels.

What is the meaning, history and factual background of Anti-Semitism?

William Marr, in 1879, took centuries-old Anti-Judaism and restated it under the term of Anti-Semitism, which signifies opposition to Jews on social, economic, political, professional, racial, scientific, financial and historical grounds. It is a weird combination of pseudo-science, forged historical documents, rationalized jealousies, inferiority complexes, delusions of grandeur, unsupported racial doctrines, distorted history and eccentric anthropology. Its bases are uniformly false, but this does not alter the fact that Anti-Semitism is a real social problem.

During the Middle Ages, with Europe in mental bondage to the Catholic Church, the problem was mainly a religious one. The Catholic Church, through its temporal power, held that Judaism was a crime against God, and should be stamped out. It ruthlessly murdered, robbed, persecuted and pillaged millions of innocent Jews. Frequently the Church held out relief for those Jews who offered to recant and embrace Catholicism, which was done by many.

With the decline of temporal power and the growth of liberalism, the Jews were gradually emancipated, their civil rights slowly established, until finally they found themselves, particularly in western Europe, free to worship or not worship as they pleased, and free to engage in business and the professions. But this did not end Anti-Semitism. The beast lost its religious aspects, but others sprang in their stead, so that today we see alarming evidence of Anti-Semitism in almost every country, except the Soviet Union, where racial chauvinism is a penitentiary offense.

Beginning in the second half of the last century, the Jews were made victims of attack, not because of their Judaism, but because they were Jews. Most of this propaganda was (and is) engineered by the Catholic Church. Forty years ago it was the Catholic daily press in Paris that helped lead the attack on Dreyfus, who was railroaded to Devil's Island because he was a Jew, the pretext being that he had sold French military secrets to Germany. Today, Anti-Semitism is furthered openly by the Catholic hierarchy in Austria and by the Catholic layman, Hitler, in Germany.

Are Jews permitted to leave Germany?

Yes, but they are compelled to leave their property behind. This brands the Hitler government as a crew of pirates. It is organized banditry on a vast scale.

Isn't Communism a Jewish movement?

There are 250,000 Jews in Philadelphia, of whom only 100 are Communists. In Chicago, out of 300,000 Jews, only 250 are Communists. There are 40,000 Jews in Pittsburgh, and only 50 are Communists. And so on down the line. When Germany had 6,000,000 Communist votes, Hitler used to make much of the "point" that they were Jews, but the absurdity of this charge is apparent when one learns that Germany's Jewish population at that time was 600,000. Even if every Jew—old and young, men and women—were Communists, there would have been an additional 5,400,000 Communists to account for, but then one doesn't expect a Hitlerite to stop to reason, any more than one expects fairness and intelligence from an American anti-Semite. There were 100,000 Communist votes in the last national
election in the U. S. As there are about 4,000,000 Jews in the U. S., even if every Communist voter were a Jew there would still be 3,900,000 non-Communist Jews. Of course, 100,000 Communist Jews in the U. S. is utterly wild. There are probably 2,000 or 2,500 Communist Jews in the entire land, out of a Jewish population of 4,000,000. Figures are stubborn things. If only the propagandists for the racial racketists didn't have to buck up against facts!

* * *

What percentage of New York Jews are Communists?

Of New York City's Jewish population of more than 2,000,000, a mere 2,000 are Communists. This gives the lie to the anti-Semitic propaganda which describes the Communist movement as mainly Jewish in membership and leadership. It happens that the leaders of American Communism, like those in Russia, are almost entirely non-Jewish. American Communist leaders are Earl Browder, Clarence Hathaway, William J. Patterson, William Z. Foster, Alfred Wagenknecht, Leo Gallagher, and they are all non-Jews. Most of them come from old American stock. There isn't a Jew in a carload.
Commercial and Industrial Developments and Statistics

How does an incubator compare with a hen in the matter of efficiency?
The ordinary commercial incubators hatch only from 50 to 55 percent of the eggs. This is because the incubators maintain a too even temperature. In nature, the sides of the eggs are not as warm as the top and bottom. In the incubator there is no period of airing or cooling, equal to when the hen leaves her eggs for exercise and food. A report from Moscow describes a new incubator that comes closer to the conditions that prevail under the hen, in matters of temperature, airing, etc., the result being an increase in hatching to 75 percent. This new machine, invented by M. A. Meshscheryakov, Moscow Zoological Park, and tested by the Poultry Breeding Research Institute, cleverly maintains different temperatures for various parts of the egg.

* * *

Which country is the greatest sugar consumer?
The U.S., with an estimated average individual consumption of 65 pounds per year. This is about twice the average for France or Germany. In all, we consume 7,000,000 tons of sugar annually. We produce only 2,000,000 tons annually, though this situation will be remedied rapidly with the development of our sugar beet industry. The sugar beet industry is still a baby, but the Department of Agriculture expects it to grow to maturity quickly.

At present, most of our sugar beets are grown in Colorado, Michigan and Kansas. This industry in Kansas is only 28 years old, centered around Garden City, where equipment is in use worth about $2,000,000 and 12,000 acres of near-by land grows the crop, which brings the farmers from $25 to $50 per acre. Raising sugar beets is more profitable than corn or wheat, but requires more labor. It takes about four or five months to raise a crop. The average production is 12½ tons to the acre where there is a good crop. The industry, at last reports, paid $5.50 per ton to the beet growers.

The beets are dug up and taken to the mill, where they are washed automatically in large tanks. They are then cut up into small portions by revolving knives working in a compartment through which the beets are conveyed by machinery. The syrup is then pressed out of the beets after being soaked in warm water. The sugar juice is of a dark color with a most pungent odor. This juice is broken up by machines which act centrifugally, separating it into raw sugar and molasses. Foreign substances are removed by chemicals.

Official figures show there are 104 sugar beet factories in this country. About 100,000 farmers are engaged in the work of raising the crop. It is generally found that 100 pounds of sugar beets contain 95 pounds of juice. Of this 95 pounds, 15 pounds are made up of solids. It is estimated that 12 pounds of sugar may be made from the 15 pounds of solids.

* * *

Is it more dangerous to be a workingman than a soldier?
If you were to add up all the casualties of all the wars in U.S. history, you would find the total only one-fifteenth of the losses suffered by industrial workers while at their occupations during the same time. Insurance actuaries figure the life expectancy of the av-
verage workingman as seven or eight years less than that of the average person in other lines. These facts constitute a great argument for social insurance, whereby the workers will be given protection against industrial accidents, sickness, unemployment and old age. Such social insurance can only be administered by the government.

* * *

What is the world’s rubber production?

The entire rubber crop amounts to 840,000 tons per year. It takes about 500,000,000 trees to produce this tonnage. A motor car requires an average of 50 pounds of this valuable commodity. In 1910, the new motor car industry caused a rubber shortage, which drove the price to an all-time high of $3.06 per pound. It’s all-time low was 2½c per pound, in June, 1932. Today rubber sells at 13c to 14c per pound. The U. S. does not produce a pound of rubber, yet it uses more than half of the world’s supply. Modern chemistry is making good progress in perfecting synthetic rubber, but it is agreed that rubber substitutes will not be able to compete while natural rubber sells at less than 25c per pound.

* * *

How many dogs are there in the U. S.?

That’s a hard question to answer, because there are no accurate statistics available. New York City has 230,000 licensed dogs, and New York State has 400,000. But this doesn’t mean a great deal, because most dogs in small towns and all dogs on farms are not licensed. Besides, most dogs are found in rural, not urban, America. It is estimated that an average of half a dog belongs to each American family. There being 30,000,000 families, it follows there must be 15,000,000 dogs in this country. If you give half these dogs to the cities, you have a city population of 7,500,000 dogs and the same number for the country.

The country dogs live mostly on table scraps, but the city dogs constitute a food problem, for in these days there isn’t the quantity of scraps that prevailed in the near past. Most city dogs today are fed by the dog food industry, a new and powerful business class. It may surprise you to hear that the dog food industries, at their recent national convention, estimated that they sell almost $90,000,000 worth of prepared dog food annually. That’s a big business.

Prior to 1920 there were business houses supplying dog foods, of course, particularly Spratt’s, an English house with an enormous volume of trade in this country. During recent years the chain groceries began putting in canned dog food, with the result that the business took a tremendous spurt. Now we find the Great Atlantic and Pacific stores giving serious attention to this source of business.

Horse meat is the favorite canned food for dogs. Some companies use reindeer meat. A few use beef. One company, Chappel Bros., Inc., distributors of Ken-L-Ration, killed 60,000 horses in one recent year, which puts this concern up near the top. In 1931, this company sent out 10,000 carloads of dog food. Believe it or not, Chappel Bros. use 1,500,000 acres in Montana, South Dakota and Wyoming, cut up into 15 ranches. These ranches raise wild horses for this vast business. Their favorite stallions are Clydesdales, for breeding, and during a recent year 72,000 colts were produced. These horses, when they reach three or four years of age, are shipped to Rockford in daily lots of about 250, to be slaughtered and canned for our canine consumers. Chappel Bros. were not pioneers in this business, but they are the ones who put it over on a big scale.

* * *

Is the umbrella business in the U. S. getting bigger?

No. In 1933, according to U. S. reports, we spent only $5,000,000 for this article. In 1929 the bill amounted to $29,000,000.

* * *

Why don’t we get canned beer as well as bottled?

Can companies are now working
on that problem. It is still in its experimental stage, but I'm sure it won't be long before you'll be getting your beer in cans. The difficulty is to take care of expansion resistance. Also, there is a chemical reaction that must be overcome. Some experts question whether the public will accept its beer in cans. I think it would be a good idea for several reasons, the best being the economy of having to put up no deposit for bottles or going to the bother of returning the empties.

* * *

How much milk is needed to make a pound of ordinary American cheese? 2. A pound of butter?
1. About 4½ quarts. 2. About 10½ quarts. In both cases considerable by-products remain.

* * *

Why are most industries in cold climates?
The hot climates produce immense stores of raw materials, but most of the processing is done in cold climates because industry, to be operated economically, must be near its supply of coal.

* * *

How much cheaper is it to run a textile mill in the South, compared with the North?
I have no recent information, but in 1926 Main and Gumby (American Society of Mechanical Engineers) showed that the average mill cost in the South was 16.8 percent less than in the North. The main reason for this difference was the element of labor, which accepted longer hours and lower pay. According to the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Southern mill workers, in 1917, got an average of $10.98 as against an average of $17.15 for Northern mill workers. Labor conditions in the South are notoriously bad, even after the "blessings" of the NRA, though there are numerous signs of labor's awakening. The Southern workers are beginning to fight.

* * *

Do we make all the paper we use?
No. About 70 percent of our paper stock is imported from foreign countries, mainly Canada. In all, we brought in about $170,000,000 worth of paper during 1933, and that is about the figure for the past four or five years. It is suggested that the marginal lands taken out of farming, in the South, be given over to southern pine, which can now be made into newsprint. That, it is claimed, would make us self-sufficient with regard to paper. Dr. Charles H. Herty claims that the land formerly used unprofitably in raising cotton could be made to raise $170,000,000 worth of paper yearly, if southern pine trees were planted in sufficient quantities. Such pulp would cost about one-third less than the imported low-grade paper.

* * *

What is the American hosiery bill?
We buy yearly 1,200,000,000 pairs of hose, for which we pay about $500,000,000.

* * *

I work in the children's toy department of a big store, but know little about the scope of the industry. Can you enlighten me with some general data?
The children's toy business is so vast that it does a yearly gross business, in the U. S. alone, of $200,000,000. According to the Dept. of Commerce, the industry, in 1933, was valued at $50,000,000. There are about 1,000 concerns engaged in this manufacturing enterprise. Most American consumers use toys made by home concerns, the total of imports amounting to only 5 percent. About 25,000 employees are engaged in the toy industry, independent of selling. Styles in children's toys constantly change, the present tendency being toward toys of a practical nature, such as mechanical devices, electrical apparatus that does actual things, wood burners, etc. The quintuplets in Canada caused one company to offer children sets of five dolls, which is my idea of commercial ingenuity. Miniature farm equipment, buildings, machines, etc., are becoming quite popular among the children. One doll-maker is turning out a doll that "drinks" milk. Others can be bathed. A strong association strives, with some suc-
cess, to keep thieves in the industry from stealing ideas.

** **

How large is the Pacific Coast canned seafood industry?

It is estimated that the investment in this business amounts to $100,000,000. About 20,000 persons are employed, normally. About 75 percent of our country’s annual supply of canned seafood comes from the Pacific Coast. In 1934 the fishermen of Northern California ran into a wonderful sardine catch, getting more than 50,000 tons during September, against the previous year’s pack of 15,000 tons. In Alaska conditions were favorable in the salmon catch, with an increase of 2,000,000 cases of canned salmon. The fish pack for 1933 amounted to $55,000,000, but this is expected to mount higher for 1934. The domestic market for canned seafood is growing.

** **

How much food does it take to keep a person alive for a year?

The average consumption in this country is 1,612 pounds of food per year, or about 4½ pounds per day for every man, woman and child in the land. Our yearly ration amounts to 1,019 pounds of vegetable matter and 593 pounds of animal food. This quantity is broken down as follows: dairy products, 385 pounds; pork, 70 pounds; beef and veal, 62 pounds; lamb and mutton, 6 pounds; poultry, 13 pounds; fish, 14 pounds; eggs, 26 pounds; lard and margarine, 16 pounds; potatoes, 182 pounds; other vegetables, 144 pounds; beans, peas and peanuts, 13 pounds; vegetable shortening, 9 pounds; fruits and melons, 184 pounds; citrus fruits, 35 pounds; wheat flour, 252 pounds; cornmeal, rye and oat cereals, 93 pounds; rice, 5 pounds; sugar, 100 pounds.

** **

How is the paper used in butter cartons given its special glazed finish?

Cartons intended to hold butter are expected to resist moisture, which is done by running the paper through heated paraffine, after which it is run through cold water. This chilling serves to harden the paraffine and, in addition, give it the desired gloss.

** **

What is the scope of the chemical industry in the U. S.?

It is not generally appreciated how truly immense the chemical industry has become in this, and other, countries. The U. S. comes first in the volume of production in chemical and allied production, according to figures supplied by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which reports that in 1899 this industry produced only $372,000,000 of products, but which grew to the perfectly immense figure of $3,698,730,000 in 1929, the industry’s all-time high. In 1931 the production had a net value of $2,718,458,000, which was still the world’s record.

The chemical industries are described as those which make dominant use of chemical operations. To give my readers an idea of what this means, I call attention to the following list of industrial enterprises which depend primarily on the assistance of the chemist:


The greatest chemical company in this country is the vast E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co., which is more than 125 years old. It started originally to make gun-powder, but it is now interested in the manufacture of paints, lacquers, dyes, plastics, cellophane, duPrene, and numerous other materials. The Eastman
Kodak company is also a great chemical manufacturer, its first interest being photography, which is, of course, a triumph of chemistry.

* * *

I work in a paint factory that uses a great deal of tung oil, but none of us seems to know anything about it. Please explain.

Tung oil is a product of tung trees, and is used as a base in paints that are intended for use in warm or damp climates. We export a great deal of such paints to Central and South America. During the past year we imported $10,000,000 worth of tung oil from China. Knowing that it would be an easy matter for our manufacturers to use $100,000,000 of tung oil annually, C. C. Concannon, chief of the U. S. Department of Agriculture's chemical division, together with several Southern congressmen, have been studying tung tree culture in the South, with a view to expanding this important crop. Ten years ago we had no tung trees in this country, but the last decade has seen considerable headway made, so it may be said that before long the U. S. will be independent of the Chinese supply. We now have almost 60,000 acres covered with tung trees in the Gulf states. Southern Mississippi put in 25,000 acres during the past four years. All of which is the merest start, when one realizes the vast acreage at hand. Land unavailable for the south's main crop—cotton—can be planted to tung trees. Tung trees are fast growers, producing the oil-bearing nut in four years. At the same time they stop land erosion. A plant to crush the tung nuts is now being erected at Bogalusa, La., while preparations are being made for another plant at Picayune, Miss., which will be close to 20,000 acres of tung orchards. Land suitable for tung culture is available only in the extreme south of the Gulf states. It is possible that once the industry produces a sufficient quantity of oil, paint factories, now mainly in the North and East, will be erected in the South. The government is anxious to help develop this new industry and is considering instructing the New Orleans Federal Land Bank to make mortgage loans on tung tree orchards.

* * *

How many motor cars has Ford made?

In July 1934, Henry Ford reached the 26,000,000 mark, of which 16,000,000 were Model Ts. Ford estimates his 1935 production at 1,000,000 cars.

* * *

What are all these monkey-shines Henry Ford is going through with soy beans?

When Henry Ford does something in his own field, he usually knows what he is about. In the case of soy beans, it looks as though this great industrialist is "going places." He (or rather his famous chemical laboratories) has given the humble soy bean a new dignity, through additional uses that are being found for it. His chemical experts have extracted a new, tough enamel paint from the bean's oil. This same soy bean oil produces a lubricant. Henry Ford is now making buttons for the horn, gearshift knobs and several other minor parts from the soy bean pulp which remains after the oil is extracted. At present, each Ford car uses a half bushel of soy beans. It is said that before long the soy bean will be used for all steering wheels, and, believe it or not, for a synthetic metal that will be used for the fabrication of entire car bodies. The lowly soy is coming into its own.

* * *

Even the low-priced motor cars advertise easy top speeds of 80 and 90 miles. Please comment.

It can mean but one thing: murder. Our automobile capitalists are spending millions of dollars yearly telling people to go out and kill. And they get away with it because they seem to be above the law. There isn't a state in the Union that permits driving at 80 or 90 miles per hour, and yet these auto companies can use the newspapers and magazines to condition the riding public to break the law and their necks at the same time.
The best experts in the land agree that a top speed of 45 miles per hour is the safe rate at which to travel, even in the open country.

What is the factory cost of these snappy-looking $700 cars?
$100.

How large is the Penney chain?
The J. C. (James Cash) Penney Co., a clothing and general merchandise chain of stores, now has almost 1,500 units, scattered in 48 states. This chain has made tremendous progress, considering that there were only six Penney stores in 1909. The business was started in Evanston, Wyo. The head of this concern, Mr. Penney, almost boasts of the fact that the employees are paid miserably low wages while the stockholders received dividends throughout the depression, including a $2 extra on the company’s common stock.

What company is the largest retail grocery outlet in the U. S.?
It’s the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company, which began its career 75 years ago on Vesey street, New York City. There are now 15,500 of the familiar red-fronted stores throughout the country, employing 90,000 persons and doing a gross business of $1,000,000,000. This company handles its goods economically because of its tremendous volume, but its dealings with its employees are notoriously bad, there being an almost heartless exploitation of its numerous staff of workers, who, however, are beginning to organize and demand their rights. To give you an idea of the company’s vast undertakings, consider the following yearly purchases: 30,000 carloads of potatoes; 5,000,000 barrels of flour; 90,000,000 dozens of eggs; 24,000,000 cans of salmon; 25,000 tons of butter, which, of course, is 50,000,000 pounds.

How many retail store clerks are there?
Almost 2,000,000 in the U. S. These workers have received little or no attention in the struggle to improve labor’s condition, but there are numerous signs of almost rapid unionization. For too many years our store clerks considered themselves “white collar” executives, and though they received meager pay for their “dignified” position in the business scheme, they seemed satisfied with their status. But now they are beginning to see that their interests rest with the workers instead of the “executives.” About 300,000 of these 2,000,000 clerks are employed in 60,000 chain food stores, where labor conditions have been notoriously bad, but even here the “white collared” wage slaves are beginning to fraternize with the overalled “rough necks.”

Why do chain food stores move their store managers so often?
This is done to keep the manager from getting to know the community too well and quitting his job to start his own store, switching the chain’s customers to his independent outlet. It has been noticed by great chain executives that communities are ready to move their trade when an employe opens up for himself. By making him jump around like a trained flea, he doesn’t have half a chance to establish himself in a town.

I run an elevator in the Empire State Building, and wonder if you can tell me something about this vertical railroad business.
Your building, which is 102 stories high, is equipped with the best kind of elevators, capable of running 1,200 feet a minute, but at present permitted to operate at 980 feet per minute, which is plenty fast enough. You are one of 36,000 elevator operators in New York City, but this figure is not exact because no census of operators in your city has ever been taken. It is estimated that a man and a half are assigned to each elevator, and as there are 24,000 elevators in operation we arrive at this number of operators. You lift or lower 15,000,000 passengers each day, traveling more than 120,000 miles daily. Taking the average, each elevator travels about six
miles daily. Modern fast elevators travel from 12 to 16 miles per hour. There is one elevator in your city that can make a speed of 1,400 feet per minute, which is pretty fast action even for these speedy times. It takes only 50 seconds to reach the top of a 1,000 foot skyscraper. For the first time in the history of your city a union of elevator operators has been formed, which I hope you have already joined. If properly managed, such a union should be able to command good wages and other conditions, for if you and your fellow-workers ever went on strike you'd just about paralyze Manhattan business in 10 minutes.

* * *

Please comment on the Consumers' Research, Inc.

This company conducts a laboratory which tests products that are offered to consumers. There is no doubt that such a service is needed, for most buyers go to the stores with only the vaguest ideas of what they should get for their money. Advertising ballyhoo confuses and often deceives prospective purchasers, so that they often buy the poorer merchandise at higher prices, strange as that may seem. I have not read all of this company's literature and reports, but that which has come across my desk has impressed me as a useful service. If this company were sincerely desirous of aiding the consumers it would permit the use of its reports after they have been issued to its subscribers. Instead, every effort is made to keep its information secret, or at least strictly limited to its subscribers, who are pledged to keep the information confidential and not even let their pamphlets and circulars be circulated among friends or members of one's family. This impresses me as a desire to commercialize the idea, for anyone fighting sincerely for the rights of consumers would tell the world about it and urge all subscribers to get the facts broadcast. Some years ago The American Freeman used some of its facts (rewritten, of course, to fit the editorial needs of the paper) and it brought down on its head the wrath of this corporation, which seemed to detect a desire to lessen the company's income, when, as a matter of fact, the motive was one of public service. The company in its literature claims this secrecy is necessary because of the danger of libel suits. This, of course, is an absurd argument to offer, because it is just as much a libel to limit one's statements to one's paid members as it is to publish the facts to the world. The success of this concern (if membership reports are to be accepted) leads one to believe that the time is ripe for a real consumers' research movement which will function as an educational force instead of a secret society.

* * *

Is it true that Macy's Department Store guarantees to undersell any other store?

This cleverly run store cuts prices only on advertised articles which includes only 5 percent of its stock. On articles other than the run of advertised brands the prices are usually higher. This vast institution is run by shrewd masters of the art of advertising.

* * *

As a workingman I'm finding it increasingly difficult to pay my family's grocery bills. This leads me to wonder how much of each dollar I spend is wasted in advertising.

I can't give you a flat figure for everything, but I can give you the advertising bill of one of the world's greatest food concerns, General Foods, Inc. This company, during 1933, spent $10,000,000 in advertising its various packaged and patented foods. During the same year the company declared dividends amounting to $10,000,000. When you bought this company's products you had to turn in your share of the corporation's dividends and then cover each dollar with another dollar for the same company's advertising.

* * *

There is great advertising noise about "dated coffee." What is there to it?

Of course, the advertisements make some ridiculous claims when
they chant about this new feature in the sale of coffee, but there remains the indubitable fact that "dated coffee" means freshness, and that means the taste is there. Flavor is important to the coffee-lover.

* * *

Is there any particular virtue in Ivory soap's advertising slogan: "It floats"?

Any soap can be made to float by creating air holes when it is being made. There is no particular advantage in this. In fact, it is a little against the consumer's interest, because air holes in soap are free to the manufacturer but cost the purchaser a little money. Everything else being equal, a soap that doesn't float is just as good as one that does. In the case of Ivory soap, it is a worth while product, despite the unfortunate element of the "It floats" slogan, which qualifies as just a nice chunk of bunk. I recommend Ivory soap as being as good, or even better, than many 10-cent brands.

* * *

Who is responsible for the new streamline trains?

The railroad publicity hounds are getting the company officials reams of free advertising for their new trains, but if the whole truth were told the real credit would have to go to Washington. Uncle Sam not only suggested the idea but actually advanced the money to pay for the experiments. Now that the idea looks like a success, let's remember where to give the credit—to Uncle Sam.

* * *

As a mail order man, do you favor business reply envelopes?

No. I am strongly against them. I used several million business reply envelopes (on which the customer need put no postage, the seller agreeing to pay 4c when the envelope is delivered by the P. O. dept.) and I finally decided to abandon them and go back to the old-fashioned return envelope, on which the customer affixes his own 3c stamp. I found, for example, that hundreds of smart-alecks used these envelopes to make wise-cracks at my expense. They would put in some pieces of blank paper, or write a "ha-ha!" on a sheet of paper and shoot it back, at my expense. Or they would use the envelope to write me a long, friendly, intimate letter explaining just why they couldn't afford to buy any books just yet, but that they might be in the market next yuletide. That's delightful news to a mail order seller, especially when he has to pay 4c to hear it! I noticed, of course, that the great mail order houses stuck to the old return envelopes. They know their business. Of course, there are certain uses that one can make of these business reply envelopes, but they certainly have no place in a general mailing to the public, though I know of many publishing houses that disagree with me, if one judges them by their continued use of these expensive, wasteful envelopes. It is my theory that if I am selling the public a useful article, and the public feels it wants what I am selling, it follows that it is the customer's job to pay for the delivery of his letter in the same way that it is my job to prepay the carriage on my letters, circulars or catalogs. Incidentally, I have found in certain kinds of mailings that it is better to omit return envelopes entirely, letting the customer use his own stationery. It is all a complicated business and I try not to be dogmatic, but I have decided finally and unalterably that business reply envelopes are very bad practice. When I finally abandoned their use I did not receive a single complaint from my hundreds of thousands of customers, which shows how the public feels about them.

* * *

Are these new streamlined railroad trains economical?

It is reported (and it sounds incredible) that it cost only $80 for the oil used on the Union Pacific streamlined train that shot across the U. S. in 56 hours and 55 minutes. That is more revolutionary than the speed, to my notion. As for the speed, it is agreed that it is possible to cut down the time still
more, as the weight is only 200 tons, which is less than a third of that of a regular train. The railroad system may yet be saved for the nation's passenger traffic.

* * *

Why have you cut out C. O. D. selling?
As a mail order book seller I, along with others, used the C. O. D. plan for many years, but was forced at last to admit that it is economically wasteful. I found that something like 20 percent of the packages sent out were not accepted. If it costs 50c to send it out, one must pay the postoffice $1 when the rejected parcel is returned, and that is a staggering waste. Many people order when they haven't the money, thinking they'll have it when the goods arrive, and if the money doesn't show up they blandly tell the postoffice clerk they don't want it, or they never ordered it, or that the seller is a crook anyway and deserves to have his package returned. Of course, if I were selling something new and strange, I'd permit C. O. D. shipments, but when I've had almost 15 years in which to acquaint the public with what I am offering, I don't see the sense of continuing the C. O. D. method. Besides, a C. O. D. costs more than a regular parcel post shipment. The fee is heavy, and frequently the customer blames the seller for this! I remember many letters from customers complaining they ordered something worth $2 and when the package arrived the bill was for $2.25, and "you're a durn-blasted crook and I won't buy from you again," etc.

* * *

How much gasoline do we use?
Three experts, at Iowa State College, estimate our gasoline consumption at nearly 17,000,000,000 gallons, in 1930. Their report also says that such immense use will, in time, deplete our natural supply, making it necessary to gradually replace our motor fuel with supplies extracted from agricultural products. It is commercially feasible to extract ethyl or grain alcohol from corn, wheat, rye, or oats. Such a development in the fuel industry would put millions of farmers to work supplementing the food supply with crops intended for industrial uses. It is stated that a bushel of wheat will produce 2.8 gallons of alcohol. Oats will produce only 1.2 gallons. Corn produces 2.5 gallons, potatoes only 1.0 gallon. Rye will yield 2.2 gallons to the bushel. Such grain alcohol, of course, is intended to be mixed with hydrocarbon fuels. It is likely that in the near future millions of farmers and other workers will be engaged in the new industry of manufacturing fuel for our motor cars, for on the basis of a yearly consumption of 17,000,000,000 gallons, farm products would be used on the following basis if only 1 percent of this fuel were to be made from agricultural products: 68,000,000 bushels of corn; or 65,000,000 bushels of wheat; or 204,000,000 bushels of potatoes. That gives you an idea of what is in store for our farmers once our fuel industrialists have to turn to them for what it takes to keep our motor cars moving.

* * *

How is coal turned into oil?
The British, who have been working on this chemical problem for years, first pulverize the coal. The powdered coal is then mixed, under heat, with a very thick oil, until it becomes extremely hot, thus becoming a liquid coal. The convertor containing this liquid then receives compressed hydrogen made from hydro-carbon gases and steam. This causes the removal of oxygen, nitrogen, and sulphur. What remains, of hydro-carbon matter, is mixed with hydrogen matter, forming hydro-carbon oils. After distilling the oils a crude light oil is refined into gasoline. A little more than three tons of coal will produce one ton of gasoline. A new plant, now being erected, estimates a yearly production of 30,000,000 gallons from 365,000 tons of coal.

* * *

What is the manufacturing cost of Uncle Sam's coins?
Silver dollars cost $1.05 per 1,000. Half dollars cost $7 per 1,000. Dimes cost $4.50 per 1,000.
Banking and Finance

I want to know if there is the slightest chance of achieving the goal of nationalized banking in the U. S.?

The signs seem to point to the fact that Roosevelt is at least seeing the handwriting on the wall. Let me quote from an able, well-informed correspondent, Paul Y. Anderson, who writes in the January 24, 1934, issue of The Nation, as follows:

"... the greatest blunder which Roosevelt ever made was to turn the banks back to the bankers. It is my belief that he already realizes it, and it is my suspicion that before he gets through events will compel him to take them over again. The government is now prepared to take their gold; the next logical step would be the assumption of their commercial functions. ... If recovery must wait until the public can learn to trust the bankers again, we might as well end everything now."

Mr. Anderson has been writing from Washington for many years. He knows the situation as well as any newspaper man in the White House. His words quoted above indicate that Roosevelt is about ready to nationalize the credit facilities of the country and socialize the banking system. When that day comes a great step will have been taken in the direction of socialized industry, for once the government, under Roosevelt, gets control of $40,000,000,000 of deposits the money will be used to finance a great program of socialization, beginning with the telephone system, the telegraph, the railroads, power, etc.

Watch developments and bet on this sure thing: If Roosevelt takes over the privately owned banking system, it will follow that he is definitely turning to the left, with socialization as the ultimate goal. If he doesn't, it follows that he still believes in capitalism, and if he does he is going to walk into a whole lot of trouble.

* * *

What is your opinion of the plan to establish a central international bank?

Many important figures in the world of international finance are in favor of a Bank of International Settlements, to which each member nation would ship quantities of gold in order to expedite international commerce and stimulate foreign trade. But there is a difficulty that presents itself at the very beginning, even granting that such a financial institution would be of service to each member country's industries. Let us suppose that such an international Bank were agreed upon and England, the United States, France, Holland, Switzerland, Germany and other governments were to join. They would ship billions of dollars in gold to such an establishment, which, of course, would have a great effect on business—to the good, needless to say—but what would be the result in case of a sudden war? Imagine for a moment that the gold were deposited in the bank's headquarters—London, for the sake of argument. And then picture a sudden declaration of war against one or more of the countries which are parties to the bank. The gold in the bank would be confiscated by England, without a moment's hesitation. Of course, the international financiers who favor the plan blandly say that wars, being basically injurious to business, will be avoided, but that is obviously nothing more than a case of wish-thinking. If war were so remote, or even impossible, they why is it so evident that practically every cap-
italist nation is preparing for war, voting record-breaking budgets for the armies and navies and lining up allies wherever they offer themselves? Where there is so much feverish haste there must be a war in sight, and if there is, the whole idea of an international bank blows up so long as capitalism remains in the saddle—capitalism with its endless war threats and imperialistic races for power and profit.

* * *

**Do you favor currency inflation?**

A moderate amount of inflation certainly should do no harm, if it could be held in hand. However, there is always danger of uncontrolled inflation, which would be calamitous. Such inflation, as shown in European countries after the World War, will cause:

1. Quick, harmful increase in the cost of living.
2. Wages will lose their purchasing power.
3. The savings of the poor will lose a great portion of their purchasing power.
4. Small investors, who rely on securities that pay definite rates of interest, will see their values decline precipitously.
5. Heavy decreases in the volume of foreign trade, with resultant ill effect on employment.
6. Capitalists will move their holdings to foreign countries, so far as possible.
7. The liquidation of debts, but the economic destruction of the creditor class, which, under capitalism, is essential to the financing of the system's industrial and commercial expansion.
8. When a government resorts to unlimited inflation this is taken as unquestioned evidence that it is bankrupt.
9. The masses, determined to get rid of their rapidly depreciating money, will spend wildly as long as the cash lasts, causing a seeming increase in the volume of business, but this, naturally, can be only of short duration, with a next-morning headache.

The above nine points do not alter the fact that moderate inflation can be made to help the workers through a governmental plan of larger, and still larger, public works. An increase of five or 10 billion dollars in paper money could do the country no harm, and at the same time make possible improvements of a permanent nature that would provide employment for millions and bring activity into the almost dead heavy industries.

But it must be borne in mind that tinkering with the Money Question will not solve the problems of Capitalism, whether we resort to inflation or deflation. The sickness of Capitalism is not in its money but in its economic injustice to the millions of men and women who must live by their labor. We have depressions with almost clockwork regularity, because Capitalism, in its stupid greed and blind struggle for profits, refuses to guarantee each worker a job and the full social value of his or her labor. If it did, Capitalism as a system would die. A guaranteed job, and the elimination of labor's exploitation at that job, would mean Socialism, and Socialism means there's no more Capitalism.

* * *

**Is the New York Stock Exchange absolutely essential in financing industry?**

Wall Street frequently defends its "big board" with the claim that without it there would be no capital for necessary industry, transportation, etc. This statement has been analyzed carefully in a book by John T. Flynn, entitled "Securities Speculation: Its Economic Effects." As a result, the point is torn to shreds. Here's how Mr. Flynn meets this argument:

The bonds of 220 industrial and other corporations are listed on the N. Y. Stock Exchange. In 1929 these bonds had a market value of about $3,000,000,000. On the other hand, there were 433,413 corporations throughout the land with bonds issued for some $19,000,000,000. The stocks of 915 corporations were listed on the "big board" during 1929, with a market value of $30,000,000,000. The 433,413 corpor-
ations, ignored by the "big board," had stock issued to the amount of about $91,000,000,000.

The above two comparisons prove conclusively that American investors are willing to put their money into corporation stocks and bonds that have no access to the buying and selling facilities of the N.Y. Stock Exchange. This demonstrates finally that the stock exchange is not an essential institution even under capitalism. It could be closed tomorrow and most of the stocks and bonds of the land would be untouched. Those affected would have to find customers who really wanted the stocks, instead of using their holdings for purposes of speculation. Incidentally, Mr. Flynn defines speculation as "an operation in which one buys stocks and bonds in a given market to make a profit from a change in price in the same market without adding any utility to the shares."

* * *

I frequently read that "almost everybody" was a party to the 1929 stock boom. Is it true?

Editorial writers and others keep repeating that unwarranted statement. There were about 124,000,000 people in the U.S. in that year of crazy market speculation. John T. Flynn, in his book, "Security Speculation: Its Economic Effects," draws on income tax reports, statistics of Stock Exchange houses, the various reports of the Pecora investigation, and economists like Berle and Means to prove that only 1,108,000 people in the U.S. were mixed up in that orgy of stock trading. That leaves almost 123,000,000 Americans unaccounted for. With figures telling so plain a story, how can one repeat the bit of choice nonsense which would have practically all Americans in the 1929 market. It appears obvious that Wall Street bankers and speculators are trying to blame the public for their own deeds. The 1929 crash was Wall Street's and not the American people's party. A little over a million people played the crazy game of speculation, but the fiddler is now being paid out of the sweat and blood of the 123,000,000 who had nothing to do with the mad dance. Wall Street (Capitalism) brought on the panic. The depression is the penalty we must pay for tolerating this crazy system.

* * *

Is not the loss of confidence in our financial institutions, industrial leaders and others—due to their criminal dishonesty, greed and lust of power—one of the prime causes of this great crisis, called depression? Is not confidence the cornerstone of every business transaction?

The depression got its start at a time when there was no lack of confidence in our financial, industrial and social institutions. Back in 1929 everyone had confidence aplenty. Millions of workers thought the Republican party was to rule forever. Other millions invested their savings in phoney stocks, foreign bonds, Insull securities, real estate mortgages, bank deposits and every other branch of capitalism. Confidence was there in full force. So I fail to accept the usual ballyhoo which would have the absence of confidence blamed for the depression. Confidence gradually disappeared long afterward, when it was realized that prosperity was not around the corner. It was only then that confidence became a factor in the depression, or rather the absence of confidence. We were then psychologized through press and radio to return to the bland optimism and confidence of the good old days of 1925–29. But the propaganda came too late. Confidence could not be reborn when new millions of workers were being thrown out of jobs and forced to turn to charity for relief.

It is true that confidence has a great deal to do with many business transactions, but a careful examination will show that most transactions, particularly those connected with banks and other financial institutions, are based on collateral more than on confidence. The man with a thousand-dollar Liberty Bond may be an all-round bad character and crooked racke-
teer, but he can raise something like $900 at any bank when he offers the bond as security, while the fellow who inspires confidence has to do a whole lot of talking with the chance of getting no loan, just because he is without the “bad man’s” Liberty Bond.

We must get back to the simple proposition that the depression was not caused by lack of confidence, or even too much confidence, but came because of the innate failings of the industrial, financial and social system. Letting a small class own the large-scale industries for private profit, letting the workers produce more than they can buy back, wasting countless billions on capitalistic wars of imperialism, piling up a debt structure that stifled the debtor classes, milking business through speculation and stock schemes, wasting billions regularly through unsound advertising, senseless competition, and duplicated service—in short, the flowers of capitalistic civilization brought us the weeds of the present depression.

* * *

Why do you advocate the nationalization of banking and large-scale industry?

Recognizing the death of the old deal, the end of large-scale individualism, the New Deal should mean a quick program of socialized industry, making the people’s money the means of working out the program. Nationalized banking will mean the nationalization of credit—and that credit need not be used to finance big business but to buy it out.

Where borrowers have collateral, the government will always be in a position to take care of the needs of the people. But where big business cannot run because of the faults of its own organization and is dying because of a self-generated cancer, the remedy is not to pump government credit into it but to take it over for the service of the people and the restoration of prosperity.

A great deal of our banking could be done, once nationalized, through the postoffices. There is a natural means of contact with the people. Then, with the government in possession of the savings of the people—and who is better entitled to the right to watch over it?—the money could be applied to a vast program of socialization.

Several industries are just waiting to be taken over. Take the matter of communication. Here we have the telephone, telegraph and radio industries almost monopolized. The telephones are now non-competitive. The A. T. and T. is the boss of the telephone system. In the telegraph companies, we find one immense company and one small concern. They can be merged and then taken over by the post-office department. That’s where they belong. The radio system also should be nationalized, with the peoples’ savings, taken over by the nationalized banks, paying for the property—paying a fair price, and not a penny more. So much for communication.

Take transportation. The railroads are about 80 percent bankrupt. They will stay there unless something is done by the government. The system should be nationalized. Then should follow coal, steel, copper, lead, cement, shipping; insurance companies, power, construction—all should be nationalized. This does not mean confiscation. It means the government going into business with a view to feeding, clothing and housing the people in decency, instead of letting them shiver and starve as they do today. When private capitalism worked, there was no reason for governmental action. But when it fell down on the job, when it ceased to function, when it could no longer supply the people with jobs and their families with food, it became the duty of the government to step in and say that the people, through nationalization, would bring about economic recovery.

* * *

To what extent does the Morgan bank control industry?

According to a U. S. Senatorial Committee’s report, J. P. Morgan and Co.’s 24 partners hold directorates in 88 corporations, with as—
sets of more than $20,000,000,000. This is final and indisputable proof of tremendous concentration of wealth and economic power. To say that Wall Street rules the U. S. is to tell the cold, bitter truth. It has been shown that 200 U. S. corporations control 22 percent of the entire wealth of this country, and 38 percent of all wealth connected with business. The remedy, of course, is not to "divide up" this wealth. That would be childish. The scientific program that will really correct this and other capitalistic evils is the one that demands that our means of wealth production, distribution and exchange be socialized. The industries, transportation systems, banks, etc., should be used to serve the people instead of Wall Street.

Please comment on the present trend of American banking.

Under the pretext of codifying their business under the NRA, the banks are beginning to apply a social steal that will strangle commerce and in the end kill the banks themselves.

You depositors are going to pay for everything the bank does. You will pay for the right to bring money to the bank, through a charge on each deposit slip.

You will pay a service charge on each check you write, in addition to the 2c tax collected by the federal government.

You will pay a collection charge on each out-of-town check you deposit. You will pay a service charge on what the bankers call the "float," which means the money represented by that out-of-town check you deposited.

You will pay an activity charge, which means that business will pay a monthly rental for the right to withdraw payrolls and the like from bank balances.

The interest on time deposits will be cut perhaps 50 percent. No interest will be paid on the balances in open accounts.

In numerous other ways, banks will quietly dig into your bank balance, in the hope of making such service charges pay the dividends that formerly came from the collections connected with the note-case.

In this the banks are acting like the old small interurban street-car systems that hiked their fares when they saw automobile competition get too hot. The idea was to make up the loss, but it worked the other way, with the result that practically every interurban street-car system is either out of business or in the hands of receivers.

The banks will make it impossible for the people to do business with them, with the result that their elaborate list of service charges will drug business instead of saving it. Instead of making deposits, the people will use the postal savings banks more than ever before, in the face of the fact that the postal savings system has made truly astounding progress in the past four years.

Instead of keeping a balance in the banks, the public will work it down to an irreducible minimum (which may be zero) and then continue to do business by cash, paying out money instead of checks for payrolls, supplies, rentals and the like. This will go on a while and then the people will demand that the postal savings banks permit commercial services, clearing checks and in other ways enabling the people to do business without having to pay daily toll to the bankers who refuse to act as bankers.

This will mean a gradual strain on the banking system. This pressure will be met by federal support, for a while, but in the end it will snap, and the closing will not be a "holiday" but a permanent collapse, should President Roosevelt fail to act before it is too late.

Before providing the postal savings banks with commercial facilities in the shape of clearing checks, etc., it would be well to inquire if the system, as run today, is showing a profit or a loss.

The postal savings banks showed a net profit of $2,118,000 during 1933, according to the report issued by Postmaster General Farley, on January 20. The number of depos-
itors increased by 2,000,000 during the last three years. Its gross prof-
it in 1933 amounted to $6,500,000, but after paying interest and hand-
ling costs the net amounted to $2,118,000. Farley, who is
nothing more than a cheap Tam-
many politician and is the least
social-minded member of the
President’s cabinet, is opposed to
having the postal savings banks
permit the clearing of checks. He
gives no valid reasons for this po-
position. On the other hand, more
important members of the official
family are coming over to the idea
that the postal savings banks
should supply the usual banking
services. Once that is done hun-
dreds of millions of hoarded dol-
ars will come into circulation
again. With the private banks put-
ting outrageous service charges in
to effect, the people are not in the
mood to continue patronizing them.
They have no confidence in the
private banks, but the have com-
plete faith in the postal savings
banks and would patronize them if
the government made it easier to
deal with them.

* * *

How much money did the American
people lose through closed banks?
$2,250,000,000 to $2,500,000,000
will be the loss to bank depositors
when the institutions are liqui-
dated. This estimate is by Chair-
man Jesse Jones, of the Recon-
struction Finance Corporation. He
says this is in addition to the
money advanced by the RFC for
liquidating frozen deposits,
amounting to about $1,000,000,000.
This is an illustration of how ex-
pensive it is to tolerate private
banking. After taking such a stag-
gering loss, the American people
should have demanded that the
banks, at the close of the 10-day
bank holiday in 1933, be national-
ized, but President Roosevelt saw
fit to let the banking system—the
key to socialized industry and real
recovery—remain as the private
property of a class that has shown
itself incompetent, stupid, anti-so-
cial and plainly crooked. The idea
that banking is now safe is a de-
lusion and a snare. Deposit insur-
ance means that the “sound” banks
will have to carry the losses of the
unsound institutions. It follows,
naturally, that another crisis (and
capitalism spells newer and great-
er crises) will bankrupt the “good”
with the bad. Roosevelt has given
social progress a body-blow in his
policy of private banking.

* * *

What is the total public and pri-
ivate interest-bearing debt of the
country?
There is quite a difference in the
estimates of several authorities.
Prof. G. Warren says it is $175,000,-
000,000; Prof. Irving Fisher says it
is $200,000,000,000; Prof. Robert R.
Doane, in his book, “The Measure-
ment of American Wealth,” pub-
lished by Harper’s, in 1933, sets the
figure at $136,318,000,000. All these
figures are for 1932. I have no way
of finding which economist is
right.

* * *

What is the status of the U. S.
treasury?
Every citizen should be familiar
with the main facts of the depart-
ment headed by Henry Morgen-
thau. The Secretary of the Treas-
ury, on August 28, 1934, reported
that on June 30, 1934, our gross
public debt stood at $27,000,000,000,
which was an increase of $6,000,-
000,000 over the debt as it stood on
March 4, 1933, when Roosevelt went
into office. However, this does not
tell the entire story. Other facts
must be taken into consideration.

On March 4, 1933, the cash bal-
ce in the U. S. treasury amount-
ed to $200,000,000, but on June 30,
1934, the balance on hand was $1,800,000,000. This registered an
increase of $1,600,000,000. Naturally,
this increase must be taken from
the $6,000,000,000 increase in the
public debt, bringing it down to
$4,400,000,000.

We next must take into consid-
eration the government’s “profit”
in its gold manipulations. By re-
valuing gold, the government made
a “profit” of $2,800,000,000, which is
untouched, the vast store of gold
being still in the department’s
vaults. If this “profit” were taken
now, it would, in effect, reduce the
debt increase from $4,400,000,000 to only $1,600,000,000.

Finally, there is the factor of government securities in its vaults. Such government corporations as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Public Works Administration and other agencies hold notes and other securities for money lent to states, cities, industries, banks, insurance companies, etc., including mortgages on private homes, farms, etc. Between March 4, 1933, and June 30, 1934, these assets increased by $1,095,000,000, though it is true that some of these loans will never be paid. Secretary Morgenthau insists, however, that most will be realized on. If so, it would be proper to deduct this item—$1,095,000,000—from the debt increase already figured in the last paragraph, $1,600,000,000, bringing the increase in debt down to only $505,000,000, which, again according to Secretary Morgenthau, would not have existed had not the federal government been faced with an unexpectedly severe drought in numerous states, which caused the government to appropriate $525,000,000 for drought relief.

From this it may be seen that the federal government has not even scratched the surface of its credit possibilities. If the government were to become serious in its fight on depression, unemployment and poverty, the money could be made immediately available and the government enter into a series of industrial projects that could, in a short while, put every needy person to work making the things that are needed by the poor.

The unemployed need opportunities to work; the government has, or can easily get, the money. The two must be brought together in a vast program of socialized industries in which wealth will be produced for the use of the people instead of for the profit of capitalists. This is a long step in the direction of Socialism, and it must come if the people are to be rescued from their economic plight. Don’t let anyone fool you about the government’s approaching “bankruptcy.” The government is solv-
by check instead of postal money order, cash or stamps, is playing into the greedy hands of the bank-hold-ups. I notice in my own business that the public is given less and less to the practice of writing checks. We hope to see them eliminated entirely, but, that, of course, is out of the question for the present. However, the day is coming when the government will be forced to take over the banks—to nationalize banking—in order to save the economic life of society, for private banking, if continued much longer, will strangle what's left of legitimate business. To repeat: Write as few checks as possible. Don't buy bank drafts or cashiers' checks. Instead, buy postal money orders. They're safe, quick, sure and economical. This advice is intended for persons in the U. S. A., Alaska, the island possessions and foreign countries. Checks written on banks in Alaska, Hawaii and the Philippines, etc., are not cashable without a long wait, while they are being collected, and with a service charge that is nothing short of a greedy steal. Persons in foreign countries should always remit by international postal money orders, the best and safest form of transferring money.

* * *

What is your opinion of Metered Banking?

The term Metered Banking describes the service charges that have gone, or are going, into effect throughout the country. The plan provides for a flat "maintenance of account" charge, usually about 50c per month. Then follows an outrageously "ledger entry fee," amounting usually to 3c, which means that every time you put money into a bank the bankers will deduct 3c from your deposit for the "right" to let the bank use your money! Then comes a charge on deposited checks or those taken to the bank to be cashed, amounting to 2c, 3c or even 5c per item for out-of-town checks, and 1c and 2c each for local checks, or what are known as Clearing House items. This last charge means that even postal money orders, if deposited in your bank account, will be charged 1c and 2c each. And that isn't all, by any means. Each check you write against your account will cost you 3c, if you write more than five free checks on a $50 account. Then, if your account runs below $50 you are charged 50c in order to keep your account with the bank. That's all I can think of at this moment, though I am sure there are many other forms of "metered banking," all of which amount to an elaborate system of making the public pay toll to the bankers every time they are compelled to do business with them, forgetting all along that the banks have your money and are collecting interest on notes, mortgages, bonds, etc. "Metered banking" has reached the point where it is unnecessary for the banks to make any loans at all in order to get a big profit. A bank can keep all deposits in liquid form and still make money. The remedy for all this, of course, is nationalized banking, which should come as soon as possible, preferably through the extension of the postal savings system to allow the writing of checks and other commercial services. Be sure to write your congressman and senators to the effect that you favor such a change. And while you're waiting for nationalized banking, which must come or economic improvement will be made impossible, just try to get along without a bank account. If you're not in business, you'll be surprised how easy it is to do this. Leave your money at the postoffice. Don't write checks. Remit to out-of-town concerns by postal money orders, cash or stamps. If you simply have to write a check, never fail to add 10c for exchange, in order not to cause a loss to the person with whom you are doing business. Locally, you can pay your bills in cash, taking a receipt. These measures will put your hard-earned savings out of the reach of the bank bandits. Don't let them rob you. "Metered banking" is a slicker racket than Al Capone ever was able to set up.
Is Father Coughlin a citizen of the U. S.?

Father (of what?) Coughlin (pronounced Cog-lin) was born in 1891, in Hamilton, Canada, of Irish-U. S. stock. Being Canadian born, he can't, under the Constitution, use his National League for Social Justice as a means of capturing the presidency. It is not clear that he is even a citizen of the U. S., a point he is reluctant to discuss. There is nothing to show that he has ever taken out his "papers."

* * *

What do you think of Father Charles E. Coughlin, the radio priest? I don't recall your ever having mentioned him. How come? Remember, he talks to 30,000,000 Americans and has tremendous influence?

It's true that I haven't mentioned Father Coughlin. This was because I didn't consider his economic vapors worthy of serious consideration. I note that you repeat the usual radio hokum—propaganda to the effect that he has a radio audience of 30,000,000. According to the radio interests (which have advertising to sell) no one ever opens his mouth before the "Mike" without talking to at least 3,000,000, and if he makes any kind of a splash, his audience immediately hops to 10,000,000; then up to twenty, and now, in Coughlin's case, to 30,000,000.

Now stop to reason for a moment. Just fancy what it means to have 30,000,000 stop suddenly and listen to one voice. It means 25 percent of the people—men, women and children—are around radio receiving sets whenever Father Coughlin opens his trap. Do you believe that? If you do, you are more than gullible. As for myself, I don't believe one-tenth of this radio propaganda about the vastness of its audiences.

Take the matter of letters received by the various speakers. Oh, boy, how they do lie when it comes to telling the world about their "fan" mail. Father Coughlin is supposed to receive never less than 150,000 letters each week, and frequently he is supposed to get almost that many letters in a single day. You can believe that if you want to, but pardon me for being a little cynical. I'd say that 10 percent of such a quantity would be an exaggeration.

For example, consider the mail of the most publicized and powerful figure in all America—the President of the United States. Roosevelt gets from 4,000 to 8,000 letters per day. That's a whole lot of mail. Half of it is official business; the balance is what our radio publicity hounds would call "fan" mail. He gets nearer to 4,000 letters than to 8,000 letters per day, during normal days of business at the White House. It takes a whole lot of excitement to get 10,000 letters.

When Roosevelt delivered his famous speech announcing the NRA, he talked to a vast audience, because the air was cleared for him. No one else made a sound while Roosevelt delivered his talk. Each station in the country was at his command. In addition, every word of his speech was printed in every newspaper in the country, and they have a combined circulation of more than 30,000,000 daily. What happened? Well, Roosevelt, when he finished explaining the purpose of the Blue Eagle, specifically asked his hearers to wire or write him immediately. He wanted to know how the country felt about his NRA program. He plainly asked for "fan" mail. How much did he get? Ten thousand wires and 120,000 letters.

That was a tremendous showing, but remember it was the President
of the United States speaking, with every facility of communication—through press and radio—at his command. The flood of letters broke all White House records. It was a lot, but notice that it was less than Father Coughlin claims to have received after numerous hot-air demonstrations. That's why I am hopelessly skeptical about Father Coughlin's claims of a following.

I grant you he has influence and that he has a large following, but it isn't anywhere near what he claims.

So much for the radio audience of 30,000,000. Now what about his messages? To answer this I must be frank and to the point. I consider him the greatest fraud in American public life. He is an ignorant yokel suddenly catapulted into fame, and he talks like a combination of the Pope, Jesus Christ, Moses, Gandhi and Jack Dempsey. All the wisdom of the ages has been rolled into a little pill and deposited in his cranium.

At present, he is harping on gold and silver. He wants the government to issue $25,000,000,000 of new money. But he forgets that the banks are rolling in money today. There is no shortage of money, though there would be no particular damage if another few billions in money were issued, if it is understood in advance that the issuance of more money is by no means the road to recovery. We have plenty of money today, the trouble being that it is frozen in the private banks, where it is doing nothing, when it should be taken over by the government so that credit would be nationalized and thereby do some good in the direction of more business and work.

To bring the lesson home to you, look at this financial statement of a small bank on my desk as I write this piece. This bank, like thousands of others, has deposits amounting to $250,000 and loans of only $90,000. There's proof that our problems of unemployment and mass misery will not be solved by more money.

If $25,000,000,000 of new money were printed today, it is only a question of time before this money would be deposited with our private banks, and the results would be staggering. Frozen deposits would be multiplied several times, and we would be exactly where we are today.

No, the remedy does not lie in the simple expedient of printing more money. We must dig deeper. Instead of issuing new billions for the tills of the private bankers, let Father Coughlin come out for the real remedy—the nationalization of credit and the socialization of the banking system. Let that socialization be used for social ends—that is to say, let the billions of money be utilized immediately to buy out the large-scale industries, so that wealth might be produced for use instead of profit, so that workers who are hungry may go back to good jobs, so that industry may revive with a view to feeding and clothing the masses instead of robbing the people of what little money they have left.

Father Coughlin carefully avoids such a policy. This is because he is an economic fraud, muddying up the issues at a time when the people are in dire need of economic truths. He comes along, in times like these, and talks such high-school nonsense as making silver more expensive in China and India, but at the same time he wants money to be worth less at home. He blows hot and cold. He wants deflation here and inflation there. This proves just one thing: the man is talking positively, with the pompous air of infallibility, without the slightest grasp on the economic realities of the day. He is having his day of popularity now, as Henderson, down in Shreveport, had it a few years ago, and as Dr. John R. Brinkley had it in Milford, Kans., only the other day. These radio charlatans come and go—they have their flings with the fickle, superficial public, they talk themselves out—and then make room for some other quack. So goes the merry game.

Please comment on Father Coughlin, the Detroit radio priest, and
his National Union for Social Justice.

Blatant Father Coughlin's cavortings bear all the familiar earmarks of a lightly-disguised fascism, though he may take elaborate pains to deny intentions in the direction of a fascist state. Such Catholic denials are "good politics" in the United States, where the Catholic Church is still a minority power.

After all, Father Coughlin is only a priest, and nothing that he says can commit the higher-ups, who always have the final say. In a political democracy it is good propaganda for the Catholic Church to permit one or more of its priests to pay lip service to democracy, knowing all along that its traditional hostility to democracy, liberty, freedom of discussion, press, criticism, education and assembly remain in operation where Catholicism is in a position of power, as in Italy, Austria and other fascist states.

It is plain on the face of it that being a priest in the Catholic Church means acceptance of church authority, and that authority is anti-democratic, anti-libertarian and socially repressive. There are many Catholic crimes in Europe that look extremely unpleasant in print, and it is considered more than advisable to cover them in countries like the United States by allowing an occasional priest to express economic or political ideas that may sound "radical" but which are, according to historical precedent, the forerunners of the fascist organization work. Students of political mass movements recall the seeming economic radicalism of Adolf Hitler when he was propagandizing his movement with a view to capturing power. He took a few ideas of Socialism, tainted them with his own warped personality, and came out as the "savior" of humanity. Once in power, those radical ideas were thrown overboard and the great industrialists came into their own, with an industrial autocracy previously undreamed of in civilized Europe. The great industrialists have been rewarded by Hitler with the complete destruc-

tion of labor unionism and social democracy or Socialism. Fascists work that way because it is necessary to win over the masses to presumably radical ideas and at the same time to get the necessary money from the rich capitalists who want to continue in their positions of financial power.

Father Coughlin is now organizing what he calls "The National Union for Social Justice," which sounds idealistic but which certainly looks like another fascist maneuver. Such an "organization," which will never be anything more than the private possession of this radio rabble-baiter and tom-tom beater, will, says Coughlin, soon number 5,000,000 members, but I have long grown to suspect any statistics or facts that emanate from that unreliable source. He is given to talking in astronomical figures, knowing that a mass appeal must be tied up with plenty of bluff and bunk. I'd want to have more proof than Coughlin's own word for any statement he makes regarding the nature or size of his new outfit. His figures, especially with regard to the size of his following as shown by reports of the quantity of mail he receives, have been rejected by Detroit newspapermen who are in a position to check upon some of his claims. Only the other day I saw a confidential report, written by a newspaperman, in which the statement was made that anything that comes from Coughlin has to be discounted heavily.

It stands to reason that if Father Coughlin were to be able to organize 5,000,000 followers in his dupe organization, he could not remain a priest five minutes if he took a stand that contradicted the actions of the hierarchy in countries like Italy, Austria, and until recently Spain and Mexico, though in Spain the Catholic Fascists appear to be regaining some of their lost powers, mainly through the weapons of murder and terror.

The lesson one learns from history is simply this: A Father Coughlin, like other frauds and quacks, can throw out a few radical
phrases, which, at the proper time, can be thrown overboard, and then make way for the real fascist program, the facts of which are known all too well by all students of current affairs. The Catholic Church never attempts to carry out its full traditional policies in a country in which it is in a minority, as is the case in the United States, though it is an obvious fact that this minority is tightly organized and well disciplined.

The Popes have never surrendered a single Catholic idea with regard to what they consider their "rights" under a Catholic state. Let the United States become a Catholic state and we will find the Father Coughlins storming at free discussion, yelling to destroy every social freedom that was bought at the price of millions of martyrs to social and political progress. It couldn't be otherwise and still be the Catholic Church. Catholic leaders do not hesitate to protest against states that "persecute" them when they are in the minority, but this does not mean they will show tolerance when they are in power themselves, for bigotry, intolerance and persecution are formal parts of their reactionary policy.

A demagogue like Father Coughlin could be useful to the hierarchy in organizing a mass movement in the United States, for such a body, under clerical control, could bring about action that would result in Catholic control of our educational institutions, public or private, persecute all Socialists, radicals and Freethinkers, scrap the Constitution and inaugurate an authoritarian state that would put us in the same class with Italy. That, of course, would be Fascism, so I feel safe in predicting that Father Coughlin's radio activities are nothing less than a smoke-screen for maneuvers in the direction of intellectual, social, political, cultural and economic tyranny.

* * *

What kind of labor is building Father Coughlin's $1,000,000 church?

Non-union labor is being used exclusively. In November, 1934, the Detroit Federation of Labor passed a resolution criticizing Father Coughlin for refusing to use union labor on his new church and paying his non-union workers wages far below the scale. Coughlin placidly ignores such criticisms and goes ahead with his demagogic appeals to the masses, who are expected to give his program the support that will make it serve as a weapon against real economic progress.

* * *

Father Charles E. Coughlin, the radio priest, claims to be a friend of the working people. What about that?

According to Frank Walker, who knows his facts, Coughlin's Society of the Little Flower was the first Detroit organization to go in for a spell of wage-cutting. His present building program, in connection with his new church, is being carried out by non-union men who are being forced to accept a cut under the scale, amounting to 40 percent. Father Coughlin does a great deal of printing, and it is known that every piece of printing issued from his office—from letter-heads to pamphlets—comes from a scab shop, where low wages are paid. His labor record is filled with brutalities and selfish exploitation of unprotected toilers.

* * *

Is it true that Father Coughlin has all his printing done in a scab shop?

Yes, this demagogue talks about "helping the working man," but when the workers organize themselves into unions he stabs them in the back by giving his substantial printing orders to non-union concerns.

* * *

Is Father Charles E. Coughlin a Socialist?

V. R. Griffith, Mo., has received a letter from Father Charles E. Coughlin, radio priest, which I quote in full, as follows:

"1. In answer to your inquiry may I inform you that I am not a Socialist. If you care to study the origin of Socialism along-


side the doctrines of Christianity, you will find that the best things of this system have been borrowed from Christian morals.

"2. On the other hand, please remember that Socialism, according to its avowed founders, is not only an economic system, it is an entire philosophy, embracing things theological as well as things economical.

"3. The founders of Socialism, as you call it, professed atheism.

"4. Karl Marx was logical enough (which is more than I can say of most modern Socialists) to admit that if there is no such thing as private ownership, then there is no such thing as a man possessing his own home and children.

"5. The kind of Socialism as predicated by Norman Thomas is not Socialism in its real sense.

"6. Socialism is predicated upon the fact that men will regard each other as brothers. That is Christianity. That is a result which can be gained only through religion and not through legislation."

The above letter, to which I have added paragraph numbers for the sake of convenience, shows the Jesuitical mind of this Detroit misleader of the working masses. I don't recall so few sentences with so many misstatements as will be found in the above. In truth, there is no limit to the mental depravity of this exploiter of the masses and spokesman for a church that has always shown itself to be the worst enemy of humanity, freedom, progress, culture, science and plain decency.

Let us look into a few of his statements:

1. We need not be told that Father Coughlin, with his scab printing, non-union building contracts and sweated labor, is not a Socialist. His claim that a study of the origin of Socialism will show its indebtedness to Christian morals is a libel on Socialism. The Catholic Church, for which Coughlin speaks so dishonestly, has always been the real enemy of true morals. Because of its objections to divorce and because of its opposition to birth control, a Catholic woman, married to a syphilitic man, is expected to give her body to this Catholic husband and then give birth to a syphilitic, which is a "moral" act approved by the Catholic Church but disapproved by every sane, decent, honorable human being. This Church has built up a code which it calls morality, but it has nothing to do with real morality—honesty, truth, justice, non-exploitation of one's fellowmen, peace and freedom of thought and speech. This great "moral" Catholic Church was, during the Middle Ages, the greatest slave-owning class in all Europe. Its Jesuits introduced slavery on a vast scale into South and Central America. It manned its own armies from the Vatican State and went forth to slaughter and pillage, all in the name of Jesus and the Pope. It burned and tortured and persecuted millions of men, women and children who refused to accept its dark and sinister code of conduct and belief. It sent to the stake and the gallows great thinkers like Giordano Bruno and gagged mighty scientists like Galileo. It fought with insane fury the organization of workmen's guilds during the Middle Ages. It provoked wars, massacres, and prodigious suffering among countless millions of innocent sufferers. It put back civilization a thousand years. And yet, the spokesmen of this corrupt and indecent organization of priestly exploitation and robbery have the gall to talk to the world about decency and "morality." Yes, it is quite true that Socialism refuses to claim or admit any kinship with Catholicism. Socialism's ethics are based on the purely materialistic code that the people who work have the right to the full social value of their labor, and this code does not come from slave-holding Catholicism but from thinkers and doers who have refused to accept the dictates of a great organization dedicated to intellectual and physical darkness.
2. In this paragraph Father Coughlin prepares the way for the cry of horror that must always come with the word “Atheism.” It is not only an economic system, it is “an entire philosophy, embracing things theological.” It would be more accurate for Father Coughlin to say that Socialism does not embrace theology, it rejects it. Socialism is a strictly materialistic philosophy, based scientifically on the things of this life and this world. It deals in machinery, land, labor, electricity, technical knowledge, food, clothing, shelter and the other physical things of existence. It is devoted to making life on this world livable and decent, without telling the poor, deluded, priest-ridden masses that there is a life beyond loaded with pearly gates, pie and golden streets. Socialism rejects theology in its entirety and it makes no apology on this score.

3. Ah, now we come to the terrible sin! Yes, the founders of Socialism—Karl Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Debs and others—all rejected Theism and accepted Atheism. This is to the credit of the founders of Socialism. They were, and are, honest, sincere thinkers, and as such they could never lower themselves to the level of espousing ideas based on superstition, super-naturalism and revelation. It is freely confessed that a person could accept the fundamentals of Socialism—socialized industry—without bothering about the truth or untruth of the God-idea, but at the same time the founders of Socialism have almost invariably been Freethinkers, and as such have earned the malicious hatred of the priests and cardinals who grow rich at the expense of the working masses. Not only do real Socialists believe in Atheism, but when put to the test they give reality to their ideas. In Russia, for example, 10,000,000 people belong to the atheistic organization, and Atheism has the direct approval and support of the entire State. At the same time, these Russian Communists, unlike the Catholic priesthood, believe in freedom of worship, so persons who wish to worship their God-idea may do so undisturbed in all of Russia, provided they obey certain laws which insist on complete separation of Church and State. Where the Catholics throughout history censored the press, suppressed freedom of thought and expression, tortured anti-religious philosophers, the Atheists of Russia permit full freedom to religious worshippers, provided they do not use this privilege as an excuse for counter-revolutionary activity. Yes, Father Coughlin, we glory in the materialistic philosophy of the atheistic founders of Socialism. They could not be otherwise and still be sane, logical, honest thinkers.

4. Now we come to a fine piece of bunk. Oh, boy, what an enormity we must deal with now! The crux of the paragraph is based on the assumption that Socialists do not believe in private ownership. Prove this, Father Coughlin! Socialists have always believed in private ownership of private things. They limit their ideas of socialization to large-scale industries, monopolies, trusts, utilities, etc. Personal property may always be privately owned, as may be seen in Russia today. Why, you may even own a farm privately in Russia—real land—if you work that farm yourself, or if it is worked by members of your family. It is true that Russia will not permit land to be exploited by absentee landlords. You have to work it in order to own it, but what’s wrong about that? Private ownership of personal things may always be put down as a cardinal principle of Socialist economics—private ownership of homes, apartments, furniture, clothes, tooth-brushes, musical instruments, radios, automobiles, and the like. Socialism puts nothing in the way of home-ownership, and as for the “ownership” of children, we fail to see any proof of the notion that Socialists, when they took charge in Russia, put an end to family life. Many babies are born each year in Russia, and they belong to their parents, which should be happy news to this Detroit priest who, it seems, hasn’t the courage to bring
up that old, exploded Catholic libel to the effect that Russia, when it took on the philosophy of Socialist economics, nationalized its women. For years after the Russian revolution these priests, and other enemies of working-class progress, spread the lie that Russian women had been nationalized. It was only when they were challenged in such a way that they could not make their lies stick that they gave up this claim, though they do stick to the sly insinuation that children, in Russia, are torn from the breasts of their mothers. There are many well-run, modern, well-equipped nurseries in the Soviet Union, but the children in them are there with the full consent and approval of their parents, in the same way that our children in America are in the public schools because we parents want them there.

5. I fail to see anything really wrong with Norman Thomas' Socialism, though we may disagree on minor points here and there. Norman Thomas believes in Socialism as applied to American conditions. He is not a Russian Bolshevik or Communist, though I know from his writings that he is in full sympathy with the aims and ideals of this first working-class state. Norman Thomas is working in the direction of a classless society, with the people in full control of the means of large-scale production, operated with a view to public service instead of private profit. What is there about this program that is foreign to what Coughlin calls "real Socialism"?

6. Here Father Coughlin—who can father more fallacies than anyone I know—takes a nose dive and hits the bottom of the pool. I never got the notion that scientific Socialism is "predicated upon the fact that men will regard each other as brothers." Such verbiage is too loose for genuine logicians. I have seen brothers who were enemies and I have seen strangers who cooperated. Why? Because of their self-interest. Men are moved by motives of real self-interest and not by sentimental notions of "brotherhood," whatever the word means. If brotherhood means cooperation, why not say cooperation, which means something real? Socialism is predicated upon the fact that men, as measures of self-protection and preservation, will pool their economic interests in order to avoid the penalties of an unsound economic philosophy. With industry no longer an individual problem of craftsmanship, but rather a complicated process of divided tasks, the individual must cooperate with his fellow workers if he is to survive. If individualism were a reality, there would be no room for cooperative enterprise, but since man already cooperates in his work, he will have to cooperate in his social economy if he is to expect a reward for the time and energy he expends in the avenues of wealth production. The problem is, therefore, a material, physical one, without recourse to any sort of a moony mysticism known as "brotherhood." For this reason, Christianity has nothing to do with the issue. Christianity has been used to bless wars and slavery, to give the consent of the divine to the exploitation of man and subjugation of women, to keep tollers satisfied with their chains and stamp with righteousness and virtue the robbers in the high places. Religion will get you into heaven after you die—if there is a heaven and immortality. We'll let the religionists deal with such hooey. We prefer to deal in realities. This life needs science and reason and fair social legislation. Life as it is lived on this good old earth is a problem in practical, realizable things like food, clothes, shelter, comforts, services, security and opportunities to gain access to the machinery of production. Such problems are materialistic. They are as real as a clay brick. We prefer to deal with such everyday realities and leave the gassy things of religion to its priestly experts. Incidentally, we notice that when Coughlin talks about religion, no one pays any attention to him. It is only when he leaves the things of the "spirit" and makes some sort of an attack
on real questions like money, jobs, banking and the like, that his listeners begin to listen. In other words, the closer he gets to religion the farther he gets from his audience. It is a sign of the times that the masses are no longer concerned over spooks. The spookologists like Father Coughlin are finding this out fast, so they are trimming their sails to the wind. In order to keep their hold upon the masses they are dropping some of the religious vapors and turning to the real things of this common, everyday life but, unfortunately, to confuse and mislead, and not to clarify and help lead to economic emancipation.

** Has Father Coughlin ever denounced Hitlerism? **

Of the millions of words he has poured into the radio, not one was in denunciation of the barbarities of Hitler and his savage cohorts. Being an ignorant, bigoted anti-Semite himself, Coughlin until recently quietly approved of the persecution of the Jews in Germany and other equally unfortunate countries, and on April 28, 1934, tore off a tirade that is intended to provoke anti-Jewish persecution in the United States.

As is known to millions, Coughlin has proposed the remonetization of silver as a means of curing the depression—a piece of rank economic illiteracy. Now we know his motive. The dear father has publicly admitted his guilt to the charge that he used the money of his Little Flower League to take a whirl in silver, to the extent of buying 500,000 ounces of the metal on a 10 percent margin. It is plain that he wanted to cash in on his propaganda. In this he joins hands with the Protestant Pope, Bishop Cannon, who also showed how ready he was to combine a little old-fashioned money-making with the exposition of the divine virtues.

Father Coughlin’s speculation was exposed by Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr. It happens that Morgenthau is a Jew, which provoked the Catholic father to a white frenzy. He issued a press statement, which was printed in thousands of newspapers, charging Morgenthau with being in cahoots with the Warburgs and the Rockefellers (all Jews) in continuing mankind’s slavery to “Jewish gold.” His own metal he described as “gentile silver,” which takes its place as a new low in demagogy. We now are told that the 1,000,000,000 orientals who use silver are patrons of the “gentile metal,” while the yellow metal of Rockefeller, Morgan, the Bank of England, the government banks of France, Switzerland and Holland is nothing less than non-gentile gold. This is the language of a Hitler-fascist and it will be only a matter of time before this dangerous fraud throws off the rest of his mask and emerges as a full-fledged enemy of liberal and democratic government.

I can’t quite get over that expression “gentile silver.” It is a masterpiece of Hitlerism. By the way, is this silver gentile because it is uncircumcised, and, by the same token, has anyone noticed whether or not gold is really circumcized?

** In a radio speech on “The Red Menace of Communism,” Father Charles E. Coughlin said that Communism’s aim to destroy family life is attested by the fact that there were almost 200,000 divorces in the United States in 1929. Please discuss. **

This is typical of Quack Coughlin’s demagoguery. To begin with, there are only 9,000 Communists in the Communist Party of America, according to an official report made to Moscow. They had nothing to do with our 200,000 divorces. Those divorces were gotten by good old Republicans and Democrats, in pious, Christian states like Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma and other centers of Holy Rollers and Catholics, Christian Scientists and Seventh Day Adventists, Methodists and Baptists, sprinklers and total immersionists.

** In a speech in Royal Oak, Mich., **
Father Coughlin said: “Russian Communism is more or less nutty. It wants everything owned in common—the hat you wear, the shoes you wear, even your children.” Please comment.

Father Coughlin has expressed the same idea over the radio, according to a number of letters I have received. This quotation is typical of the man’s superficial, hazy grasp of economic realities. Either that or he knows better and prefers to hide the truth. Father Coughlin plainly lies when he says the Russian Communists want to own in common the hat or shoes you wear. The principle of private ownership of personal property—furniture, clothes, motor cars, cameras, books, etc.—is recognized and protected in the Soviet Union. There is nothing in the Russian program that aims to end the individual’s right to own privately his hat or his shoes. Father Coughlin should have added that what the Russian Communists object to—and most firmly—is the private ownership of the machines that make hats and shoes. There’s quite a distinction.

* * *

I think you are wrong when you attack Father Coughlin and his efforts in behalf of humanity. He and you say many things with which I and perhaps many others do not agree, but you both are working toward the end that I desire. Here’s to you both in your work for humanity. Praise, don’t knock.

I have not attacked Rev. Coughlin on personal grounds, preferring as I do to center my case on principles, not personalities. As his social policies are, to my way of thinking, absolutely dangerous to the welfare of the workers, I fail to be impressed with your advice that I “praise,” instead of “knock.” I prefer to “knock,” if by that word you mean opposition to an anti-social policy, a campaign of befuddlement, a service to minor, superficial issues.

As a spokesman of the Catholic Church, Coughlin can do nothing but take the traditional policies of the church, however much he “dresses” them up for American hearers. The Catholic Church at times seems to be all things to all men, being for monarchy here, dictatorship there, parliamentarianism in X-land, Democracy in Y-land, slavery in Z-land, but underneath it all is a consistent acceptance of mass exploitation, social betrayal, hatred for real democracy, disloyalty to ideals of freedom and justice. As I write this paragraph there comes to hand a clipping from the front page of the February 8, 1934, issue of The Boston Post. I quote:

“With a ringing declaration that ‘nothing redder ever came out of Red Russia,’ the Rev. Jones I. J. Corrigan, S. J., yesterday placed Cardinal O’Connell, Bishop Thomas M. O’Leary of Springfield and Bishop James E. Cassidy of Fall River on record against the proposed child labor amendment to the federal Constitution.”

What is this terrible Red Pest? Nothing short of an attempt of the American people to keep their children from being exploited in mines, mills, factories and other places of toil. Here and there a priest may be permitted to give lip service to seemingly radical ideas, but examination will show how persistently the real powers that be in the Catholic Church lend their strength to the perpetuation of reactionary conditions. Father Coughlin will talk “economics,” and he will make a great noise, shout and yell, and seem to invite Hell and damnation on the enemies of the Republic, but underneath it all is an implacable acceptance of mass exploitation, private monopoly, and deathless opposition to the philosophy of socialized industry. In the face of that, I consider it a public duty, as an editor, to denounce and expose such a charlatan.

* * *

Please explain Father Coughlin’s scheme of organization for the National Union for Social Justice.

I have seen an interesting and informative report on this Fascist organization, written by a news-
paperman for a select group of corporation heads, and never intended for publication. It tells of a press conference in Father Charles E. Coughlin’s study in the Shrine of the Little Flower, Royal Oak, Detroit, Michigan, at which the priest was asked to discuss his plan of organization for the 5,000,000 dupes he intends to corral. It makes delightful reading.

What Coughlin’s union amounts to is nothing less than a dictator’s paradise. In explaining his plans, Coughlin said the new organization will take all its orders from the top, and that Father Coughlin, of course, will be that “top.” It’s that simple. The so-called members will be grouped on a Congressional district basis, says Coughlin, and will thereby be in a position to put on the heat when Coughlin wants members of Congress terrorized into supporting his program of temporarily-veiled Fascism.

One reporter asked Coughlin if there will be any meetings, to which the radio pope replied that no such gatherings will be permitted. There will be no discussions, no meetings, no exchange of opinions, no reviews of programs, no voice in policies among the “members.” The “members” will have nothing to do except obey Coughlin when he snaps the whip “from above.” Coughlin will be a Hitler, Mussolini and Pope Plus XI rolled into one. “The ideas will all come from the top,” thundered Coughlin. “There will be no attempt made to get ideas from the members. Meetings have been outmoded by the radio.”

Thus spake the Lord. And 5,000-000 persons are expected to swallow this plan, without investigation, without voice, without power—pawns of a rambunctious priest. Will they? I have my little doubts. I don’t think it is going to be possible to keep 5,000,000 men lined up with the understanding that they are to be nothing less than Coughlin’s robots, his messenger boys whenever he thinks he must get his “organized” lions to roar at Washington. I may be abysmally ignorant of American psychology, but I persist in holding the idea that such an organization will defeat itself before it gets half started.

Coughlin, from what I can gather, is a vain, glib, shrewd, bigoted, foggy-minded charlatan. During the press conference referred to above, Father Coughlin was asked by one of the reporters to explain what he meant by the plank in his 16-point program calling for the “immediate recall of non-productive bonds.” To which the priest replied: “Any person of normal intelligence knows that.” And with that snappy reply he turned to other matters. But I am inclined to stand by the dumb reporter. I must admit to Father Coughlin that I lack normal intelligence, for I also do not know what a “non-productive bond” is. I wish he would explain, so that we economic illiterates would learn something. In all candor, “non-productive bond” means exactly nothing, and Coughlin avoided answering the reporter’s question because he didn’t know what he was talking about. Somebody—one of his numerous braintrusters—put it into his platform, and he had no idea what it meant.

The stake is all set for a tremendous wave of Coughlin publicity and ballyhoo. The man will run wild this winter. But I believe his union will blow up when even his fool followers find out that the radio has outmoded the idea of democracy and made imperative the taking of all ideas “from the top.” I don’t believe the American people are quite ready for complete intellectual authoritarianism. Fascism may be flirting with us, but it isn’t here yet, by any means.

What is your opinion of Father Coughlin’s program for his National Union for Social Justice?

I read it with great care and came away with the firm conviction that it is a perfect instrument for the beginning of Fascism. His 16 points do some queer meandering, but the vicious, ugly head of Fascism persists in bobbing up, especially when Coughlin lists the demand for the outlawing of strikes and lockouts. Put that one
thing into practice and you will have full-fledged Fascism in the U. S. Every Fascist movement—in Germany, Austria, Italy, etc.—began with this terrific blow at free labor, and Fascism will do the same in this country, if that menacing philosophy ever gets a hold on the people.

Coughlin, true to his brazen demagogy, offers to outlaw strikes and at the same time give the capitalist class a real slap on the wrist by forbidding lockouts. Of course, the linking of the two should not deceive even a high school sophomore, for a lockout is capital's weapon against organized labor only when there is the threat of a strike, and if the Coughlin Fascists succeed in making strikes unlawful there automatically is no need for a lockout. So the demand simmers down to an attack on the working class, who can command no authority in the industrial field once denied the right to use its only effective weapon. To tell the workers that they can't strike means nothing less than industrial slavery, on a par with the deplorable plight of labor in the Fascist countries of Central Europe.

Coughlin will continue to make faces at Wall Street and shake his fist at the financial interests, in addition to offering to tinker with the money question, but so far as the workers are concerned the man stands forth as their most promising enemy, a Hitler dressed in the habiliments of a priest.

* * *

Does Father Coughlin believe in Democracy?

I have examined his "16-point platform" carefully and can find no words in support of Democracy, free speech, free press and the other rights of enlightened civilization. For a mass-leader to avoid support of Democracy in these times of Fascism and dictatorship gives support to the suspicion that the motive behind his cavortings is the establishment of an authoritarian state along Fascist lines, with Democracy and civil liberties crushed. His record supports this assumption. He mouths just enough "radicalism" to impress the masses and enough Fascism to convince the industrial leaders of the country that he is the ideal leader for a Hitler-Mussolini movement in the U. S. A.

* * *

What does Father Coughlin mean by "Christian Capitalism"?

It's very difficult to know just what Coughlin means when he discusses economics. He has a way of clouding everything in vaporous verbiage. Ordinary Capitalism he has condemned because it embraces only the profit motive. This would imply that he favored the Socialist economy, in which production would function for use instead of profit, but he condemns Socialism, so that's out. Then he lets loose a verbal barrage in support of "Christian Capitalism," which, he says, means "production for use at a profit." Just where that differs from ordinary Capitalism I'm unable to tell. Capitalism, to be sure, is actuated by the profit motive, but it can't get a profit unless it produces, so Coughlin's "Christian Capitalism" simmers down to plain, old-fashioned Capitalism.

* * *

Would not the number of telegrams sent U. S. Senators in protest against entering the World Court be something of an index to Father Coughlin's real following?

I think you are right. In two radio speeches Father Coughlin brought his full powers to bear against having the Senate pass its resolution to join the World Court (Permanent Court of International Justice) and ended with urgent appeals to his followers to telegraph their Senators at once, whether or not they could afford to spend the money. Both telegraph companies report they delivered a total of 60,000 telegrams protesting against adherence. But it can't be claimed that all of these 60,000 telegrams came from Father Coughlin's supporters. Hearst used his numerous large newspapers to whip up sentiment against the resolution, and undoubtedly a certain number of these 60,000 telegrams came as a result of the Hearst campaign,
which was as hot as Coughlin's. So, for the sake of argument, let's grant Coughlin 50,000 telegrams as a result of his plea. Does that look so immense when one considers the Coughlin claim that he never talks to less than 10,000,000 and that more than 5,000,000 persons belong to his League? Admitting that 50,000 responses indicate real influence, we still need evidence to convince us that his following is as large as he boasts. To cause only one percent of his members (5,-000,000) to voice their stand on a matter that their leader decided was a test of power is to suggest the conclusion that Coughlin's organization and audience are far smaller than we have been led to believe.
President Roosevelt and the New Deal

Many thanks for your valuable reports on FERA doings, which one cannot get from the newspapers. Are the states doing anything along the lines of FERA?

Yes, several states are already getting into action, putting some of the unemployed to work making things needed by the jobless. The Illinois Emergency Relief Commission is giving relief jobs to 12,000 men and women, their work being to prepare food, canning, digging fuel and making mattresses and clothes. About 4,000 employees are making mattresses and garments and bed clothes, in 891 state-run shops in 82 Illinois counties. About 1,700 employees are working in 250 canneries in 64 counties. Almost 1,000 workers are at work at 38 places cutting wood and digging peat. I have no figures on activities in other states, but I know for a fact that the FERA idea is growing rapidly. It is possible that before long something like 10,000,000 of the unemployed may be put to work producing for themselves, in state-owned factories, canneries and other industrial establishments.

What do you think of the government's policy of giving relief to strikers?

I consider it the right thing to do. When a workman is fighting for union recognition, he is really fighting for section 7a of the NRA, which provides that it is a penal-tentiary offense for an employer to refuse to deal with a union of his employees. Thousands of large and small employers are openly flouting this law, which means that every strike for union recognition is a strike for the government and the enforcement of its federal law. Under the circumstances, why should the government refuse food and other supplies to strikers? They are entitled to relief, under FERA, regardless of the fact that they quit a job. After all, they quit because conditions were unbearable. They quit because they seek economic justice, and it is not for the administration of FERA to ask them to become strikebreakers. Many of these rich employers are getting help from the government, particularly through RFC. If the government can give RFC relief to employers who violate section 7a of the NRA, why shouldn't the U. S. A. give relief to the victims, under FERA? Of course, the capitalists and their editors are howling over this new policy of FERA to give relief to strikers. They do not stop to study their inconsistency, in taking relief themselves. The workers everywhere, employed or unemployed, should insist on federal relief to strikers, when they are in need of food. The union treasuries are weak, so if the workers are to get any measure of economic justice they should demand that their government, which is supposed to help and protect the weak, shall do something.

What is the government doing about illiteracy?

According to Acting Administrator of Relief Aubrey Williams, 40,000 unemployed, needy teachers are now being enlisted in the war on illiteracy. The immediate program is intended to reach 2,000,000 illiterates, most of whom are adults. This great movement is being financed by FERA (Federal Emergency Relief Administration) and aims at the following points: 1. Illiteracy classes; 2. vocational training; 3. vocational rehabilitation; 4. general adult education; 5. nursery schools.

What is the Roosevelt Road?

This is a project that has been considered for some months by
PWA, and it begins to look as though it will be carried through. If it is, the Roosevelt Road will extend from New York City to Los Angeles. This road, if constructed, will cut straight across the country, be six-cars wide, avoid all cities and towns, with a system of viaducts to eliminate cross roads. It will be intended for high-speed travel. Such a job will help the depressed motor car industry and give a boost to the “See America First” movement. The plans provide not only for a road across the U. S. but also look to two branches, one to Seattle and the other to Miami. Such a PWA project would give the administration something to boast about and would have real political influence in 1936, when Roosevelt must give a report to the country and ask for reelection.

* * *

1. How many families are on relief? 2. How many persons have jobs under FERA? 3. What has been paid them in wages?

1. 3,992,368 families were on the relief rolls in August, 1934; 4,016,018 in September, 2. During the week ending October 11, 1934; 1,387,000 men and women were employed in the FERA work program (Fed. Em. Relief Adm.), as against 32,542 during the week ending March 22, 1934. 3. The October 11 employees received nearly $14,000,000 in wages during that week. These workers were engaged in numerous projects, a few being: mattress-making, canning, sewing—room work, redecoration and repair of the various kinds of public buildings, work on waterworks, sewage and garbage—disposal plants, irrigation, hospitals, swimming pools, athletic fields, and the like. Adjoining the plant of the Haldeman—Julius Publications, FERA helped erect a fine brick and concrete fire station. While at the other end of town the young folks now have a swimming pool, also put up by FERA labor. The high and grade schools have been repainted and redecorated, and in many other ways the little town has received permanent improvements. In fact, the community got more improvements during the past year of depression than she got during 10 years of booming “prosperity.” And Girard is only one of thousands of benefited communities.

* * *

Have you any information regarding the quality of the goods made under FERA?

The best way to answer this question is to call attention to the heart—breaking squawk of the St. Louis Retail Furniture Dealers’ Association, which angrily complained that the mattresses now being made by and for the unemployed under FERA (Fed. Em. Relief Adm.) are of such high quality that they may stand 15 or 20 years of service. The dealers object to such strict specifications on the score that there will be no market for mattresses among millions of families when the unemployed are reabsorbed into private industry, if ever. I have seen some of the mattresses and am impressed with the workmanlike way they are made and the quality of material used. I have no direct knowledge of the quality of other articles being made under FERA but feel safe in assuming that the good standards applying in the mattress factories undoubtedly hold in other projects.

* * *

I work in an FERA meat cannery and wonder how many cans can be filled out of an average steer, but no one around here seems to know.

175.

* * *

Does Washington intend to do anything about grade crossings?

There is some talk in the PWA, at Roosevelt’s order, to go into the problem of railroad grade crossings. It is estimated that such a project would cost $1,000,000,000, which, of course, would have to be in the form of a gift to the railroad corporations, because they refuse to carry the expense of such a needed improvement. If grade crossings were eliminated, 1,500 lives would be saved yearly. In addition to saving lives, it would give great impetus to the heavy industries, which, of course, have been the heaviest hit during the
depression. The plans have been studied for the past six months and it is possible that something may develop soon. There's no denying that it, like the Roosevelt Road, would be appreciated by the people.

***

How is the San Francisco–Oakland bridge being financed?

This record-breaking bridge will cost $71,400,000 and will be seven and a half miles long, with six auto lanes on the top deck, and three truck lanes and two electric car lines on the lower deck. The money is being advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, at 5 percent interest. Until 1954, the U.S. government will collect all tolls and apply the money to this RFC loan. Meanwhile, maintenance and operation costs will be met by the California Highway Commission, which will draw on the gasoline tax. This is a genuine example of a self-liquidating project.

***

How can a workingman who gets small wages enjoy a vacation without going broke? The reason I ask is because I spent 10 days in a mountain resort and ended up with my bank-roll gone and $25 in debt to friends. It was an awful hold-up.

Your complaint is a just one. Working people aren't supposed to want vacations, according to our Babbitt standards. Vacations are for society debutantes, "tired" businessmen, fat society dowagers, gay sports and the like, but let a workingman "horn in" on one of these vacation resorts and he has to mortgage his radio, car and shirt before he can get a little recreation.

The government, through the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, is planning something right up your alley. The government will begin with an expenditure of $5,000,000, to make possible cheap vacations for workers, under decent conditions. The National Park Service, in conjunction with the relief agency, is now buying poor land that should be withdrawn from farm purposes, near great industrial cities, and turning it into recreational centers.

Land is being studied in 15 states to obtain suitable sites, mainly in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Virginia. This land, owned by the government, will be used strictly for recreational purposes. In perhaps a year the average worker, whose purse can't stand much of a strain, will be supplied with the best facilities, including cheap transportation. That is just one more of "those socialistic things" our government is doing. No wonder the capitalists are howling about higher taxes, unbalanced budgets and the other fears of the class that lives off unearned income.

***

Is Uncle Sam going to make shoes, as he is making mattresses, etc.?

At this writing it seems as though it is but a matter of time before the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, run by Uncle Sam, will be operating shoe factories with the men and women now on the relief rolls. The federal government is now the world's greatest owner of hides, as a result of its purchase of millions of cattle for slaughter, because of the drought. The unemployed will be put to work making millions of pairs of shoes, which will be turned over to the needy, who, in turn will, in many cases, be put to work making other useful commodities. This movement is only at its beginning. It again shows how socialistic ideas are becoming more popular every day.

***

I read that Roosevelt is putting the unemployed at work making mattresses, etc., for those on federal relief. Is this Socialism?

The Federal Surplus Relief Corporation has gone into the market and bought up millions of yards of ticking. Every unemployed family will receive a mattress, made in government factories by the unemployed, who will be paid wages for their work or will receive scrip.
which will be good for the products of other government plants. This enterprise alone will consume 2,500,000 bales of cotton, the one farm product which is in surplus despite the drought. This has caused a protest from the bedding manufacturers, but the government is paying no attention to them, except to state that the unemployed, who are without bedding, would not be markets for these capitalists because of lack of purchasing power.

Canning factories are being opened in numerous cities to handle the 7,000,000 cattle bought by the government to prevent their starvation because of the drought. Instead of letting this meat go to waste, the government will put thousands of unemployed at the job of preparing it for consumption by the 10,000,000 unemployed and their families.

The government is now at work placing many of the 80,000 men on relief in Washington, D. C., on nearby farms, where they will produce crops, milk, butter, cheese, etc., for the unemployed. Others of these 80,000 will work in factories, in Washington, making consumer goods like bedding, dresses, shirts, etc., which will be disposed of through stores run by the relief agencies. Scrip will serve in these places, instead of money. In this manner the relief workers on farms and in factories will work together for their mutual good, without resort to profit, dividends, interest, etc.

All this sounds truly amazing, and it is. The project is absolutely in the direction of Socialism—in fact, a long step in that direction. It shows how socialist ideas force themselves on people who hate the word Socialism, because the philosophy of Socialism is sound and will prevail. There is no escape from its demands. Capitalism or no capitalism, the people must eat, wear clothes and live in shelter, and they can't think up any plan that is superior to the simple, plain truths of Socialism.

What is astonishing about all this is that the steps are being taken by people who deny they are Socialists. Of course, they are not Socialists. Many of them, including those on relief, would grow angry if they were told they were perilously close to Marxism. But the facts speak for themselves.

The day will come when the unemployed will all be put to work making supplies of all kinds in plants operated and owned by the government. And when that proves itself a great success, the next step will follow almost inevitably—the employed, who are not on relief, will demand that they also work for themselves instead of piling up profits for the capitalists.

I am receiving relief supplies and want to know if I can exchange part of them for gasoline, etc?

It is unlawful to sell or exchange relief supplies, the penalty being up to 10 years' imprisonment. Canned goods, meats, flour, mattresses, etc., must be used by the recipient or his family, but under no circumstances may they be sold.

How much has the government collected on its processing taxes?

AAA estimates that $495,000,000 has been taken in through processing taxes on wheat, corn, hogs and cotton. Of this sum, $430,000,000 has already been spent, leaving $65,000,000. In all, according to AAA, collections will amount to about $1,107,000,000. Expenditures may reach $1,120,000,000, leaving a deficit of $13,000,000, covering the entire program of one year for corn and hogs, two years for cotton and two years for wheat. These figures prove that the hundreds of millions of dollars paid in benefits to farmers will not hike income taxes.

What's your attitude towards Secretary Wallace's reduction program in agriculture?

With millions in want, the Department of Agriculture is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to reduce future crops and destroy past ones. The program is typical of capitalist economics. There being no profit in a crop, a capitalist politician immediately concludes that if most of the crop were destroyed then it must follow that
most of the deficit would automatically disappear. So we see millions of tons of coffee burned, hundreds of thousands of acres of cotton plowed under, millions of pounds of hogs slaughtered, and tens of thousands of wheat and corn growers paid United States bonuses to keep their land idle for a stated period.

In this policy we see the profit motive of capitalism emphasized to the last degree. We see, with crystal clarity, that capitalism does not envisage industry or agriculture as a social service to render the lives of the people secure. Industry and agriculture, under private auspices, are mediums of exploitation and nothing else. What matters if millions of women and children go hungry and millions of men walk the streets and roads in a futile search for a chance to earn a living?

In capitalistic America we work feverishly to destroy crops. In the Soviet Union the farm workers strain themselves to the limit to produce greater abundance. What a difference! In the former, we see capitalist economy at “work,” to the detriment of the working masses. In the latter, we see what happens when the government owns industry and agriculture, with a view to supplying human needs as a social service instead of as a source of private profit.

When the history of dying capitalism is written, therein will be blazoned, in large type, “Here lies a system that first plowed under its cotton and then buried itself.”

* * *

What does the Bankhead Compulsory Cotton Restriction Bill provide?

This bill signed by the President, is now a law. It aims at reducing the cotton acreage from about 41,000,000 acres to 25,000,000, which is a cut of 40 percent. As there are 2,000,000 families engaged in the cotton industry, it will follow that something like 800,000 families will be deprived of a livelihood. The bill’s sponsors hold that these farmers—many of them Negros and share-croppers—will be absorbed in other employment, but

the fact that there are something like 10,000,000 now unemployed leads one to conclude that most of these 800,000 families will be made, and kept, destitute. There are signs of growing militancy among the share-croppers of the South, but whether or not they will go far enough to the left to realize the benefits of Socialism remains to be seen. However, they will have to turn to Socialism if they want lasting relief and a guaranteed living. Roosevelt’s idea of solving the cotton question by reducing acreage by something like 16,000,000 acres is little short of criminal, when there are millions of people in this country and scores of millions of people through the world who are in dire need of the things that cotton will make. Such policies show the bankruptcy of capitalism. The remedy will have to be applied—Socialism—if the dispossessed are to be saved from further economic agony.

* * *

Will the program of CWA, PWA and other works cure unemployment? If not, what will?

The programs listed above can help relieve unemployment, but not cure the social evil. This is because the enterprises are, in the main, non-productive, being intended to distribute wealth regardless of whether or not the recipient does productive work that can, in turn, be disposed of for money.

Sending thousands of men out to manicure the roads is perfectly correct national policy on the part of President Roosevelt, because this means wages instead of charity relief. There’s nothing wrong about making able-bodied men exert physical energy and contribute time for the money they are to receive from the government. But this, I repeat, is only an expedient, not a cure.

If we want to cure unemployment for good, we can’t even say that we should return to the boom days of 1925-29, for even during those days of immense, feverish activity in all businesses and enterprises, there was an army of unemployed always with us, ranging from two to three million men.
Unemployment is a disease that runs with capitalism, even when the system functions at its best. This is because the capitalists dare not tolerate a system in which every worker is employed, because this would automatically turn the labor market into a seller's market, instead of a buyer's market, as the capitalists prefer. By this I mean that if every man had a job, there would be extraordinary competition for workers among the capitalists, and as a consequence the workers could demand such high wages that the capitalist would, in most instances, find himself deprived of his much-sought profit. The system would simmer down to this: The capitalists would enjoy the thrill of owning the industries, but the workers would get the last possible dollar of reward, to the sacrifice of profits. And as capitalism is based on the principle of profit and not service, the system would commit suicide. That explains why the system sees to it that even in the very best times there is always a surplus of labor. Of course, even when there is always a surplus of labor there is, in boom days, a certain amount of competition for skilled workers, whose wages are thus forced up and up, until the employer is able to bring in his surplus workers and thereby level the rewards of labor.

In addition to the system's demand for an army of unemployed workers, we also find a certain amount of unemployment caused by technological changes. By this I mean the fact that thousands and tens of thousands of workers will find themselves suddenly deprived of work and wages because of basic improvements in machinery and methods of production. In good times a certain number of these workers can be absorbed in other industries, but by and large the problem of unemployment is aggravated.

Finally, we must also consider the fact that capitalism cannot function properly without a profit, and this profit comes from the labor of hand and brain. If the workers therefore do not receive the full social value of their labor, then it follows logically that they cannot purchase back the full value of what their brain and brawn gave to the world. This creates a surplus, because the capitalist—rich in dollars but weak in the power to consume wealth—is suddenly faced with the problem of disposing of what he already has stored away before running the risk of applying new labor to further production. It is then that we walk into a major depression, such as we have been "enjoying" these past four years.

Under such an economy, with labor willing and able to produce, but not able to render the capitalist a profit, we see the problem of unemployment grow more severe from day to day. Thus, instead of having 2,000,000 out of work, we find 13,000,000 without jobs. Such unemployment cannot be permitted to starve, because the government well knows that it is a case of "feed 'em or fight 'em." It is cheaper to feed the starving unemployed than it is to send soldiers out to shoot them down. Besides, there is always the danger in times of riot that the mobs may take control, turning the guns of the soldiers not only on their immediate enemies but on their social masters as well. So, as a measure of self-defense the system goes about the unpleasant task of feeding its unemployed until the system will again be able to hire the men and women at a profit. Naturally, the cheapest and best way to do this is through the government, so we see all classes turning to Washington for a method of relieving the unemployed. It is at such times that we are greeted by vastly conceived plans for public works. Some of the work, like roadbuilding, it is necessary, but a great deal of it is makeshift labor, without a view to getting value for each dollar spent. However, this matter should not be a cause for severe criticism, because it is impossible to put millions of men to work in a few weeks or months and then see to it that each produces socially valuable results. If the administrators are honest, if there is no graft or cutback, the people are satisfied, even though, as I said.
before, the men often are put to work manicuring roads instead of doing things that will be self-liquidating.

You ask now for the remedy. We have reduced unemployment from about 13,000,000 to something like 8,000,000, though we are still without accurate figures. It is possible that the army of the unemployed will be still more reduced, though I claim, as I believe I have shown, it is absolutely impossible for capitalism to ever solve the problem of unemployment, even in its palmiest day. So, what to do?

We now come to the one and only remedy—the only relief that will be a cure—socialization of industry under a Socialist administration.

If we say to the world: Every man who wants to work has the right to a job and will get it at the hands of the social organism, we are then given our choice between giving him a productive job immediately, or, failing in that, temporarily, we must provide unemployment insurance as a temporary relief until we get him the job to which he is entitled.

If society owns the railroads, power plants, factories, mills, communication systems, mines, and the other means of wealth production, distribution and exchange, its motive will be service to the people and not profits to a single, small class. We thus take the profit motive out of business and bring in its place the motive of service.

After having socialized industry, society establishes the principle that the worker is to receive the full social value of his or her labor. This does not mean that if a worker produced $10 worth of wealth in a day he is to receive $10. He must allow for depreciation, wear and tear, social insurance, overhead, etc. Then he gets the remainder, which is really the full social value of his energy.

By getting the full social value he does not create a surplus for the capitalists. Instead, he is placing in his own hands new purchasing power, and as a direct result he sets in motion new social enterprises, with the consequence that society goes on a permanent boom, with no limit to the amount of wealth it will be permissible for the workers to produce.

A great surplus of wheat would not mean that the workers should go hungry, once we have Socialism, because a surplus would be a sign of real social wealth, to be enjoyed by the workers until that surplus is disposed of. Under such a social order a surplus would be a cause for happiness, instead of misery and charity.

Unemployment, next to war, is capitalism’s worst evil. It is chronic under capitalism; it cannot be cured so long as the system endures and the capitalists own the large-scale mechanisms of wealth production. Under a system of socialized wealth, however, unemployment, like war, is automatically solved, because no class will exist to exploit and rob another, more numerous class. All will be workers, if physically able, and those who are able and will not work will be permitted to go without food until they decide it would be better to join in the ranks of creative workers and do their share.

If Roosevelt patches up the system to work for another 10 or 20 years, he will find, in time that the patches won’t hold. Unemployment will be with us chronically, only to become a major catastrophe in times of depression. And so long as you have capitalism you must inevitably have depressions. They can’t be avoided under a capitalistic economy. So, instead of merely patching up the system, let’s all get to work to socialize the industries, place the workers in control, put every man and woman to productive tasks, without exploitation, and then see how soon this little old earth becomes a haven of joy and happiness instead of a hell and torture chamber as it is under the rule of the private owners of the large-scale industries. That is the only way to cure unemployment, and I urge every one of my readers to do his or her share in the work of bringing these simple economic facts to the attention of the victims of this cruel, unnecessary, unscientific system.

* * *

Please give some CCC facts?

These camps, run by the Civilian
Conservation Corps, employ 300,000 young men, at $30 per month, but most of this money goes to the families of the youths. $80,000,000 was paid out to these families during the first year. During this period, the CCC camps cost $35,000,000 for food, $24,000,000 for shelter, and $40,000,000 for clothes. Numerous industries were aided by these expenditures. These vigorous young men are engaged in numerous projects—fire and flood control, roadside clearing, roads, trails, driveways for livestock, dwellings, barns, camp ground clearings, public camp ground water systems, seed collection, insect pest control, rodent control, elimination of useless range stock, tree and plant disease control, eradication of poisonous and other plants, ground water surveys, erosion control, bridges, ponds for fish and birds, recreational facilities, dams, clearing river banks, earth fills, channel enlargements, levees, landscaping, landing fields, and other activities too numerous to mention. There's no question that Uncle Sam did a good thing in starting these CCC camps. They have done the country a great deal of good, and with time will grow more useful, if Congress agrees to continue them.

* * *

What are the facts of the U.S. government's program for a belt of trees to modify climate?

F. A. Silcox, Chief Forester, U.S. Department of Agriculture, reports that his department has been authorized by President Roosevelt to proceed with a gigantic program that is intended to serve as drought-relief. The project will consist of a forest shelterbelt, 100 miles wide and stretching from the Canadian line down through North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and the Texas Panhandle. Roosevelt has already appropriated $15,000,000 to get the work started, and it is estimated that the project will cost $75,000,000 before it is completed. The belt will be 1,000 miles long, which makes it the biggest job of its kind in the history of the country. It will cover a total area of 100,000 square miles, or 64,000,000 acres. This windbreak of trees, set in rows seven rods wide, will have about 100 parallel sections one mile apart. The windbreaks alone will cover about 1,420,000 acres. The land will be bought by the Federal government, or leased for 99 years. It is estimated that the government will have to make deals to cover almost 200,000 individual land holdings. Each strip of windbreak will be fenced in to prevent damage by stock. Something like 200,000 miles of fencing will be needed, containing between 30,000,000 and 50,000,000 fence posts. Estimating 1,000 fence posts to the car, something like 30,000 to 50,000 freight cars will be needed to transport these fence posts. The government plans to buy or lease only the land actually needed for the trees, the land between each line remaining with the farmers, who, of course, will enjoy improved farming conditions as a result of this enterprise. It is claimed by the department that many strips of trees will be superior to solid forests. The government is already at work on a chain of nurseries to grow the seedlings. The actual work of tree planting will be going on a large scale in 1936 and will take until 1946 to complete. About 180,000 acres will be planted each year. The project will take about 3,500,000,000 trees, truly a breath-taking job. The windbreak will serve efficiently in various ways. First of all, it will help prevent wind erosion of the soil. We who live in the Middle West know what havoc the wind can play when it begins moving away billions of tons of topsoil and settling it somewhere in the Atlantic Ocean. Sufficient trees will prevent this catastrophe. Trees also serve to keep the moisture in the soil, thereby modifying this section's tendency to droughts. The President is to be commended for his intelligent handling of this problem. Trees prevent soil erosion, droughts and floods, if only man has the energy and will to get the big task done. The remedy is at hand; we need only apply it.

* * *

What is our loss through forest fires?

On the average, forest fires cost the U.S. $200,000 per day. During
1932, 43,000,000 acres of timber were destroyed by fire. During 1933 there was an improvement, because of the fire-fighting activities of the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps). In the national parks the losses were cut 37 percent.

* * *

Is President Roosevelt a Socialist and are his policies in harmony with the platform of the Socialist Party?

No, Roosevelt is not a Socialist. His policies, in some respects, are socialistic, rather than Socialist. There is a marked difference between the two. Socialist policy would mean a direct approach to a system of socialized industry, with wealth produced for use instead of profit. It would mean a classless society. A socialistic policy means nothing more than an opportunistic use of planks in the Socialist program, without the ultimate objective of the Cooperative Commonwealth. This does not mean that Roosevelt (who strikes us as an honest, courageous, unorthodox executive) may not gradually work around to out-and-out Socialism. Let's hope he will. He has the power to bring about the socialization of the means of wealth production, distribution and exchange. The man in the White House could inaugurate Socialism, considering the obvious fact that he is tremendously popular with the masses and that he has shown, in more ways than one, that he does not feel bound to the fallacies of capitalist economics. Unfortunately, thus far he has flirted with the left (Socialism) and at the same time told the right (capitalism) that he still believes in the profit system. But then, let us not forget that Roosevelt is a masterly politician, probably the ablest politician ever to occupy the White House. He may feel that he can best achieve the New Deal by moving cautiously, without unduly arousing the opposition. No one can tell what the future holds for us. At any rate, we can hope. And my hope is that President Roosevelt will, in time, come over to complete Socialism.

* * *

If you believe for one minute that Mr. Roosevelt is drifting to Socialism you have another guess coming. As he is one of the powers that be he surely will not go much farther than he has, regardless of what the voters of this country may think or ask.

Maybe you're right. My license as a prophet expired years ago. I don't know how far President Roosevelt is going to go in the direction of Socialism, but I'm sure you know about as much. He has made some fairly definite moves toward the left, and it is possible for him to go the whole way, though in this matter your guess is as good as mine. I fancy he is moving as far towards Socialism as the voters ask, and as the voters are still enamored with capitalism one can't expect too much. It may be true that if the workers were to become educated to the point where they would demand Socialism, they might find Roosevelt ready to go the whole hog. The best job for us to work on now is the steady, useful, necessary one of educating the people to an understanding of socialized industry. If the people were for our policies, we wouldn't have to guess about a Roosevelt or anyone else. We'd get our program carried out. Let's keep pounding at this campaign of education. It's the key to the future.

* * *

Is Roosevelt at the end of his rope unless he nationalizes or socializes industry?

I think so. He has his choice between patching up the system—and falling ignominiously—or going forward to the goal of socialized industry. I don't doubt that he can give the system a pair of crutches so that it can hobble around for a while, but he can't make capitalism work so that depressions will not reappear regularly, bringing in their wake poverty, unemployment, misery and social disorder. On the other hand, the socialization of industry would put society in a healthy and vigorous condition, so that man could go forward to new conquests. Socialized industry would solve the problem of unemployment. It would give the workers a sufficient volume of purchasing power so they could buy back what is produced, thus making depres-
sions impossible. Socialized industry is the real remedy for our social ills, and President Roosevelt knows it, but this does not mean that he is ready to risk the program, for such a movement would mean social revolution. By this I do not mean social violence. The system of production would be changed so materially that a social revolution would be effected, though it could be done under our Constitution without violence or illegality of any kind. Whether or not he will embrace this policy I can’t say. He has, thus far, shown no readiness to go the whole hog. He had the chance of a lifetime to socialize—or at least nationalize—the banking system, at a time when the banks were closed and their system in collapse. Instead of doing this, Roosevelt started patching them up, so that now they are beginning to grow arrogant again and are introducing a system of service charges that will, in time, cripple business for good and all. We haven’t begun to feel the evil of the rotten American banking system. There is still time to socialize it, but Roosevelt gives no sign of an awakening.

* * *

What is Stalin’s opinion of Roosevelt?

Joseph Stalin, secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was interviewed by the famous British novelist, H. G. Wells, on October 8, 1934, during which Russia’s leader discussed our President and his New Deal. Stalin said he felt admiration for Roosevelt’s energy and resourcefulness, but held that his “planned economy” could not control Capitalism and remedy its numerous evils, particularly with regard to unemployment. A planned economy, according to Stalin, could not bring prosperity to the working class so long as Roosevelt and his administration tolerate private ownership of banks, transportation systems, utilities and the general means of production and distribution. So long as the large industries remain in private hands it will be a part of capitalistic economies to demand and maintain an army of unemployed, for such an army, of varying size, is essential to the profits of the employing class. If the capitalists were to allow a solution of the unemployed problem the result would be a vast bidding for labor, ending with wages so high that the private owners would not be in a position to make their much-sought profits. Unemployment, like war, is a part of the capitalist system. Stalin further told Wells that the only solution is for the world to follow Russia’s policy of eliminating the capitalist class and making the workers the owners of the tools of production. Under such a system, he claimed, there would be no unemployment because the motive acting the social order is one of production for use, instead of wealth production for the sake of dividends. A planned economy, said Stalin, could only work in a society that did not operate under the profit motive. He added that Roosevelt might eliminate certain excesses of the capitalist system, but that he would do nothing to end the reign of capitalism, and for that reason his present policies were destined to fail.

* * *

Is President Roosevelt an enemy to capitalism?

No. He has said or done nothing to indicate that he believes in the principle of socialized industry. He accepts the profit motive. He had a chance to socialize the banking system when the financial house of the nation was in collapse early in 1933, and he did nothing except take steps to keep the banks going in private hands. In fact, President Roosevelt is capitalism’s best friend, in that he is giving his best energies to patching up the system in order to get the engine running again. He made a few moves leftward, but soon became frightened and is now firmly on ground belonging to the right. In other words, he is an intelligent, shrewd, resourceful, courageous progressive, with a strong belief in political democracy and the protection of civil rights. There is no denying the man’s charm and winning personality, but after all a government cannot solve its problems with a fetching smile and an attractive amiability. Roosevelt may still move
leftward, but it is a question how far he will go. Judging him by his record, I would say that he won't go very far. He certainly won't do a thing in the direction of socialized industry, the only sure remedy for our social ills. And if he won't do that, everything else he does will be beside the issue. He may put over social insurance and old age pensions (in which the Socialists will support him) but this won't mean the end of capitalism. In fact, it might make capitalism stronger, in that the workers would become completely satisfied with the system of private ownership of the means of wealth production, distribution and exchange. Roosevelt's progressivism will run its course, but in the end it will leave capitalism intact, and by doing that he lays the foundation for future crises, no matter how "radical" he may seem at times. If Roosevelt were a real social scientist he would go to the roots of our economic problems and end, once for all, the system of private capitalism, but it is plain that he does not intend to do this, so it follows that the workers will have to organize themselves under the banner of the philosophy of socialized industry and do the job for themselves. Socialism is more necessary than ever before in the entire history of the nation. It will grow more necessary in the future as the people learn that Roosevelt's progressivism is no substitute for socialized industry. The system will be glued together here and patched up there, but it will continue to be the same old rotten system of exploitation and greed.

You suggest that Roosevelt could carry his movement to the extent of socializing the United States. How could he overcome the resistance of the American Federation of Labor, the American Legion, the Daughters of the Revolution, the Catholic Church and all other opponents of Socialism?

I have never had any illusions about Roosevelt's "Socialism." I have written, again and again, that Roosevelt's interest is not in going to the Left, but rather in preserving the present system, patching it up here and there so it will work. The man has declared frequently that he is no Socialist, that he does not want a system of socialized industry, so I do not see why we should fail to take him at his word. I believe that Roosevelt's non-Socialism has the support of the majority of the American people. If the majority believed in Socialism, they most assuredly would have elected a real Socialist, who ran on a real Socialist platform. The reason the bodies you list are able to block progress in the direction of Socialism is because of the plain fact that these organizations represent majority opinion. If there were to be a great and effective campaign of education, so that a majority of the people really wanted Socialism and went to the polls to vote for it, there wouldn't be anything to fear from the bodies listed in your question. They block the way, because the people, in their ignorance, let them hinder social progress. You might say that they are ignorant because of the activities of most of these bodies, and in this you would be right, but that doesn't do away with the argument that the only antidote for their poison is the medicine of vigorous, clear, powerful Socialist education. It may be a slow fight, but it is by no means hopeless. Conditions favor the Socialist philosophy. The facts and conclusions are all on the side of the Socialists. They have the correct analysis and solution. And yet, they are not in power, while the non-Socialist Roosevelts are in positions of power. The fault lies with the Socialists themselves for not taking full advantage of their opportunities. It is their duty to wake up and get into action. Once they win over the majority, they will have nothing to fear from the reactionaries. They will be kept in line by the full use of every facility of the federal government, once that government comes under the direction of believers in a system of socialized industry.

Is Roosevelt moving towards fascism?

I can't see the slightest sign of it. Roosevelt's powers were given to
him by Congress, for a definite purpose, and must be surrendered at a certain time. We have an electorate that has the right to pass on Roosevelt's policies. We have free press, free speech, free assembly, secret ballot, free labor unions and the right of organization among opposition parties. So where's the fascism?

* * *

Why doesn't the government let its factories do something for the part-time workers?

You have brought up an important point. Millions of workers are now holding down part-time jobs that pay wages hardly enough to keep one alive. They should demand from Roosevelt that they be permitted to have access to the products of the governmentally operated factories. They also need mattresses, blankets, pillows, shirts, shoes, canned goods, etc. They should be included in the government's program. Incidentally, this is just one more way of pushing FERA another step in the direction of Socialism. Mass pressure can get the necessary cooperation from government officials. Part-time workers are urged to write strong letters to the President, demanding that they be permitted to share in the output of these new production centers.

* * *

Is Washington planning to do anything for Alaska?

Alaska's most immediate problem is unlike that of most of the civilized world—it is underpopulation. With less than 60,000 inhabitants in a territory of 600,000 square miles, we find less than one person to each 10 square miles. If anything, Alaska needs more people. Let us not forget that if Alaska were placed over the United States, it would touch the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and the Canadian and Mexican borders—and yet it has less than 60,000 people.

Dr. Ernest Gruening, recently appointed director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, is extremely well-informed and able to handle the problems of Alaska and our other possessions and territories in a competent and liberal spirit, striving to serve the sections and their inhabitants instead of letting them become mere objects of exploitation. I understand that Dr. Gruening is now studying the possibility of colonizing parts of Alaska, making it possible for a certain number of Americans to homestead desirable places. The plans are now only being studied, so it is likely to be some time before anything definite develops, but I feel fairly certain that so long as Dr. Gruening is in charge of this division of the government that something worthwhile for Alaska will eventually result. In addition to colonizing, there is room for much encouragement to Alaskan tourist trade, for there are wonderful sights to be seen up there. Those who love scenery cannot do better than spend a vacation in Alaska. There are glaciers so large that just one of them could more than cover one of our eastern states. Norway's fjords are children's toys compared to those in Alaska. Then there is the greatest, highest mountain in North America—Mount McKinley, 20,300 feet above sea level. What a country is Alaska! Tremendous forests, many of them not even explored. Bears, wolves, moose, caribou. Great herds of reindeer. Seal and sea lions. From Seward to Fairbanks runs the Alaska Railroad, built and operated by the U.S. government—400 miles of modern transportation waiting to serve hundreds of thousands of tourists yearly. I see that Russia's present rulers are expressing sorrow over the foolish sale of this territory to the United States in 1867 for only $7,200,000. At the time, our own newspapers and politicians criticized Washington for its "folly" in buying Alaska, but it seems more than certain that before long Alaska will be studded with hundreds of thousands of homesteads, with great numbers of workers applying brain and brawn to making Alaska's vast natural wealth available to the world. And while I am speaking of Alaska, let me say a good word for the people who are living there now. As a publisher and editor I have had numerous dealings with Alaskans during the past 15 years, and I have always found my best
audience of readers up there, Alaskans are great readers, and if the people in the United States bought as many of my books as are bought by Alaskans my distribution would have been increased 10 fold. A few of my Alaskan readers have called on me when visiting the States, and I have invariably found them delightful, simple, charming and more than intelligent. I always have a warm spot in my heart for the people in Alaska, for they have been more than friends to my institution. Alaskan readers are not afraid of serious literature. They do not run away from ideas. And as for theological superstition, I still have to meet an Alaskan who falls for such bunk. I don’t know why this is so. Maybe it’s because of the long, winter night. Maybe it’s because there’s lots of time for reading. I’m not able to say, but this I know: Alaska’s readers compare with the world’s best. An amazing fact, which I am sure will sound impossible to many of my readers, is this: More than 15 percent of the entire population of Alaska are customers for my publications, particularly my little volumes. That’s an astonishing record, and it’s the literal truth.

* * *

What do you think will happen if Roosevelt policies fail and bring the country back to what it was in the days of Hoover?

I can’t give this question a flat answer, because there are a number of possibilities, not merely one. Communist reds would say that Rooseveltian chaos would be a big break for them and put them in power, but recent history shows that chaos is a poor thing on which to stake Communism’s future. In Germany, before Hitler grabbed power, the Communists were sure they would take over Germany because chaos was going to play into their hands. History spoke otherwise, and even the Communists are beginning to learn something from that appalling blunder. A Rooseveltian debacle could serve as a signal for a Father Coughlin type of Fascist to move swiftly and establish a dictatorship, with Coughlin and the big capitalists in absolute power. Coughlin is grooming himself for a Fascist dictatorship, and it is hardly possible that he would build himself up as the logical dictator and then let someone else do the ruling. Or, if Coughlin fails to put himself over, some other rabble-rouser could rush forward and swing the country into Fascism. Which will happen I can’t tell. But it is fairly safe to predict that Coughlin is Capitalism’s hidden ace, and he will be thrown into the game when conditions compel Capitalism to forestall revolution by means of dictatorship. If that day ever comes (and let’s hope it won’t), Father Coughlin will be the man to put the United States back into the Dark Ages. Medievalism will rule. Freedom will die. Civilization will end.
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How many fascist organizations are there in the U. S.?
California alone has 40 fascist groups. I have no figures for the country at large, but it is safe to say there are between 300 and 400 groups and organizations, all out to "save" the country from Communism and, at the same time, get handouts from the rich.

* * *

Is Mussolini conducting any kind of propaganda in the U. S.?
There is a numerically small group of Italian-American Black Shirts at work in this country, amply financed from Rome. The propaganda is concentrated on the Italian press in this country, but from reports one concludes that the overwhelming majority of Italians in this country have no use for the political barbarities of Mussolini. There is always a great clamor over the propaganda "conspiracies" of Stalin, but these same elements never mention Mussolini.

* * *

What's your opinion of the Silver Shirts?
The Silver Shirts was started on January 30, 1933, by William Dudley Pelley, in North Carolina, and is intended to give the United States a good taste of Hitlerism and fascism. Pelley has also organized a subsidiary body, known as the Silver Rangers, which is intended to be ready at all times to serve in a violent capacity, in a war of extermination on Jews, Free-thinkers, Communists, Socialists, aliens and all other "subversive influences."

Pelley, who aspires to be an American edition of infamous, brutal, maniacal Hitler, rests his case for American fascism on the notions that the Jews are in a plot to ruin the world, that the Communists are about to start a violent revolution in the United States, and that the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" constitute valid expressions that point to the "menace" of Jewish "usurpation."

The whole movement is just insane enough to attract a large following among morons, normals and individuals of sadistic inclinations. The arguments against the Jews are particularly confusing, and would be amusing if it were not for the fact that these would-be dictators mean to inflict torture and persecution on the Jews in this country. To believe Pelley and his deluded followers, the Jews are in a conspiracy to corner the money of the world, through their control of international finance—a plain lie, because it has been shown that Jews are insignificant figures in world finance. The added resources of all the "international Jewish bankers" would not equal the resources of the two largest banks in New York City, and they are known to be strictly non-Jewish.

In one sentence, we learn that the Jews will enslave the United States through manipulation of capitalistic avenues, and in the next we bump into the sensational news that it is the intention of the Jews to support Communism and other radical movements in order to destroy our present capitalistic civilization. The thing is shoddy, and yet there are many ignorant men and women ready to believe such rubbish. How the Jews could conspire to make their own race the master of capitalism and in the same gesture destroy capitalism and put an end to the economic rights of the international bankers is a little too intricate for my naive mind. A Jew may be a conservative, or he may be a radical—and you will find both types—but to conclude from this that the Jews have conspired to both maintain capitalism and destroy capitalism is to take only a cock-eyed view.
A great deal of this "reasoning" rests on the publication of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," a document that has been exposed a thousand times as a rank forgery, but the lie continues despite repeated exposures. There never was anything even remotely resembling the "Protocols," the "Elders of Zion" are an organized body known only to these anti-Semites, and the contents of the supposed documents are so silly as to cause one to wonder how even a half-wit could believe in them. The "protocol" hoax is on a par with the medieval superstition that the Jews practice ritual murder.

As for the menace of Communism (as a weapon in the hands of world Jewry) there is plain evidence that the Jews are only a small minority in this movement, whether in or out of Russia. In Russia, only two Jews are today in positions of importance—one an assistant to Stalin (certainly no Jew) and the other Maxim Litvinoff, the Soviet Union's foreign commissar. Trotsky is a Jew, but he was ousted from power years ago. He was a disciple of Lenin, who was not a Jew. Karl Marx was a Jew, but Frederick Engels certainly wasn't. Nor were Bebel, Jaures, Debs, Hyndman, Keir Hardie, and the other leaders of radicalism. Individual Jews will be found here and there in the Socialist movement, but to claim that the movement is Jewish inspired, or Jewish controlled, is to utter rank claptrap.

Pelley warns his readers that there are 40,000 Negroes in Harlem, armed and provisioned for a Communist uprising. To think such nonsense shows a complete lack of knowledge of the fact that American Communism does not constitute a menace to American institutions. There are only 9,000 Communist party members in the entire U. S. A., and in the last election their leader (Foster, a non-Jew) polled only 102,000 votes out of a total of 40,000,000. Communism is nothing more than a strawman erected by Pelley in order to have an "enemy" to smash as a return for the money he receives from his dupes. If 40,000 Negroes in Harlem were to find themselves possessed of arms and ammunition, it is safe to say that the first thing they would do would be to storm the pawnshops in an attempt to realize something on their property. The thing is too silly for words, but it is silliness that rules in the end when such mountebanks as Hitler and Pelley thunder their hokum.

It is true that there are prominent Jews in public offices in Washington—such as Louis D. Brandeis and Benjamin N. Cardozo on the U. S. Supreme Court bench, Morgenthau in the Treasury department, and a few others. But these men are there because of individual fitness and not because of any kind of a racial conspiracy. The "Elders of Zion" had nothing to do with it.

There is no denying that Pelley's Silver Shirts organization is growing. Just how much, I cannot say. He claims 75,000 members, but that seems an exaggeration, though it is possible that the organization may exceed this number if the propaganda campaign (aided and partly financed from Germany) continues long enough. That Pelley's Silver Shirts are closely allied with the American representatives of Hitler is a proven fact. Nazi influences are hard at work to win American sentiment to the barbarities of Adolph Hitler. Such men as Pelley offer themselves as convenient tools, so it is likely that this country will soon be facing a serious propaganda that aims at creating race hatred and prejudice. The methods used by Hitler will be repeated in the United States, should the Silver Shirts grow strong enough to assert their will.

What's the answer to this? There can be no counter-offensive but the one based on reason, intelligence and free expression. Those who oppose the decadent notions of the Silver Shirts must fight fairly and honestly, for they know no other way. They would not dream of meeting Pelley's fire with the poison of persecution, bigotry and racial hatred. The best hope is a tireless campaign of education, based on a vigilance and concern over the fate of democratic ideals,
particularly free speech, free press, free assemblage, constitutional methods, orderly procedure, and the other expressions of civilized life. This does not mean that democracy has no right to defend itself. It is no denial of constitutional rights for the government of a democracy to insist that no military body, trained and disciplined, shall be organized by private or group interests. Such organizations can be outlawed without question, for there is no reason why a democracy should stand by and see its precious institutions of freedom and enlightenment destroyed by a group of uniformed vandals. The people's government can strike back with all its strength, and it certainly should. But this does not mean that the government should deny these elements a hearing. They should be permitted every privilege of free speech and the other rights of citizens, so long as they are orderly and do not infringe on the rights of others.

We are going through a period in which the friends of democracy in politics and industry must be ready to defend the institutions that have been wrested from the clutches of the tyrants. Our rights came to us only after we had paid for them with blood and tears. They are valuable rights. They are worth defending.

A United States ruled by Silver Shirts would mean we were living in the Germany of 1934, and the Germany of 1934 is nothing more than the darkest expression of current and debased life in the Europe of the Dark Ages. Let us all stand ready to protect our country from such a dark fate. We can do it by expecting our government not to permit overt acts on the part of these bigots and at the same time go ahead with an appeal to reason, a campaign of education, a constant drive to let the people know that these Silver Shirts and other bigots are conspiring to destroy what the founding fathers of the Revolutionary War fought and died for.

* * *

Is there any evidence that the German-American groups are further-

ing Hitler's anti-democratic policies in the U.S.?

The American Guard, organ of the Nazis, in its June, 1932, issue, said: "We repudiate the doctrine of popular sovereignty. Our political conception is... the very antithesis of liberal democratic ideas." The direct aim of the German-Fascist elements in the United States is to destroy the Constitution and place our government in the hands of a small minority, with the people denied the right to vote or any control in the government, whether in Washington, in the States or in the local sections. If Hitlerism were to seize power, the nation would be subjected to political despotism, at a time when our people are only beginning to give serious thought to the enlightened plan of extending political democracy so that it will include industrial democracy.

* * *

What is the standing of William Dudley Pelley as a writer and a thinker?

This organizer and leader of the American Fascist Silver Shirts is a queer hash of mysticism, superstition, economic bunk and historical clap-trap. In one of his books he speaks of having gone up to heaven and interviewed God himself for some seven or eight minutes! His mysticism is nothing less than intellectual hog-wash, as the following mish-mash from his magazine, Liberation, shows:

"Out of the vastness of Cosmos the Psychic Antennae tunes in a voice. If the Word was made flesh and spake once to men, how much stronger may be its pronouncement when the handicaps of flesh are perished? If we cannot believe this, to whom or what shall we look for authorship of commitments like the following...?"

Do you know what it means? I can't get any sense out of it. And this sort of rot is typical of his writings.

In discussing our political future, Pelley writes, in the same magazine:

"Do you know that this strictly Christian Militia, the Silver Shirts of America, means
to save America as Mussolini and his Black Shirts saved Italy, and Hitler and his Brown Shirts saved Germany—but without altering our republican representative form of Constitutional Government, if it can be managed.”

Do you catch that “if it can be managed?” Pelley would destroy racial groups, establish political and economic terrorism, crush all civil rights and force on the people an autocracy that will strip everyone of the rights of criticism, free speech, assembly, etc., and all this will be done in the name of Constitutional Government, if it can be managed! It is as though one were to say that a new World War would be presented to the world, but along pacificistic lines, if it can be managed!

Pelley says a great deal about Jews, one of his favorite charges being that President Roosevelt’s real name is Rosenfeld and that he is a descendant of Jews!

* * *

Please tell me something about Mosley’s activities.

Sir Oswald Mosley comes from old English aristocratic stock and is the son-in-law of Lord Curzon. He is extremely wealthy, of fine physique and a brilliant orator who is able to arouse the passions of uninformed working-class audiences that are easily moved by emotional appeals. This young man started in politics as a conservative, became a Minister of the crown at 30, turned radical, joined the Labor party as a left-winger, acted in the government as a member of this Socialist group, but with the growth of fascism in Italy he turned suddenly to fascism. He claims to have 500,000 members of his Black Shirt movement, and conducts a lively, vigorous campaign of agitation against Socialism and all forms of democracy and parliamentarian procedure. Unlike his twin Gods, Mussolini and Hitler, Mosley, as a temporary policy, prefers to follow constitutional methods, but it is known that these methods will be chucked overboard as soon as the movement grows big enough to grasp power. Mosley was not taken very seriously, but the sudden conversion to Mosley’s banner on the part of Lord Rothermere and his tremendously powerful press has brought thinking England to a realization that this young man may, in time, upset democratic England and give staidBritishers a sample of Mussolini’s fascism. He avoids some of the theories and methods of Hitler, particularly with regard to anti-Semitism and the glorification of what Hitler quaintly calls the “Aryans,” a race about which competent anthropologists know nothing. Mosley is a shrewd, compelling showman and may, in time, become a moving figure in England’s economic life, if the defenders of democracy and Socialism fail to stand by their tried and true principles. He is a warning to all England of what awaits the cradle of modern democracy, should those who believe in the free institutions of democracy let themselves go to sleep at the switch.

* * *

Why get all hot and bothered about what’s happening in Germany? That’s a long way from us. Why bother?

Hitlerism is a poison, and if it isn’t countered it will reach neighboring countries and eventually strike down American democracy and free institutions. Hitler’s philosophy of tyranny and terror is not a remote incident worthy of only casual interest. It is an immediate and pressing problem for Americans as well as Germans. Hitler has agents in this country, who are at work propagandizing our people for fascism and reaction. That makes the issue an American one, as well as Germany’s problem. Let us not fool ourselves about American democracy. It can be toppled over, if anti-democratic fascist leaders get a sufficiently large following. Let us not forget how easy it was for the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, an ignorant Texas dentist, to organize millions of Americans in a campaign of bigotry and persecution. It didn’t succeed, but that doesn’t mean the future could not tell a different story. There is a vast body of fascist opinion in the United States. Every lyncher is a potential Hitlerite. All Socialists,
Fascism and the Shirt Movements

Freethinkers and radicals of every school of modern thought should be on guard against a wave of reaction that can put this country back into the Middle Ages, along with Italy, Austria, Yugoslavia, Poland and Germany.

* * *

It is true that the rich Jews of Germany helped finance Hitler's campaign to destroy the republic and establish fascism?

This charge has been proved against the German Jewish bankers, who supported Hitler's treasury with heavy contributions before January, 1933. However, it is interesting to note that not a single German Jewish editor or publisher supported Hitlerism before or after the madman took power. They, including the great Jewish editors of powerful and influential daily newspapers and weekly and monthly periodicals, stood to a man in defense of democratic ideas, going down in the end to glorious, manly defeat. While Hitlerism has received no support from American Jewish capitalists, it is a plain truth that they have, been, and are, supporting reactionary, illiberal, semi-fascist causes, societies, organizations and slick red-baiting racketeers. Probably the worst instance to come to my attention is found in California, where the great Jewish capitalists in control of the movie industry joined in a brazen and dishonest conspiracy to defeat Upton Sinclair. The two worst offenders were Louis B. Mayer and his associate, Irving Thalberg. They almost blackmailed their employees into contributing a day's wages to the Merriam campaign treasury, knowing that Merriam is as reactionary a politician as Herbert Hoover and so reckless in his hatred of unionism that he called out the troops to murder peaceful strikers during the recent stoppage in San Francisco, when thousands of toilers attempted to organize into unions and get the rights "guaranteed" them under section 7a of NRA. In the Sinclair campaign, Mayer and Thalberg, two millionaire Jews, prepared a fake newsreel, which they distributed free of charge to the exhibitors throughout the state. This film was called "The Inquiring Reporter" and disgracefully pictured swell, swanky, smart-looking Gentiles telling why they were going to vote for Merriam and then showing several "low-brows," who spoke with Jewish accents, and said they were going to vote for Upton Sinclair because they would then be able to enjoy a fat living "without having to work." It is this type of Jew that gave dirty money to Hitler when he was getting ready to slaughter, persecute and imprison tens of thousands of innocent, poor Jews, intellectuals, freethinkers, radicals and others.

* * *

Are the Nazis making headway in the United States?

To read their publicity one would imagine our millions of German-Americans falling over one another to line up with Hitler, but the facts indicate that Germany's madman is making no progress in this country. For evidence, I refer to the 1934 election in New York State, where two Jews headed the old party tickets. Ex-Mayor Hylan, of New York City, also ran for Governor and it was assumed that the Germans (presumably won over to "Aryanism" and anti-Semitism) would support him. Out of 3,000-000 votes cast less than 10,000 went to Hylan. In one of the populous German districts in New York City (Yorkville) only 220 voted for Hylan, while 27,000 cast their "Aryan" ballots for Jews. This should indicate that the George Sylvester Viereck publicity campaigns for Hitlerism in the U.S. represent just that much wasted money, which is good news for lovers of decency.

* * *

Are these "shirt" movements in the U. S. sincere?

They are, one and all, rackets—cheap schemes to get easy money. The Federated Press reports that it has photostatic copies of letter written by Harry A. Jung, who calls himself "honorary manager" of the American Vigilant Intelligence Federation, offering copies of the often-exposed fake "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" to the chiefs of the Silver Shirts at 60 cents each, while at the same time his files show
cash collections from rich Jews for the suppression of Communism. That’s what constitutes a racket. Arouse anti-Semitic sentiment with one element and draw money from rich Jews at the same time. Some of the Jews who let themselves be “touched” are: Milton Florsheim, of the famous shoe company, Max Epstein, head of the rich and powerful General Tank Car Corp., and the Rosenwald heirs who are connected with Sears–Roebuck Company. These and other rich men, Jews and otherwise, are being scared by a lot of racketeers, who provoke disorders through their spies in Communist ranks and then use the incidents to shake down some cash. The red menace is a farce, but it pays real dividends to some clever racketeers. Go down the line and you will find that every shirt organization or red baiter is out to scare up trouble and make easy money.

* * *

**Why are European Fascists so ready to kill one another?**

The answer is indeed simple. Fascism is based on nationalism. Nationalism is the great breeder of discord and violence. Hitler’s Fascists hate Mussolini’s Fascists. Mussolini “supports” Austria because he hates the bigger Fascist—Germany. Hitler’s Fascists assassinate Austria’s little assassin, Dollfuss, because he stands in the way of Nazi nationalism. There you find the fatal flaw in Fascism. Its frenzied nationalism brings about conditions that make for violence, assassination, persecution, “purges” and wars. Fascism is nothing more than a symptom of the disease of nationalism. That is why Socialists join in opposing nationalism and supporting internationalism. The hope of the future civilization rests on internationalism and the end of nationalism.

* * *

**What is a “para-military force”?**

This is the technical term for private armies, such as the Black Shirts of Mussolini, the Brown Shirts of Hitler, the British Black Shirts of Mosley, the White, Silver and other kinds of Shirts of the U. S.

Defenders of democratic institutions now realize that no government should permit “para-military forces” to exist. Laws should be passed, and enforced, denying anyone the right to organize private armies, to drill and discipline armed or unarmed private forces that intend to assert power when strong enough to act.

In some countries, particularly England, friends of peace, democracy and freedom are insisting that the authorities prohibit “the wearing of uniforms or other distinctive articles of dress that are used to indicate political opinion.” “Para-military forces” are the usual weapons of Fascism. They should be prohibited.

* * *

**Why limit the boycott to only one fascist country?**

You are quite right. Hitler destroyed the labor unions, persecuted the Jews, murdered Communists and in other ways showed himself an enemy of civilization and common decency. But in this he was not alone. The same policies prevail, in the main, in Italy, Austria, Yugo-Slavia, Bulgaria, Latvia and Poland. The radical, union and liberal forces of the world should enlarge the boycott to include all goods and services originating in fascist countries.
Index

Abortion, death-rate from in U. S., 60.
Accion Popular, party of Catholic Fascism in Spain, 36.
Advertising, adds to cost to consumer, 79.
Alaska, its great need is population, 113.
Has great attractions for tourists, 113.
Alaskans, are great readers, 114.
Their character, 114.
Alcohol, may be motor fuel of future, 81.
Can be extracted from cereals, 81.
Alexander, King, assassination of, 16.
Character of, 17.
American Civil Liberties Union, condemned Communists for breaking up Socialist rally, 33.
American Freeman, is it organ of Socialist party, 21.
Would it be with workers, if they united, 30.
Readers should support federal antilynchling bill, 62.
Used facts from Consumers’ Research, 79.
American Guard, organ of Nazis in U. S., 117.
Ameringer, Oscar, collected $700,000, 44.
Has a genius for promotion, 44.
Anderson, Paul Y., article in The Nation, on banking, 82.
Anti-Semitism, its history and background, 71.
Arbeiter Zeitung, circulates secretly in Austria, 37.
Australia, its program of socialization, 17.
Autocrat, the inherent danger in his government, 5.
Automobiles, their speed means murder, 77.
Factory cost in low-price field, 78.
Baer, Max, displayed superb sportsmanship, 70.
Bankhead Cotton Bill, provisions of, 106.
Will work hardship on many, 106.
Banking, will it be nationalized in U. S., 82.
Why it should be nationalized, 85.
Present trend in U. S., 86.
Belief it is now safe a delusion, 87.
Will strangle business if left in private hands, 89.
Banks, rob the public with service charges, 86.
Bankers, make the public pay toll, 89.
Bank failures, losses from in U. S., 87.
Bank of International Settlements, would it be practicable, 82.
Beer, may be sold in cans, 74.
Bills, how to pay them through mails, 88.
Biro-Bidjan, offered as a Jewish autonomous republic by Soviet Union, 87.
Bolshevik, definition of, 40.
Boom of 1929, was everyone party to it, 84.
Boycott, should be applied to all fascist countries, 120.
Boyd, Ernest, article, Scribner’s, on fascism, 19.
British Columbia, its policies attracting attention, 44.
Brown Book, gives facts of Hitler terror, 63.
Bullitt, William C., outlines plan for trade with Soviets, 52.
Business reply envelopes, their use is poor policy, 80.
Canned seafood, production statistics, 76.
Capitalism, a useful development in social history, 4.
Is international, 23.
Unemployed are its victims, 25.
Its fall will not insure Socialism, 26.
Means endless threats of war, 83.
Its problems not solved by monetary experiments, 83.
When it fails, government must step in, 85.
Profit motive emphasized in crop reduction, 106.
Its epitaph, 106.
Its bankruptcy shown by crop reduction policy, 106.
Profit motive results in unconsumable surplus, 107.
Chain food stores, why managers are moved, 78.
Chemical industry, scope in U. S., 76.
“Christian Capitalism,” a piece of Coughlin bunk, 100.
Civilian Conservation Corps, facts about, 108.
Civilization, what is greatest essential of, 3.
Finest things in built on freedom, 14.
Has never died, 14.
Coal, how it is turned into oil, 81.
C. O. D. selling, argument against it, 81.
“Collectivist,” means same as Socialist, 26.
Comintern, what it is, 40.
Commonwealth Plan, should be studied, 22.
Communication systems, are waiting to be nationalized, 85.
Communism, leaders in U. S. are infer-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ior bigots, 28.  
American form, false echo of Russian, 29.  
Contrasted with Socialism, 30.  
Implies a socialized society, 39.  
Not a Jewish movement, 71.  
**Communist Party, its strength, 38.**  
Its leaders out of tune with America, 38.  
Not led by workers in U.S., 39.  
Present membership in Soviet Union, 57.  
Has few Jewish members in New York City, 72.  
**Communists, repudiated by Mooney, 28.**  
Did they steal from Mooney, 28.  
Are they working for same ideals as Socialists, 28.  
Many joined Hitler in Germany, 29.  
What do they mean by "united front," 29.  
Took little part in Austrian revolt, 57.  
Their philosophy inconsistent, 40.  
Are blamed for every disaster, 42.  
Have nothing to do with U.S. divorces, 97.  
Bank on chaos, 114.  
**Confidence, disappeared after depression started, 84.**  
**Conservatives, brand reform as "Socialism," 26.**  
Losing ground in Britain, 34.  
**Constitution, does it guarantee capitalism to exclusion of Socialism, 3.**  
Not committed to capitalism, 3.  
Americans will stand by it when they realize the implications of fascism, 8.  
**Consumers’ Research, Inc., aims and methods, 79.**  
**Cooperative Commonwealth, conditions are ripe for establishing it, 5.**  
**Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, is feared by Pattullo, 45.**  
**Cooperative movement, international status, 33.**  
Is strong in Soviet Union, 56.  
**Corrigan, Rev., places Catholic hierarchy on record against Child Labor Amendment, 98.**  
**Costigan-Wagner Bill, will curb lynching, 62.**  
**Provisions of, 62.**  
**Coughlin, Father Charles E., is he a citizen of U.S., 90.**  
Does he talk to 30,000,000 Americans, 90.  
**Exaggerates volume of fan mail, 90.**  
He is an ignorant yokel, 91.  
**Has no grasp of economic realities, 91.**  
His National Union promotes fascism, 92.  
**Dupes his followers with radical phrases, 92.**  
**Church, 92.**  
**His claims must be discounted, 92.**  
**As a priest he must stand with Fascism is his goal, 93.**  
Non-union labor built his church, 93.  
Has record of labor exploitation, 93.  
Has printing done in scab shop, 93.  
Is not a Socialist, 93.  
No limit to his mental depravity, 94.  
Is a father of fallacies, 96.  
*Gives no attention when he talks on religion, 96.***  
Has never denounced Hitlerism, 97.  
Took a flyer in silver, 97.  
**Makes false statement on Russian Communism, 98.**  
**His social policies are dangerous, 98.**  
**His dupes will take orders "from top," 99.**  
**Will his followers consent to be robots, 99.**  
**His union will blow up, 99.**  
**Plan to outlaw strikes is fascist, 100.**  
A Hitler in the garb of a priest, 100.  
**Not a believer in Democracy, 100.**  
**Is capitalism's hidden ace, 114.**  
**Craft unionism, has served labor, 32.**  
**Crop reduction, its fallacy, 105.**  
**Cummings, Attorney General, declares Russia in default under Johnson Bill, 53.**  
**Currency inflation, a little would do no harm, 83.**  
**Results if uncontrolled, 88.**  
**Daily Worker, lied about Austrian revolt, 37.**  
**Urged readers to steal Madison Square rally, 37.**  
**A despicable sheet, 40.**  
**Has no sense of honesty or fairness, 42.**  
**Attitude towards CWA, 42.**  
**Lied about Mayor Hoan, 43.**  
**Does not state all facts in case of Severing, 43.**  
**Charged Mayor Hoan used police against strikers, 43.**  
**“Dated coffee,” has superior taste, 79.**  
**Dawes, Charles G., benefited from RFC, 38.**  
**Debt, total of in U.S., 87.**  
**De Leon, Daniel, theory of dictatorship of proletariat, 10.**  
**Estimate of, 32.**  
**Wished to fight A.F. of L., 32.**  
**Democracy, difference between it and dictatorship, 3.**  
**Why superior to dictatorship, 3.**  
**Why it is better to count heads under it, 4.**  
**Is it of benefit to wage slaves in capitalist countries, 4.**  
**In its political form not a cure-all, 4.**  
**Is ours a bogus form of, 5.**  
**Our form too limited, 5.**  
**Making it a reality is our path to economic emancipation, 5.**  
**Is limited by selfish class exploiters, 5.**  
**Are we Americans ready to scrap it, 5.**  
**Still the best form of government, 6.**  
**Its benefits in America, 6.**
Is a new philosophy, 6.
Why it moves more slowly than dictatorship, 8.
Minority rule under, 11.
Can be toppled in America, 118.
Has right to defend itself against Fascists, 117.
Depression did not start from lack of confidence, 84.
Detroit Federation of Labor, criticized Father Coughlin, 93.
Deutsch, Julius, leader of Austrian Socialists, 36.
Dewey, John, Pres. of People’s Lobby, 33.
Dictators, entrenched because they control military, 12.
Violent measures only hope against, 13.
Cannot change policies, 15.
Rule by force, not consent, 19.
Dictatorship, difference between it and democracy, 3.
Does it get things done, 16.
Its basic weakness, 16.
Works two ways, 9.
Countries now under its rule, 8.
Growing in numbers and powers, 12.
Its effect on journalism, 15.
Dictatorship of the proletariat, can be a democracy, 10.
Free institutions will be crushed, 29.
Dillín, Elizabeth, wrote “Red Network,” 42.
Dogs, their number in U. S., 74.
Dog food industry, a new and flourishing business, 74.
Dolffus, murdered Socialists, 38.
Was he loved by Austrians, 20.
Dreyfus, Alfred, victim of anti-Semitism, 71.
“Due process,” is it a Constitutional barrier to Socialism, 3.
Earle, George H., gave false report, 36.
Eastman, Max, does he follow Trotsky, 41.
Eddy, Sherwood, discredits Russian famine rumors, 50.
Evaluators, facts and statistics of, 78.
Elevator operators, could paralyze city’s business, 79.
Engels, Friedrich, when did he live, 39.
England, why sympathetic to the South, 28.
Europa, population of under dictatorship, 17.
Export-Import Bank, now at state-mate, 53.
Farley, James, opposes extension of postal savings banks, 87.
Fascism, what it is, 6.
Where is its menace in the U. S., 7.
Many in the U. S. ignorantly advocate it, 7.
A picture of the U. S. under its rule, 7.
It means a return to medievalism, 8.
Not threatening outside Central Europe, 12.

Propaganda in the U. S., 13.
Cannot be compared to democracy, 17.
Contrasted with Democracy, 30.
Contrasted with Socialism, 30.
Contrasted with Communism, 30.
Menace of in Spain has brought radicals together, 36.
“Capitalism plus murder,” 43.
Based on nationalism, 120.
Has received support from Jewish capitalists in U. S., 119.
Number of organizations in U. S., 115.
Fascists, why so ready to kill each other in Europe, 120.
Faulhaber, Cardinal, did he defend German Jews, 66.
Federal anti-lynching law, will it work, 62.
FERA, states are following its lead, 102.
Wars on illiteracy, 102.
Number it employs, 103.
Wages paid under, 103.
Permanent benefits to many communities, 103.
Quality of goods produced under, 103.
Should help part-time workers, 113.
Federal Surplus Relief Corp., plans cheap vacations for workers, 104.
Plans to operate shoe factories, 104.
Takes steps in direction of Socialism, 105.
Food, statistics of annual consumption per capita, 76.
Ford, Henry, repudiated “The International Jew,” 64.
Has made 26,000,000 cars, 77.
Experiments with soy beans, 77.
Forest fires, losses from in U. S., 109.
Forest shelterbelt, a gigantic project, 109.
How it will work, 109.
Foster, Wm. Z., sold Liberty bonds during War, 29.
GPU, is no longer so terrible, 46.
What it is, 49.
Gasoline, annual consumption in U. S., 81.
General Foods, Inc., advertising expense and dividends in 1933, 79.
“Gentile silver,” is it circumscribed, 97.
Germany, treatment of Jews not exaggerated, 63.
Encourages racial persecution, 66.
Prelates cling to Old Testament, 66.
Why worry what happens there, 118.
Ghetto, how it originated, 65.
Gobbel, Dr., libels Jews, 68.
Gold, revaluation gave U. S. profit, 87.
Goldman Emma, brands Hitler degenerate, 18.
Grade crossing problem, will government solve it, 103.
Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co., scope of its business, 78.
Gropper, William, draws federal relief, 43.
Gruening, Ernest, studies plans for colonizing Alaska, 113.
Haldeman-Julius Pubs., have wide distribution in Alaska, 114.
Hearst, William R., promotes red-scare, 34.
Hitler, Adolf, his notorious degeneracy, 18.
Plays to rule for life, 19.
Called "obscene demagogue," by Sinclair, 43.
Criticizes Soviet Union, 51.
Played radical to win workers, 92.
Clearly responsible for Jewish boycott, 67.
Hitlerism, a poison that spreads rapidly, 118.
Hoan, Daniel, helped Milwaukee strikers, 43.
Has no control of Milwaukee police, 44.
Hopkins, Frank S., article in Harper's, 11.
Hosiery, annual sale in U. S., 75.
House of Commons, can override Lords, 34.
House of Lords, can it stop British Socialism, 34.
Could be abolished by Commons, 34.
Hutton, Barbara, status under Socialism, 23.
Income tax law, decried by conservatives, 27.
Incubator, how it compares with hen, 73.
Industrial unionism, is it superior to craft unionism, 32.
I. W. W., insisted on "No politics," 33.
Crushed by political action, 33.
Industry, why located in cold climate, 75.
Ivory soap, "It floats" means more air holes, 80.
Japan, now formidable in industrial competition, 51.
Jefferson, Thomas, quotation from, 26.
Jews, gave 100,000 sons to Kaiser's army, 67.
Came from Poland at Kaiser's invitation, 67.
Are not weaklings nor cowards, 70.
Have notable record in pugilism, 70.
Their "influence" in Washington a myth, 70.
Property stolen by Nazis if they leave Germany, 71.
Do not control international finance, 115.
Only a small minority in Communist movement, 116.
Did any of them aid Hitler to power, 119.
"Just compensation," is it a constitutional bar to Socialism, 3.
Kahn, Otto, did not finance Russian Revolution, 67.
Kerensky debts, not a legitimate obligation, 53.
In same class with defaulted Confederate bonds, 53.
May be offset by Russian claims against U. S., 54.
Ku Klux Klan, a brief history of, 63.
A shrewd racket, 64.
Kulak, definition of, 60.
Lamont, Corliss, does not wipe nose with fingers, 31.
Laski, Harold, comment on Russian penal system, 47.
Comment on living standards in Soviet Union, 59.
Lenin, did not want dictatorship of proletariat, 10.
Recognized De Leon's greatness, 32.
Did he give Jesuitical advice, 40.
Facts about his death, 59.
Liberalism, adherents must rally to its defense, 20.
Liberty, slandered by her enemies, 13.
Will return, 13.
Will call for revenge, 14.
Lincoln, Abraham, defense of revolution, 26.
Litvinoff, Maxim, his position in internal affairs of Russia, 48.
Has hopes for the League of Nations, 48.
London Times, branded "Protocols" as forgery, 68.
Lynching, how to stamp it out, 61.
Is the "sport" of cowards, 61.
Can be ended by federal law, 61.
Condemned by southern women, 62.
Statistics show it is declining, 63.
Has no social or official sanction in U. S., 66.
Lynchings, number of since 1889, 62.
Rarely occur in cities, 63.
Macdonald, Ramsay, betrayed his ideas, 29.
Macy's Department Store, run by shrewd managers of advertising, 70.
Marr, William, restated anti-Judaism as anti-Semitism, 71.
Marx, Karl, warned against cliques, 10.
On equality of rewards, 11.
His theory of the state, 25.
Praised Lincoln, 28.
His most original contribution, 39.
When did he live, 39.
Contributions to economic theory, 39.
Was his theory of leadership right, 39.
Mayer, Louis B., spread propaganda against Upton Sinclair, 119.
McCabe, Joseph, lectures at Winnipeg, 35.
Mecklin, J. M., author of "The Ku Klux Klan," 64.
Medievalism, threatens our liberties, 20.
"Merchant of Venice," a lesson in tolerance, 65.
"Metered banking," how it works, 89.
Middle Class, supported Hitler in Germany, 24.
Must learn fascism is its enemy, 24.
Milk, how much to make a pound of
cheese and butter, 75.

Miscegenation, will it solve race problem, 64.

Occurs frequently in U. S., 64.

Mob, a band of criminals, 61.

Money, no shortage of it today, 91.

Money, Tom, are only Communists working to free him, 28.

Morgan, J. P. & Co., its control over industry, 85.

Morgenthau, Secretary, reports on treasury, 88.

Exposed Father Coughlin's speculation, 97.

Morocco, still maintains ghettos, 65.

Morrison, Herbert, led Socialists in London victory, 33.

Moscow, largest city in Soviet Union, 57.

Moseley, Sir Oswald, leader of British Fascists, 118.

Is a warning to England, 118.

Movies, not “indecent,” but stupid, 69.

Extra “hot” pictures attract crowds, 70.


Is he propagandizing in U. S., 115.

“Nationalization,” is it same as “Socialization,” 22.

National Union for Social Justice, a dictator's paradise, 98.

Perfect instrument for beginning fascism, 99.

Nazis, not making headway in U. S., 119.

N. Y. Stock Exchange, is it essential, 83.

“Non-productive bonds,” what are they, 99.

Oklahoma Leader, plant owned by Ameringer, 44.

Paine, Thomas, definition of government, 5.

Paper, U. S. imports large quantity, 75.

How prepared for butter cartons, 76.

Paper money, safe to send through mails, 88.

“Para-military force,” definition of, 120.

Pattullo, Premier, leads experiment in British Columbia, 44.

Paul IV, Pope, compelled Jewish segregation, 66.

Pelley, William D., organizer of Silver Shirts, 115.

Contradicts himself with regard to Jews, 115.

Draws largely on discredited “Protocols,” 116.

Uses Communism as a straw man, 116.

A sample of his “thought,” 117.

How he would “save” America, 118.


People, their right under the Constitution to establish Socialism, 3.

People’s Lobby, what it is, 33.

Petersen, Arnold, characterizes Communism, 27.

Planned economy, not possible where profit motive operates, 111.

Plato, definition of democracy by, 5.

Politbureau, how it expresses party will

in the Soviet Union, 10.

Political action, why it is necessary for the establishment of socialized industry, 8.

Popes, did they defend the Jews, 68.

Permitted outrages against Jews, 69.

Porter, Paul, a coming leader, 22.

Postal savings banks, do they show profit, 86.

Press, a safeguard of civilization, 15.

Its status under Hitler, 16.

Its service in granting a true perspective, 16.

Editors of Wall Street now silent, 22.

Private property, not outlawed by Socialism, 95.

Processing taxes, collections from, 105.

Profintern, what it is, 40.

Progressivism, no substitute for socialized industry, 112.

Protocols of Elders of Zion, a forgery, 68.

Public works program, will it solve unemployment, 106.

Queen, John, elected mayor of Winnipeg on Socialist ticket, 35.

Racial antagonism, has economic roots, 64.

Radek, Karl, article in Foreign Affairs, 49.

Radicalism, not alien to America, 26.

Radicals, is their language American, 26.

Must they have majority to gain power, 27.

Railroads, are close to bankruptcy, 85.

RFC, aids chiselling employers, 102.

Red-baiters, make trouble to make money, 120.

Red menace, is there one in U. S., 41.

“Red Network,” lists alleged Communists, 42.

Relief, number of families on, 103.

Relief supplies, unlawful to sell or barter, 105.

Retail store clerks, becoming unionized, 78.

Revolution, cannot come by violence in U. S., 27.

Talk of in America is foolish, 4.

“Revolution,” used erroneously by dictators, 19.

Revolutionists, their cause not hopeless, 12.

“Ritual murder,” an “unscrupulous fiction,” 68.

Origin of the charge, 68.

Rogers, J. A., article on racial persecution, 63.

Rolph, Governor, encouraged lynchers, 61.

Roman Catholic Church, allied with dictators, 15.

What’s behind its crusade for “clean” movies, 69.

Its cardinal in Vienna joined in murder of Socialists, 69.

Openly promotes anti-Semitism in Europe, 69.
Its “purity” campaign a weapon against Jews, 69.
Held Judaism a crime against God, 71.
Loss of temporal power emancipated Jews, 71.
Still retains reactionary ideals, 93.
Its code far removed from true morality, 94.
Its hideous record, 94.
Roosevelt, Pres. F. D., is not introducing fascism, 6.
Derives his powers from the people, 6.
Will he swing to the left, 21.
Wavers between nationalization and socialization, 23.
Is he worthy of praise by Marxians, 28.
Blundered when he failed to nationalize banks, 82.
Daily mail is large, 90.
His policies socialist, not Socialist, 110.
Could inaugurate Socialism, 110.
Is he drifting towards Socialism, 110.
Can’t make capitalism work, 110.
Missed big chance when he failed to nationalize banks, 111.
Not an enemy of capitalism, 111.
Declares he is no Socialist, 112.
Could he overcome opposition of reactionaries, 112.
Is he moving towards fascism, 112.
What will happen if he fails, 114.
Is he of Jewish descent, 118.
Roosevelt Road, description of, 102.
Rothermere, Lord, became Mosley’s convert, 118.
Rubber, statistics of world production, 74.
Rubber substitutes, cannot compete with natural product at present price, 74.
“Rugged individualism,” still cherished by many, 22.
Sabotage, considered counter-revolutionary in Soviet Union, 49.
San Francisco-Oakland bridge, how financed, 104.
“Secret 13,” who are they, 42.
Shakespeare, not an anti-Semite, 65.
Reveals himself as great Freethinker, 65.
Shirt movements, are based on greed, 119.
Silkin, Lewis, states aims of London Socialists, 35.
Silver Shirts, origin of, 115.
A movement for morons, 115.
Organization is growing, 116.
What their rule would mean, 117.
Simpson, Herman, controversy with Max Eastman, 41.
Sinclair, Upton, is no Fascist, 43.
Socialism, its best form is industrial democracy, 19.
Will it take over small industries, 23.
Will not outlaw personal property, 23.
Is it “foreign” to America, 23.
Its significance for the middle class, 24.
Not “a form of capitalism,” 24.
Is it inevitable, 26.
Contrast between German National and American, 31.
Making headway in Canada, 35.
Can be attained in U. S. by orderly means, 58.
Not indebted to Christian morals, 94.
Its code based on Materialism, 94.
Makes no apology for rejecting theology, 95.
Its founders accepted Atheism, 95.
Not based on “brotherhood,” 96.
Is predicated upon cooperation, 96.
Forces self on people who hate its name, 105.
Surprises would be cause for rejoicing, 108.
“Socialist competition,” definition of, 58.
Socialist Labor Party, its attitude towards Communism, 27.
Contrasted with Communist Party, 31.
Socialists, making progress in England, 12.
Their duty in present crisis, 21.
Must guard their rights at the polls, 22.
Are they less militant than Communists, 27.
Are they to be trusted, 29.
Their manners better than Communists, 30.
Majority in London election, 33.
In England, are realistic, 34.
British are committed to democracy, 34.
Program of slum-clearance in London, 35.
Are they strong in Spain, 35.
Refused to join Nazis against Austrian Fascists, 36.
Have been driven underground in Austria, 36.
Must concentrate on education, 110.
Have not grasped opportunities, 112.
Socialists, Austrian, their course defended, 17.
“Socialist guards,” incurably theatrical, 15.
“Socialization,” is it same as “Nationalization,” 23.
Socialist Party, its official name, 21.
Size of its membership, 21.
How to join, 21.
Social security program, might strengthen capitalism, 112.
Social system, if perfect, would degeneration follow, 25.
Southern pine, a source of cheap paper, 75.
Soviet Union, its dictatorship not fascist, 9.
Its Journalism is different, 46.
Index

Not a dictatorship of the proletariat, 9.
Population of, 9.
Its dictatorship practicable, 18.
Why the bolsheviks succeeded, 27.
Is its regime State Capitalism, 38.
Has second greatest library, 46.
Newspaper publishing has grown, 46.
Educating younger generation to accept its policies, 46.
School enrollments are growing, 47.
Has 100,000 churches, 47.
Regards Zionism as tool of imperialism, 47.
Has rational attitude towards crime, 47.
Not partial to Judaism, 47.
Undermines religion by education, 48.
Has fewer prisons and prisoners, 48.
Lawyers are employed by state, 48.
Has little crime, 48.
Attitude towards League of Nations, 48.
Foreign policy not based on Marxism, 48.
Principles of its foreign policy, 49.
War justified in crushing White Guards, 50.
Has been too ruthless towards dissenters, 50.
Permits cabarets, 50.
Rumors of famine false, 50.
What would happen if government fell, 50.
Its collapse would entail war, 51.
Its government a guarantee of peace, 51.
Why it builds plants in Siberia, 51.
Forced to borrow capitalistic technique, 51.
What is "Iron Mountain," 52.
Is training parachutists, 52.
U. S. would benefit from trade, 52.
Always meets legitimate obligations, 52.
Must sell to us in order to buy our goods, 53.
Does it have dictatorship of proletariat, 54.
How it handles money question, 55.
Government controls real wages of workers, 55.
Scarcity of goods causes discontent, 55.
Illegal to export its currency, 56.
Prices much gold, 56.
Private business insignificant in volume, 56.
How factories get raw material, 56.
Much confusion in management of industry, 56.
Growing demand for simpler business methods, 57.
Industry now greater than agriculture, 57.
Is largest country in the world, 57.
Is Europe's best friend to the Jews, 57.
Statistics of industrial production, 58.
Not to be taken as model for U. S., 58.
Do its workers have economic independence, 59.
Condition of workers will improve, 59.
Has but few jobs for foreigners, 59.
Will soon be independent of foreign experts, 60.
Its attitude towards birth control, 60.
Conducts numerous birth control clinics, 60.
Used harsh measures against kulaks, 60.
Outlaws racial chauvinism, 64.
Sets splendid example of toleration, 65.
Children there belong to parents, 95.
Principle of private property protected, 98.
Regrets sale of Alaska, 113.
Speculation, Flynn's definition of, 84.
Spengler, Oswald, definition of Socialism, 24.
Stalin, Joseph, his position in the Soviet government, 10.
Fits into the Russian picture, 18.
Warned Japanese imperialists, 49.
May be removed by Communist Party, 54.
Holds power as head of Communist Party, 54.
Why he split with Trotsky, 54.
Is an iceberg, 55.
Not an anti-Semite, 65.
His opinion of Roosevelt, 111.
State, need it be only a tool of capitalism, 25.
State Capitalism, definition of, 38.
Steer, number of cans filled from average, 103.
Streamline trains, Uncle Sam suggested the idea, 80.
Economical in use of fuel, 80.
Streicher, Julius, author of absurd libel, 66.
Strikers, entitled to government relief, 102.
Sugar, statistics of consumption, 73.
Sugar beet industry, development in U. S., 73.
Textile mills, cost of operation, 75.
Thomas, Norman, his Socialism sound, 96.
Toy industry, statistics of, 75.
T. U. U. L., what it is, 41.
Trotsky, why he split with Stalin, 54.
Insisted on world-revolution, 55.
Trojanovsky, A. A., speech at Cincinnati, 9.
Sees no signs of revolution in U. S., 54.
Tung oil, its use in paint manufacturing, 77.
Tung tree, may be basis of new industry, 77.
Turkey, its dictatorship is not fascist, 8.
Its women have been emancipated, 9.
Encourages skeptical examination of
religion, 9.
Tyranny, definition of, 15.
Umbrella business, declining in U. S.,
74.
Unemployed, are always with us, 106.
Case of "feed 'em or fight 'em," 107.
Unemployment, partial cause is techno-
logical changes, 107.
Aids capitalists in controlling labor
market, 107.
Socialization of industry only remedy,
108.
Chronic under capitalism, 108.
U. S. government, has not strained
credit, 88.
Has money to put unemployed to
work, 88.
Lenient to Confederate leaders, 37.
U. S. treasury, status of, 87.
Viereck, George S., compares Nazi per-
secution of Jews to American Lynch-
ings, 66.
His campaign represents wasted
money, 119.
Voltaire, anecdote, 20.
Voters, still enamored of capitalism,
110.
Wall Street, rules the U. S., 86.
Ward, Lester F., did he write in defense
of racial persecution, 63.
Weideman, Rep. Carl M., investigated
Reds, 41.
Wells, H. G., interview with Stalin,
111.
Winrod, Glenn, a bigoted anti-Semite,
64.
Wirz, Henry, why he was hanged, 37.
Woll, Matthew, Communists objected to
his speech, 32.
Worker, should receive full social value
of labor, 108.
Workingman, more dangerous to be
than soldier, 73.
Working class, dictatorship of, 15.
Its dictatorship not favored in U. S.,
18.
World Court issue, an index of Cough-
lin's strength, 100.
Yaroslavsky, Emelyan, heads Russia's
militant Atheists, 47.